

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
1	Charles Barlow	When I went to 60 E. Van Buren this afternoon I was informed that I would need to contact you to obtain copies. I realise that this is not your fault, but it was nevertheless frustrating to travel downtown to leave without the documents the notice states are available at CHA's corporate offices. Please can you send hard copies of all documents out for public comment as soon as possible.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Hard copies of the documents proposed for public comment are generally available at 8am on the first day of the public comment period. Unfortunately, for this comment period, hard copies of the document were not available in CHA's lobby until July 1. CHA apologizes for the inconvenience, however the documents were available for review on CHA's website at the start of public comment on June 27.</p> <p>CHA did intend to mail hard copies of the document per this request, however the mailing was delayed. CHA later arranged to provide hard copies on July 9, and the copies were provided.</p>
2	Robert Whitfield	The current CHA occupancy policy does not allocate vouchers by bedroom size in accordance with the attached HUD Notice, and or the attached regulations issued by HUD at 24 CFR Part 982.401(d)(1)(ii). These mandatory HUD provisions specifically state the following: <i>Children of the opposite sex, other than the very young, may not be required to occupy the same bedroom or living/sleeping room.</i> CHA continues to ignore this regulatory requirement, despite ongoing verbal and written comments to CHA management officials dating back to 2011. The current draft CHA HCV Administrative Plan contains no changes to the current policy, and still contains the same language ignoring this Federal requirement. Even the section that states that CHA may make exceptions to its occupancy policy does not list the above HUD prohibition against children of the same sex sharing the same bedroom as one of those exceptions. It is requested that CHA amend its current HCV Administrative Plan to be consistent with the attached HUD Notice and HUD regulations governing occupancy standards for the HCV program; and that CHA also revise its policy for public housing residents to be consistent with the HCV standards prohibiting children of the same sex from sharing bedrooms. It is again requested that the Chicago HUD office notify CHA that the current occupancy policy set forth in the CHA HCV Administrative Plan is contrary to the regulations issued by HUD at 24 CFR Part 982, and the attached HUD Notice (PIH Notice 2011-28).	Thank you for your comment. CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing occupancy standards. The current policy complies with HUD guidelines.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
3	Robert Whitfield	<p>The Central Advisory Council (CAC) has repeatedly complained about the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) policy of convening a single public hearing on the various draft documents that were issued by CHA for public comment and a public hearing. The draft CHA documents included draft Admissions and Continuing Occupancy Policy (ACOP) drafts, draft residential leases, draft Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Administrative Plans, and draft amendments to the CHA Moving to Work (MTW) HUD approved program. These documents were normally issued by CHA at different dates and times, for a thirty day period, which included a single public hearing. CHA has, (based on my research of CHA files) for the first time ever, issued the draft ACOP, and the draft residential lease, at the same time it has issued a draft HCV Administrative Plan. The Notice issued by CHA provides for three hearings, but does not provide for any additional time for public comment. Further, CHA has also issued a draft FY 2014 Amendment to the CHA MTW program, to include changes to the flat rent policy, and information on the proposed CHA Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. This means that CHA has issued drafts on four different and complex areas of public housing and HCV operation, that could have enormous impact on public housing residents, and HCV participants. Each of these draft documents, by themselves, should have warranted separate comment periods and public hearings to allow sufficient time for residents and HCV participants to review and make informed comments on the drafts. The CHA change grid for the draft 2014 HCV Administrative Plan totals 51 pages. It is neither realistic, or fair, to expect public housing residents and or HCV participants (and or applicants to these programs) to review and make meaningful and informed comments on all these complex program changes, deletions and or additions within the current 30 day public comment period, especially since many CHA residents and or HCV participants do not have access to computers, and or are computer literate; and will therefore not be able to timely access the CHA website to become aware of these drafts, and or to submit comments. Also, will CHA change its usual policy and allow more than the usual three minutes per speaker to comment at the public hearings, or will each speaker still be allotted a total of three minutes, even if he or she wants to comment on more than one draft CHA program document? CHA should, at the very least, expand the comment period for an additional thirty days to allow for the fact that the public comment period covers different program areas, and will require additional time to review and prepare comments. CHA should also add some public hearing dates during the expanded public comment period, and include some public hearings in CHA senior buildings. This will ensure greater participation by CHA seniors; which is extremely important because of the potential impact on seniors under the proposed CHA RAD initiative, and the mandatory changes imposed by HUD on the current CHA flat rent policy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The public comment period took place from June 27-July 28, 2014. Comments could be made through a variety of options throughout this period, including at public hearings and/or by phone, email, fax or mail. CHA did hold three hearings, rather than one, during this comment period. CHA follows a standard process for conducting public hearings. Public hearings are not the only medium for comment on proposed documents during the public comment period.</p> <p>Only portions of the documents out for public comment contained the proposed changes. In addition to redlined versions of the documents which indicated specific proposed changes, CHA provided documents summarizing the changes proposed for the HCV Administrative Plan, ACOP and Public Housing Lease. In addition, CHA has communicated in a variety of ways to residents affected by changes to flat rent policies as well as those in potential RAD sites.</p> <p>CHA continuously works to improve and adapt the public comment process as necessary.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
4	Verainia Nelson	<p>My name is Verainia Nelson and I am Housing Choice Voucher Holder. I oppose the following changes to the administrative pan because they violate my rights to privacy and decent housing. I believe there to be challenges under the Fair Housing Act. The two policies I find particularly disturbing are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "A guest may visit for a maximum of 30 calendar days in a calendar year. No guest may visit for more than 7 consecutive calendar days." - "Verification of an unauthorized occupancy can be established through the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-Government issued ID's or reports 2-Utility Bills for the assisted unit 3-Property sign-in logs and/or 4-Other documentation or investigations" 	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.</p>
5	Francine Washington	<p>I asked the question before, how the smoking policy going to work? If I'm living there now, and the next one says no smoking, how is it going to work for the folks already living there with the no-smoking policy? You're not going to take my rights away because you changed it. How is the no-smoking policy going to work? Or is it going to work?</p>	<p>The smoking policy applies to properties built, acquired or rehabbed in 2014 or later.</p>
6	Aidan Gilbert	<p>I am dismayed by lease provisions which prohibit political and religious activity on CHA property. It is repugnant that a Board comprised in large of members who have benefited from political organizations would consider attempting to limit the political rights of CHA residents. Suffrage, the Civil Rights Movement, the Struggle for Gay & Lesbian Civil Rights, the Chicago Rights Movement- these all grew out of political meetings around dining tables, around living rooms. Voter registration drives, the heart of political activism, would be banned. And this isn't even beginning to address the ban on religious activity. (It is ironic that Hobby Lobby is a person entitled to religious liberty, but CHA residents are not.) You should delete this section (8aa) or else prepare for an ACLU lawsuit and a hefty legal fee award.</p>	<p>CHA is clarifying this language to state that political activity or religious recruitment is not permitted in common areas of properties.</p>
7	Cynthia Scott	<p>I live with my daughter and a grandson. They live with me. I'm the head of household, and I have been asking for a split transfer because she has her own family. And I need to get away from her. And I've been asking and asking. She has been going to the office and asking and asking. And because we have a three bedroom -- And she has her own room. My grandson has his own room, and I have my own room. But it's time -- She is 27, and it's time to -- for a split transfer. And I understand that you're not doing them, but I think you should for families that is -- who have grown children with their own kids. And they need their own apartment.</p>	<p>CHA is not proposing any changes to the split transfer policy. CHA intends to open its wait lists for families needing affordable housing later in 2014.</p>
8	Mildred Pagan	<p>Yes. I want to say about the room for two. And I don't agree for a 14-year-old to be in the same room with a 17-year-old boy, like if you are 14 and the boy is 17. I think it should be a room for each one. That is my complaint.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing occupancy standards. The current policy complies with HUD guidelines.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
9	Mary Gill	I want to thank you guys for coming out and having each development from Lathrop to Cabrini on the northeast side, all here at Truman in one area to see that there's a handful of us here because there is lack of communication and the information that we were to be here today -- it was just placed on the door in housing. There was no mailing that came out from CHA stating the facts of this meeting, what it was in regard to. We really do appreciate you guys coming out and letting us, you know, know something that is going on at this point. But in the future could you please at least do like a mailing or something from CHA to let us know so more people could come out and be aware what's really going on.	Announcements for the public comment process appeared on CHA's website and in the Chicago Defender (June 25 and July 2) and Chicago Sun-Times and Hoy newspapers (June 27-July 3, weekdays only). In addition, CHA provides information to property managers, service providers, HCV contractors and the CAC/LAC for posting in offices/common areas and to distribute to residents upon request. CHA continuously works to improve and adapt the public comment process as necessary.
10	Oden Thomas	More tenant patrols are needed in all CHA developments. When can this happen for other developments in senior buildings?	CHA senior housing and family developments have tenant patrol programs.
11	Unknown	I do. I support exactly what she said about the mailing. And also we -- If we had a bus, we would have had more residents come.	Announcements for the public comment process appeared on CHA's website and in the Chicago Defender (June 25 and July 2) and Chicago Sun-Times and Hoy newspapers (June 27-July 3, weekdays only). In addition, CHA provides information to property managers, service providers, HCV contractors and the CAC/LAC for posting in offices/common areas and to distribute to residents upon request. CHA continuously works to improve and adapt the public comment process as necessary.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
12	Cynthia Scott	We didn't get much mailing either -- any mailing. We put up flyers, but only a few people could go out and walk and put up the flyers. But, also, if we had a bus, we would have gotten more people to come. And also the one strike -- I'm opposed to it.	<p>Announcements for the public comment process appeared on CHA's website and in the Chicago Defender (June 25 and July 2) and Chicago Sun-Times and Hoy newspapers (June 27-July 3, weekdays only). In addition, CHA provides information to property managers, service providers, HCV contractors and the CAC/LAC for posting in offices/common areas and to distribute to residents upon request. CHA continuously works to improve and adapt the public comment process as necessary.</p> <p>CHA is not currently proposing changes to the one-strike policy.</p>
13	Kathy Dunbar	I feel that these proposals are unfair and a violation of a families right to privacy and right to have whomever they would like to VISIT as long as said visitors are not a threat to others. I feel people should be able to determine how long a guest visits. Why is that their concern. I feel that if CHA is provided any an all pertinent information from the Head of the Household in documentation form what is the issue.	Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.
14	Kathy Dunbar	And then I'll be through. I just wanted to know what kind of initiative or incentive that the CHA can provide for the youth because all of them getting shot up out here. What kind of programs, if any, that can be provided by CHA for the youth, the kids that's getting killed? Anything?	CHA has a multitude of summer opportunities for youth as well as partnerships with providers in the City of Chicago. Beginning in April 2015, opportunities for 2015 programs should be posted on CHA's website.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
15	Kathy Dunbar	And the next thing I'm concerned about is I have a situation where I have a landlord. It's a slum lord property. Section 8 suggested the property to me, and I want to know what can I do because Section 8 is not going to pay their part of the money but telling me I should pay my portion of the rent when it's on the landlord that his property is falling apart. Even the City -- It failed two City inspection, and the City said it should go on the demolition list.. So what do CHA do with things like that? Because I don't feel like I should have to pay them, and they haven't done anything in my house in two years, and it's two disabled people there. Now, although, I have moving papers, it's very hard for me to try to find a four bedroom house in the City of Chicago.	Thank you for your comment. CHA is already in communication to address this matter. Please contact the HCV Call Center at (312) 935-2600 or e-mail hcv@thecha.org for follow-up and resolution (if not already resolved).
16	Francine Washington	You talking about the income or to be able to certify for 2 or 3 years...every year people that's on disability and Social Security get a raise HUD mandate their rent should go up. If they have a set income, certified for 3 years, do that still affect their rent going up anyway, going up every year? The question is, if we talking about fixed income and re-certification and all that stuff, if I should be on disability or Social Security the first of the year, January, people who are on disability rent going up, would that be affected or not or wait till redetermination? Or did you get the question a little confused?	Requirements to report changes in income in public housing are not proposed to change at this time.
17	Taneysha Bass	The first thing I want to comment on was I needed to speak to someone who is (inaudible) boss. (Inaudible) Bailey speak to someone regarding her, and the second issue is my property manager, Alexis Alexander, it's just a lot stuff going on in Altgeld Gardens. People subleasing their unit, selling out their cribs. She don't say nothing about that. I turned in my new baby Social Security card about a month ago to them to add her to the lease. I signed the papers. About two weeks later she still wasn't added to my lease. I went up there today. I asked yesterday did she get the Social Security card. She said no. Just so happen I happen to go up (inaudible) and I asked her did you find it, all of sudden about a month later. I just feel like it's retaliation because I told Ms. Greer that she took my keys from my father. My father kept my property for two days while I was out of town. She took the keys and told him he could not stay in my unit. When somebody four doors down from me subleasing their crib for the last three (inaudible). She said nothing about it. They do inspections. They supposed to use a pass key. I never seen them use a pass key, and I feel that's not right. She even tell the residents I'm telling on them. You're jeopardizing my kids. If I tell they selling drugs out the unit, why are you going back and telling people? And it's coming back to me. People telling me and threatening my kids. That's not fair. So I just feel like isn't nobody doing nothing. I been trying to get transferred (inaudible). It's a lot stuff going on.	CHA is already in communication to address this matter. Miss Bass was also informed CHA following the meeting regarding employment in the summer food program. Her social service provider was asked to contact her the following day.
18	Francine Washington	I have a lot to say, but I think I'll save it (inaudible). I do have a lot to say, but I'd rather give it to you in black and white.	Thank you for your comment.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
19	Charles Barlow	I have too much to say in two minutes, so I'll be sending you some written comments, but there's a couple of things from my past three...good things, self-certification and income assets and things and what I am disappointed in and that, as well is that it doesn't -- The changes that you propose don't go far enough. They don't take account of any of our recommendations given by the advisory council numerous times over the past 5, 6 years or more...in the 2012 document that they produced. You will be hearing from me.	Thank you for your comment.
20	Claudice Ware	One of the comments that Charlie was talking about, that we would like to see actually looked at further is the fact that we been talking about the two hearts to a bedroom when you leave. It should have been one of the first things that was recognized when making changes.	Thank you for your comments. CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing occupancy standards. The current policy complies with HUD guidelines.
21	Kathy Dunbar	I wish to make another comment. I saw the little thing put together on You Tube, and I was wondering myself about the two heartbeats to a bedroom thing because I feel like, just like the last example, two boys and a girl should not sleep in the same room together especially if they are teenagers, but I did recognize that that was not nowhere in the -- Nobody said anything about that, and I was just wondering why too because that was important. Well, it's very important to us, so I was just trying to figure out why didn't anybody address that. That's what I was concerned about, too.	Thank you for your comments. CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing occupancy standards. The current policy complies with HUD guidelines.
22	Kathy Dunbar	Then I was concerned about, too, the landlords who are not taking care of their property and everything, why does CHA not pay their portion and I'm still being made to pay a portion? I just want to know that because that's not fair to me. Why CHA should not pay theirs and I'm being made to pay mine? And they know they're slum houses and stuff.	Thank you for your comment. CHA is already in communication to address this matter. Please contact the HCV Call Center at (312) 935-2600 or e-mail hcv@thecha.org for follow-up and resolution (if not already resolved).
23	Taneysha Bass	The only thing that I had to add was that my property manager -- Like I said, I put in three transfers. She denied all three of them. I have four kids -- well, five kids, as of London, but she keep saying that the three girls should be in one room together, and I'm looking at the ACOP that say two heartbeats per room. I'm not willing to share my room with nobody. My house is very cluttered, and they said I definitely need a transfer. But, once again, I just feel like there's retaliation because I told on her she's not trying to do what she's supposed to do.	CHA is already in communication to address this matter.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
24	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Barment Policy</i></p> <p>LAF applauds CHA for instituting a policy that, by identifying the specific type of conduct that may warrant the issuance of a barment notice, places reasonable limits on a property manager's discretion to bar individuals. We are concerned, however, that you propose banning individuals whose activities threaten "other persons" as opposed to "persons who reside in the immediate vicinity of the premises." In order to ensure that each resident is aware of her right to grieve a barment decision, the barment notice should clearly state that the resident has this right, identify the deadline for submitting grievance, and include information about LAF's free legal services. This information should be set forth in bold and in a large font. Residents should also have right to seek review of barment decision one year after the barment notice is issued. This will give residents the opportunity to demonstrate that the event that led to the barment decision was an isolated incident, or that subsequent events have eliminated the need for a bar.</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will take your suggested information into consideration when developing the notices for the policy.
25	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Medical Marijuana Policy</i></p> <p>LAF acknowledges that your proposed prohibition against medical marijuana is consistent with HUD's policy, which is based on federal preemption and set forth in the 2/10/11 memorandum from Assistant Secretary Sandra B. Henriquez. Nevertheless, it makes no practical sense, and LAF urges CHA to reconsider this policy. Now that Illinois has passed the Compassionate Use of Medical Cannabis Pilot Program Act, 410 ILCS 130, CHA's proposed policy effectively discriminates against public housing residents by making them the only Illinois residents who may be punished for their use of medical marijuana. CHA has no legitimate interest in prohibiting the possession and use of medical marijuana. It is prescribed by a physician, so (unlike illegal drugs) its use will not increase the incidence of drug-related crime. Furthermore, it may be ingested as opposed to smoked, so its use will not disturb other residents.</p> <p><i>(The same comment was made to several sections of the Lease and ACOP that reference the proposed medical marijuana policy changes.)</i></p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.
26	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Weapons- Free Policy</i></p> <p>This provision, which appears to be a response to Illinois' new "conceal and carry" law, is very confusing. It needs to be shorter and clearer. Furthermore, CHA is proposing language that punishes residents for unintentional acts, and it is not clear whether these acts involve the use of a weapon. For example, the proposed provision states that, "it shall be a lease violation to: ...cause, intentionally or unintentionally, any injury to or on another person." CHA also attempts to hold residents liable for unintentionally "hiding" a weapon, and for unintentionally threatening to use a weapon. One cannot, however, unintentionally hide or threaten. CHA must clarify this section.</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will review the language for clarity purposes but will maintain the policy.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
27	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<i>House Rules</i> LAF has three concerns: 1. A resident who violates the smoking ban should be offered the opportunity to transfer to a building that is not smoke-free before facing the termination of her lease agreement. 2. Some of the language in these provisions-e.g., "gatherings," and "loud music"-is vague. CHA should better define these terms, especially if a violation of the prohibition against "gatherings" and "loud music" constitute grounds for termination. 3. What if the condominium declarations and house rules conflict with the statutory provisions and federal regulations governing the public housing program? The lease should make clear that any declarations and rules that conflict with federal law are invalid.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will review the language for clarity purposes but will maintain the policy.
28	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<i>Condensing of the Lease</i> CHA may not delete the automatic renewal provision. Is this provision just being moved to another part of the lease? It's not clear.	CHA did not remove the automatic renewal language from the CHA Residential Lease.
29	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<i>Income</i> 1. Forcing residents to report all changes in income, as opposed to increases that exceed a certain amount, will do nothing but (a) force residents to report insignificant increases that do not affect their contributions, and (b) create another unnecessary basis for eviction. CHA should follow the procedure set forth in the HUD Lease that is used in Section 8 Project-Based Properties, which states that residents must report increases of \$200 or more per month. 2. Ten days is a very short time-frame. Thirty days is more reasonable, especially when residents have to provide CHA with several pay stubs to confirm the amount of the increase in income.	Thank you for your comment. CHA did not propose any changes to this policy.
30	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<i>Repayment Agreements</i> CHA should be required to offer reasonable repayment agreements. In determining what is reasonable, we suggests that CHA follow the rule set forth in HUD Notice H2013-06, which states, "The monthly payment plus the amount of the tenant's total tenant payment (TIP) at the time the repayment agreement is executed should not exceed 40 percent of the family's monthly adjusted income if the family agrees to the amount stated in the repayment agreement." Even though this HUD Notice does not apply to the public housing program, the rule makes sense.	CHA adheres to HUD guidance in regards to repayment agreements in public housing.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
31	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Criminal Activity</i></p> <p>CHA may not replace the phrase "persons residing in the immediate vicinity of the premises" with the far more expansive phrase "other persons." The federal regulations governing the public housing program provide that criminal activity-other than drug-related criminal activity-does not constitute grounds for termination unless it threatens other residents or people residing in the immediate vicinity of the premises. See 24 C.F.R. § 966.4(l)(5)(ii) ("Evicting other criminals. (A) Threat to other safety, or right to peaceful residents. The lease must provide enjoyment of the premises by that any criminal activity by a other residents, CHA covered person that threatens the employees, agents of the CHA, health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents (including PHA management staff residing on the premises) or threatens the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of their residences by persons residing in the immediate vicinity of the premises is grounds for termination of tenancy,") (Emphasis added,). CHA's proposed change, therefore, constitutes an attempt to impermissibly expand the grounds for termination. Furthermore, the proposed change makes no sense. Replacing the phrase "residing in the immediate vicinity of the premises" with the words "other persons" renders the preceding language superfluous and gives CHA the right to terminate the lease for activity that threatens anybody, anywhere, That would be shockingly unfair, Activity that does not threaten or harm another resident or someone living in the immediate vicinity of the development should not constitute a lease violation.</p> <p><i>(The same comment was made to several sections of the Lease that reference this policy.)</i></p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will take your information under advisement prior to finalizing the CHA ACOP and Residential Lease language.
32	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Political/Religious Activity</i></p> <p>This provision should be removed. CHA is a state actor, so its attempt CHA property, to prohibit political or religious activities constitutes a violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, A public housing authority may impose time, place and manner restrictions on protected speech only if those restrictions are reasonable. See de la O v. Housing Auth. Of City of El Paso, 417 F.3d 495 (5th Cir. 2005) (PHA policy of restricting hours of door-to-door solicitation, which prohibited leaving flyers on doors if no one answered but explicitly allowed any person to enter complex to engage in political campaigning or religious proselytizing as long as advance notice was provided to complex's management, were reasonable time, place and manner restrictions comporting with First Amendment.). Your blanket prohibition against all political or religious recruitment activities will not survive judicial scrutiny. See Resident Action Council v. Seattle Housing Auth., 174 P.3d 84 (Wash. 2007) (PHA could not restrict residents' constitutional right to free speech by prohibiting them from posting any signs on their apartment doors); Walker v. Georgetown Housing Auth., 677 N.E.2d 1125, 1127 (Mass. 1997) (PHA policy banning all door-to-door campaigning and solicitation violated First Amendment).</p> <p><i>(The same comment was made to several sections of the Lease that reference this policy.)</i></p>	CHA is clarifying this language to state that political or religious recruitment is not permitted in common areas of properties.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
33	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Unit Alterations/ Evictions</i></p> <p>This provision is overbroad and should be revised. It subjects a resident to eviction for making even minor alterations without permission. The provision should be amended to clarify that it is not a violation of the lease to make minor alterations that do not harm the unit or require repair. Furthermore, a resident who violates the prohibition against making alterations without permission should be offered alternatives to eviction (e.g., reimbursing CHA for the cost of removing the alteration or making necessary repairs).</p>	Thank you for your comment.
34	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Family Successions Rights</i></p> <p>1. There is no legitimate rationale for the three-years rule. Federal law does not require such a minimum period, and a PHA's policy on if there is one or more family succession rights is not controlling when it is contrary to federal policy. See <i>Gill v. Hernandez</i>, 865 N.Y.S.2d consecutive years (36 843, 852 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2008))(PHA occupancy policy, which extended succession rights to adult children of former head of household only if they joined the household as minors, was contrary to federal policy and therefore not controlling.). An individual should be entitled to remaining member status if she was identified on the lease as an authorized household member, or otherwise acknowledged as an authorized household member (e.g., her income was included when calculating the household's share of the rent) when the head of household died or vacated the premises. 2. Emancipated minors should, like adults, be able to assume the lease. See <i>Carteret Housing Auth. V. Gilbert</i>, 693 A.2d 955 (N.J. Super. Ct. Law Div. 2002) (minor daughter of incarcerated public housing resident entitled to stay in apartment as remaining member of the tenant family because she was eligible for an order of emancipation). 3. If all the remaining family members are minors, their adult guardian should, if otherwise qualified, be able to move into the premises and assume the lease. See <i>Public Housing Occupancy Guidebook</i>, § 12.3. ("A PHA may permit an adult not on the lease to be the new head of household after the death or departure of the original head of household. This would usually occur when the only family members remaining in the unit are children who would otherwise have to leave the unit.")</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA did not propose any changes to this policy. Having reviewed the cases presented, CHA will review the language but is within its rights to continue the policies.
35	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Damage to Unit</i></p> <p>CHA must clarify this provision. Does "full rent" mean the full amount of the tenant's contribution, or the full market rent? LAF assumes it means the former.</p>	The language when reviewed in its entirety of the section is clear. CHA does not charge full market rent for its public housing units. Full rent and the tenant contribution are the same in public housing.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
36	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Hardship to Minimum Rent</i></p> <p>Section Sec 5(c) of Part I of the current lease (and p. 62 of the ACOP) addresses the minimum rent requirement and provides in its entirety that: <i>A minimum rent hardship suspension will be granted to a resident who requests and can document, that due to a financial hardship he/she is unable to pay the minimum rent amount. If a resident paying minimum rent requests a hardship suspension, the CHA must suspend the minimum rent, effective the following month, and determine whether the resident qualifies for the exemption.</i> The problem with this provision is that it is buried in a single spaced, 23-page document. It is not designed to catch the attention of the average resident, who may therefore end up paying a minimum rent he or she cannot afford. To address this problem, CHA should add a provision stating that: <i>When CHA sets the resident's rent at the minimum amount or adjusts the resident's rent to the minimum amount, CHA must provide the resident with written notice that he or she may be entitled to a hardship exemption to the minimum rent.</i> This information, which must explain the procedure for requesting a hardship exemption, may be included in a rent adjustment notice provided the information is set forth in a font that is larger than the text in the rest of the notice and is also highlighted.</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA did not propose any changes to this policy.
37	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Guest Policy</i></p> <p>The guest policy should be changed and made consistent with the one set forth in CHA's existing Administrative Plan, which allows guests to visit for a total of 90 days each year, with no single visit exceeding 30 consecutive days. The proposed rule that limits each single visit to no more than seven consecutive days is especially restrictive. It is also unjustified. Imposing such a limit does not make enhance safety. If a guest poses a threat to health and/or safety and/or another resident's right to quiet enjoyment, he poses such a threat even if he less than seven days. CHA should therefore abandon the proposed seven-day limit. <i>(The same comment was made to several sections of the ACOP that reference this policy.)</i></p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.
38	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Unauthorized Occupant Verification</i></p> <p>It is not clear why CHA is identifying the types of evidence that may be considered when trying to determine whether an individual is an unauthorized resident. Is CHA merely giving its property managers guidance. If so, we have no objection. On the other hand, we strongly object if CHA is trying to suggest that this type of evidence (all of which constitutes hearsay) would be admissible in a court of law if and when CHA moves to evict a resident for violating the prohibition against unauthorized residents. CHA cannot and should not try to use the proposed lease provision to make an end run around the rules of evidence. Accordingly, if CHA keeps the proposed provision, it should add language confirming that the types of evidence identified therein are not (absent some change in the rules of evidence) admissible in a court of law.</p>	Thank you for your comment. This proposed change is to clarify the types of documents used to verify occupancy.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
39	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Smoking Ban</i></p> <p>A resident who violates the smoking ban should be offered the opportunity to transfer to a building that is not smoke-free before facing the termination of her lease agreement.</p> <p><i>(The same comment was made to several sections of the ACOP and Lease that reference this policy.)</i></p>	The smoking policy applies to properties built, acquired, or rehabbed in 2014 or later.
40	Lawrence D. Wood Director, LAF, Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Weapons-Free Policy- Criminal Background</i></p> <p>1. CHA should clarify its definition of the term "criminal background" by explicitly confirming that it includes only convictions, and not mere arrests. See <i>Landers v. Chicago Housing Authority</i>, 404 Ill. App. 3d 568, 576-77 (1st Dist. 2010) (sheer number of arrests, without any evidence that arrests led to convictions, does not establish a history of criminal activity. 2. The proposed provision is ambiguous and must be clarified. The first sentence states that there is a "look-back" period of three years, but the second sentence implies that there is no "look-back" period. This internal consistency should be resolved so it is clear that there is a "look-back" period of three years.</p>	Thank you for your comment. The <u>Landers</u> case did not prohibit the use of arrests in determining suitability of an applicant. In particular, the court agreed with CHA "that evidence of conviction is not a prerequisite for denying an application for public housing." The court further stated it did not dispute CHA's ability to reject an applicant based on a criminal record that includes convictions and arrests. Based on federal regulations, CHA is within policy. If an applicant feels that a denial based on arrests and/or conviction documentation is unjust, they have an opportunity to mitigate the denial of tenancy.
41	Dannette Williams	I am a Housing Choice Voucher Holder. I oppose the following changes to the administrative plan because they violate my rights to privacy and decent housing. I believe there to be challenged under the Fair Housing Act. The two policies I find particularly disturbing are as follows: -" A guest may visit for a maximum of 30 calendar days in a calendar year. No guest may visit for more than 7consecutive days." -" Verification of an unauthorized occupancy can be established through the following: 1- Government issued ID's or reports 2- Utility Bills for the assisted unit 3- Property sign-in logs and/or 4- Other documentation or investigations	Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.
42	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Income Re-certification</i></p> <p>LAF supports CHA's move to triennial recertification for participants with fixed incomes, as well as the change that participants need not provide proof of income that is not included in the gross income calculation and proof of small assets. CHA should undertake other changes that eliminate unnecessary and repetitive paperwork requirements (like multiple requests for birth certificates and social security cards). Multiple requests for the same documents lead to unsupported terminations and surely must cause needless administrative expense.</p>	Thank you for your comment.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
43	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Notification</i></p> <p>CHA should embrace technological changes that improve communication with participants and, especially, optimize efficient submission of documents. Hope for technological improvement must be tempered by the reality that currently CHA fails to efficiently utilize technology. Participants are required to send faxes multiple times and CHA voice mail boxes remain full and unusable. The best way for a participant to guarantee that a document is received is to make the time-consuming trip to CHA and obtain a receipt. The proposed change to allow for electronic notification seems a small but ambiguous movement to embracing technology. CHA seems to recognize the availability of electronic communication, but then refuses to accept any electronic communication from participants. CHA has the capacity to accept electronic communication from clients who have the ability to communicate in that form (in fact, CHA uses electronic communication with HUD and other PHAs). CHA should accept electronic communication as official notification from participants. CHA should not confuse clients about its use of electronic communication. CHA should not communicate with tenants electronically or give tenants email addresses or fax numbers if CHA refuses to accept electronic communication as official notification from tenants. Obviously, participants could be easily confused that an email to a provided address is proper notification if CHA does not tell them it is insufficient (for example, by a return email message that communication by email is not proper notification). As the proposed change recognizes, CHA must still make official notifications to participants on paper, by mail.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA will continue to explore options aimed to streamline operations.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
44	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Guest Policy</i></p> <p>CHA's explanation of its proposal attributes several changes to the "guest policy" when, in fact, the changes address guests and family absence from the assisted unit. This lack of explanation makes the second set of changes very confusing. This should be clarified. Guest Policy: CHA should not limit any single guest stay to only seven consecutive days and then terminate the family from the Voucher Program. While Voucher families cannot add unlimited, unauthorized residents, the proposal limits guests too much. Seven days is too short and fails to recognize that families sometimes require guests for assistance, such as helping after the birth of a new baby or watching a school-age child between school and a summer program. Even worse, it seems to imply that all Voucher families cause problems and that a limit on guests is needed to prevent a bigger problem. If guests cause a problem, CHA should continue to address the problem, but it should not draft regulations that imply all guests cause problems. The policy seems designed to create a trap for Voucher tenants. Because having a guest is such a natural extension of residing in one's home, Voucher tenants can easily forget this requirement, without any intent to harm the Voucher Program. Finally, we understand from CHA's public hearing presentation that the rationale of this change is to make it conform to the public housing guest policy. If conformity is required, CHA should adopt the more flexible policy that does not assume all guests will cause problems. Finally, because the buildings in which Voucher tenants reside are usually less dense than public housing, CHA could rationally maintain a difference in guest policy between the Voucher program and public housing. Moreover, public housing tenants may seek more time to have a guest by permission of the property manager. This does not exist in the proposed change to the Administrative Plan and would be difficult, practically speaking, for CHA to manage, so Voucher holders do not, in fact, have the same obligations as public housing tenants.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.</p>
45	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Verification of Unauthorized Occupant:</i></p> <p>CHA must make clear that third party documents (such as utility bills) may be evidence of an unauthorized occupant, but they do not prove that a voucher participant has an unauthorized occupant. Courts have ruled these documents are unreliable hearsay for good reason: utility companies and the postal service make mistakes; family members who have moved may lack resources to change driver's licenses; and homeless friends or family members may need a stable address for receipt of important mail. CHA wastes time and administrative expense by immediately jumping to the conclusion that a document by itself can prove where someone lives.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This proposed change is to clarify the types of documents used to verify occupancy.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
46	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Family Absence from Unit:</i> CHA's proposed change is confusing because no rationale is presented for the change (it is not related to the guest policy). CHA should make the purpose of the change apparent. The proposed change appears to be imposing a time limit applicable only to the entire families' absence from the unit because the proposed change takes out references to "individuals." We read the new plan to provide that individual members, without notice to CHA, may be absent for any reason and for any length of time as long as the absent family member has an intent to return home. If this proposed change means something other than this, it needs to be re-written and better explained. While we support this flexibility, we encourage careful training of front-line staff who must implement this change. The new policy eliminates directions previously given to staff on how to assess situations such as students at school away from home, children in households temporarily placed in foster care, or household members temporarily confined to institutions for medical reasons. Staff must understand that eliminating specific categories does not mean that they must always remove absent members from households.	Thank you for your comment. Your understanding of the new policy is correct. CHA will continue to ensure new policies are properly implemented.
47	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>EID for FSS Participants:</i> Assisting participants accrue larger escrow accounts is a worthy change. The wording of the proposed change ("eliminate"), however, implies that FSS participant families lose their right to claim the EID. Nothing in the EID requires that families claim the EID at a certain time. In fact, they may claim it at a time that best suits their return to work strategy. Thus, CHA should clarify that a participant may delay claiming the EID until after FSS participation but does not waive or sacrifice it.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update the language to clarify that it pertains to when they are enrolled in the FSS program.
48	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Termination:</i> CHA should not change the current Administrative Plan provision that it will not terminate Voucher Program participation because of lack of success in the Family Self-Sufficiency program. Because FSS is a voluntary, aspirational program, CHA should not make the proposed change as it will decrease the likelihood that tenants will seek to become part of this program – a fact that HUD recognized in the Housing Choice Voucher Program Guidebook (at 23-10). We asked the opinion of a client who is a public housing tenant and a spring 2014 FSS graduate. She thought this change was "DEAD WRONG": that it would discourage participation and failed to take into consideration all of the things that can go wrong in five years that are not the fault of the tenant. The change appears to eliminate any discretion. Blanket termination does not follow the federal regulations for the FSS program, which CHA is obligated to follow. In particular, the FSS regulation provides that participants may have good cause for their inability to complete the program. 24 C.F.R. § 984.303(i). Moreover, the regulation provides that "failure to become independent from welfare assistance" may only be a ground for termination with regard to the failure of the head of household to meet the employment obligation. Id. at .303(b)(5). The regulations also recognize that sometimes self-sufficiency goals remain unmet because of the unavailability of supportive services. Id. at 303(e). Finally, while it should go without saying, CHA must make clear that the change only applies prospectively to future FSS contracts. CHA must not apply this change to existing contracts that Voucher Program participants entered into in good faith with the understanding that falling short of the mark of self-sufficiency would not cause them to lose their Voucher assistance.	If a participant is terminated from the FSS program, they do not lose their Housing Choice Voucher or public housing unit. CHA will review the language to ensure it is clear that "termination" is from the FSS program only.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
49	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Medical Marijuana:</i> As more fully explained in comments on the public housing proposals, CHA should not prevent Voucher tenants from accessing medical improvements and legislative changes that are available to all other residents of Illinois.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.
50	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Wait List Preference:</i> CHA should eliminate the requirement in its wait list preference that all adult (over age 18) family members work, because it fails to recognize the extremely high unemployment of young adults, especially young African-American male adults. A January 2014 Urban League report concludes that in Chicago in 2012, only 6% of Black teens (16-19) from low-income households (<\$20,000) were employed (an unemployment rate of 94%). "Young adults (20-24 years old) in Illinois and the city of Chicago also experienced great difficulty finding jobs ... Males, Blacks, and city of Chicago residents 20-24 years of age were the most significantly impacted young adults." http://www.thechicagourbanleague.org/cms/lib07/IL07000264/Centricity/Domain/76/ILLINOIS-LEADS-AS-ONE-OF-TOP-TEN-IN-NATION-FOR-TEEN-UNEMPLOYMENT.pdf . CHA should not have a policy that forces families with low incomes to choose between housing assistance and staying together. Overall, CHA should not shift its preferences to less vulnerable families from the most vulnerable families, such as families who have lost housing assistance due to insufficient program funding.	Thank you for your comment. CHA remains committed to promoting self-sufficiency and employment for existing residents and applicants in both public housing and HCV programs.
51	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Owner Screening:</i> LAF supports CHA's continued statement that owners who engage in violent criminal activity or violate Housing Quality Standards should not continue as landlords in the program. CHA should expand the screening of owners who have engaged in violent behavior toward CHA's personnel to include Voucher Program tenants. CHA should include other screening criteria to eliminate problem landlords, such as refusing to enter into HAP contracts with landlords who violate tenant protection laws, such as knowing violations of the Illinois Rental Property Utility Services Act, or who submit false documents to CHA (we have seen several landlords recently submit fraudulent leases to prevent Voucher tenants from exercising their right to move).	Thank you for your comment. Your interpretation of the new policy is correct. CHA will continue to explore options to strengthen initial screening and on-going qualifications for HCV owners.
52	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Voucher Size Policy:</i> CHA should amend its Voucher (bedroom) size policy to consider the age and gender of children when calculating the Voucher size (page 5-8 of the redline version). The current policy forces Voucher assisted families to choose between housing teenage children of different genders in the same bedroom and maintaining affordable rent. LAF endorses the comments of the Central Advisory Council on this matter.	Thank you for your comments. CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing occupancy standards. The current policy complies with HUD guidelines.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
53	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Suspension of the Term of the Voucher:</i> CHA should change its current policy on suspension and specifically adopt the policy that it will suspend the term of the searching Voucher while it processes a submitted Request for Tenancy Approval (page 5-12 of the redline version). When the government terminates assistance while it is processing the request for assistance, it violates due process. Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S. 422 (1982). Further, suspension is HUD's recommended position in pending regulations. Public Housing and Section 8 Programs: Housing Choice Voucher Program: Streamlining the Portability Process, 77 Fed. Reg. 18731-01 (March 28, 2012). Finally, it recognizes that so many delays in the housing approval process are not the tenant's fault, especially failure of units to pass HQS and landlord withdrawal from the process because of delay. Failure to suspend perpetuates residents choosing less desirable homes in economically-segregated neighborhoods because participants submit an RFTA for any available housing rather than risk losing their Voucher.</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will continue to explore options aimed to streamline operations.
54	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Minimum Rent/ Hardship Exemption:</i> CHA should change its minimum rent of \$75 (page 6-26 of the redline version). CHA has never received MTW authority from HUD to charge Voucher families a minimum rent over the statutory limit of \$50 per month. CHA should establish and implement policies that would ensure that families are apprised in a timely and clear manner about their right to request a hardship exemption to the minimum rent. When CHA sets the family's rent at the minimum amount or adjusts the family's rent to the minimum amount, CHA should provide the family with written notice that the family may be entitled to a hardship exemption to the minimum rent. This information, which must explain the procedure for requesting a hardship exemption, may be included in a rent adjustment notice in a font larger than the rest of the notice and highlighted.</p>	CHA did not propose any changes to this policy. CHA received CHA Board and HUD approval of the FY2009 MTW Annual Plan. CHA's Board approved the minimum rent policy in FY2008, after public comment and as part of additional revisions to the HCV Administrative Plan.
55	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<p><i>Notice of Availability of Counsel:</i> CHA should include on Intent to Terminate or the notice of hearing the telephone numbers of legal aid organizations that represent Voucher Program participants in informal hearings (page 16-11 of the redline version). This type of information is provided to eviction tenants according to court rule and the informal hearing is the equivalent for Voucher participants (a copy of the form summons is attached hereto as Exhibit 1). This has an obvious benefit for Voucher tenants seeking to dispute the Intent to Terminate. Providing this information also benefits the entire process as counsel for tenants can bring information or documents to CHA's attention that could eliminate the expense of a hearing.</p>	CHA provides the information upon request. CHA will consider other options for providing this information.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
56	Matthew Hulstein	<p>I am a staff attorney at Chicago Volunteer Legal Services (“CVLS”). CVLS is the largest provider of pro bono legal services in Illinois. I practice in our Access to Justice (“A2J”) Program, which is a court-annexed referral program for Cook County’s Chancery Division. Through this program, CVLS represents numerous Section 8 participants who lost their Section 8 assistance and are seeking judicial review in the circuit court. We work closely with your legal department and often provide assistance when the CHA wishes to settle with other-wise unrepresented litigants. Most of the cases we handle are judicial review actions, in which the participant is alleging that the CHA acted outside its regulatory authority when it terminated the participant’s HCV voucher. In judicial review actions, the court reviews the administrative record to determine whether the CHA did indeed make a mistake. Unfortunately, the court can only review the evidence the parties presented during the informal hearing. Because participants are often unrepresented at the informal hearing and do not realize its seriousness, they do not present much (if any) evidence. They may also fail to raise certain legal arguments because they do not understand their rights. By the time they reach legal counsel, it is often too late: the record is closed and potential legal arguments are waived. Any wrongful termination obviously harms the participant, but it also harms the CHA and the public. Wrongful terminations turn landlords off the Section 8 program and undermine the public’s trust in the CHA. Additionally, the CHA must frequently defend itself against avoidable judicial review actions, costing additional time and expense. CVLS therefore proposes the CHA include on its notices of termination contact information for legal aid organizations. Providing adequate representation to the large number of participants facing termination is a huge undertaking that requires the dedicated cooperation of the CHA and the legal aid bar. CVLS has reached out to the CHA legal department, but our efforts to prompt the CHA to include this information have stalled. Rather than simply adding new information, CVLS requests the CHA reach out to our organization to explore a more integrated and effective referral system. This potential program carries great potential for the population we all serve. Early access to knowledgeable and affordable legal counsel helps participants better understand their rights and obligations. Counsel can also effectively gather evidence and present all the facts to the CHA and assist the parties resolve cases in which termination is not prudent. Finally, effective counsel at the administrative level will ensure that only cases that concern a true legal issue reach the circuit court, saving the CHA the expense of contesting potentially frivolous appeals.</p>	<p>CHA provides the information upon request. CHA will consider other options for providing this information.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
57	Betsy Benito Director CSH	<p><i>Demonstration Program and Special Initiatives:</i></p> <p>We are very supportive of the request to create special initiatives that target resources to subpopulations, and allow people to be served by CHA resources who did not make it on to the waiting list lottery. It is very important to have the ability to leverage housing resources to different citywide initiatives with flexibility. CSH has worked very hard to help identify people who are experiencing homelessness, need supportive housing, and who are on the CHA waiting lists, but have not had the ability to make the proper housing connections due to standard PHA regulations. We also work with populations who have had limited knowledge of and ability to apply for CHA housing due to living in nursing homes . We see the creation of the Demonstration Program and Special Initiatives as a step to addressing these discrepancies in housing access that occur for these populations over time. However , we would like to request a change in the CHA's proposed language and approach to these units. That is to make sure that the CHA recognizes and includes families in its planning for special initiatives, and not focus solely on the smaller unit sizes applicable to single adults. There are several thousand families with children that are homeless each year, most that need affordable housing and a segment that need more support through services and other initiatives. Ending youth and family homelessness is an important factor in breaking the overall cycle of homelessness.</p>	Thank you for your comment. While CHA anticipates that the majority of sponsor-based applications would be for studio and one bedroom units, CHA is not limiting the bedroom size for sponsor-based programs.
58	Betsy Benito Director CSH	<p><i>Moving on- PBV transfer:</i></p> <p>There are several components of this section of Chapter 4 that CSH believes are significant in how the CHA connects with a broad range of eligible households. First, CSH is pleased that the proposed FY2014 MTW plan formalizes the process by which tenants in Property Rental Assistance Supportive Housing Programs can "move on" from supportive housing when they are ready. CSH has assisted CHA with starting this pilot program that has worked with nearly 50 households who are in supportive housing but who no longer need supportive services. We found that the challenge for these households is to continue to maintain housing affordability, but who want more choice in where they live. When a stable family moves out into the community, space is made for a person who needs the on-site supportive services connected to housing.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
59	Betsy Benito Director CSH	<p><i>Waitlist:</i></p> <p>Secondly, CSH commends the CHA for making resources available to assist potential applicants in accessing the website and preparing for the lottery process. While we know that the waiting list lottery is open a short time, the list becomes long , and housing needs change over time, we appreciate there is some effort to connect with hard to reach populations as a part of this process. We would support ongoing consideration for a future amendment to explore limited preferences such as what the Housing Authority of Cook County established for homeless and people with disabilities that we believe will make housing access easier for these populations.</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will continue to consider options aimed to help the most vulnerable populations.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
60	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments concerning the Chicago Housing Authority’s proposed Administrative Plan for the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program, the proposed FY 2014 Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP), and the proposed FY 2014 Residential Lease Agreement. Access Living is the primary fair housing organization in Chicago for people with disabilities and the only one run primarily by people with disabilities. No other fair housing organization in Chicago: focuses on or handles such a high volume of disability-based fair housing cases; is considered the “go to” organization for disability-based testing; is as consistently consulted with on broad housing policy issues; matches its involvement in deinstitutionalization issues that are so critically linked to fair housing; or champions, on a systemic scale, the housing needs of people with disabilities in subsidized housing. For people with disabilities, who are largely low-income and unemployed, CHA housing and CHA-issued housing choice vouchers are critical to obtaining or maintaining independence. It is no exaggeration to state that CHA housing opportunities keep people with disabilities out of institutions and from falling into homelessness. The importance of CHA housing options for people with disabilities is now even more paramount in the wake of Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581 (1999), in which the Supreme Court held that the unnecessary institutionalization of people with disabilities is a form of discrimination. As a result of three federal class actions brought in Illinois by a team of disability advocates, including Access Living, to compel our state to fulfill its Olmstead obligations, people with disabilities are transitioning out of institutions in Chicago at a high rate, and most will need the type of affordable housing offered by the CHA. Only with such housing will the promise of Olmstead move forward in Illinois.	Thank you for your comment.
61	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	Over the years, Access Living has worked in partnership with the CHA to advance the housing opportunities of people with disabilities and ensure the protection of their fair housing rights. Indeed, on many occasions, our organizations have worked through difficult disability-related issues and resolved them in a manner favorable to the CHA and our constituents. We are proud of this track record. Accordingly, we were quite surprised (and, frankly, stunned) to review certain proposed changes to the Administrative Plan for the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program, the proposed FY 2014 Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP), and the proposed FY 2014 Residential Lease Agreement. We have serious concerns that specific changes, additions, and deletions will negatively affect the housing options and fair housing rights of people with disabilities, and undermine the CHA’s obligation to affirmatively further fair housing under the federal Fair Housing Act. The most pressing amendments eliminate the HCV program selection preference for people with HCBS waivers, end the distribution of civil rights-related documents with all lease documents, eliminate language requiring the CHA to conduct outreach to people with disabilities and other underserved populations for the HCV program, eliminate language encouraging the CHA to form partnerships with agencies serving people with disabilities, change the guest policy, and implement an overly strict medical marijuana policy. Because these changes will hurt people with disabilities and keep our community segregated in institutions or at risk for homelessness, the CHA should reverse/strike these amendments.	Thank you for your comment. CHA has addressed specific comments on these topics in the following responses.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
62	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	Housing choice vouchers are critical for people with disabilities to be able to live in the community rather than in institutional settings. Currently, the CHA offers a selection preference for the HCV program to a “[f]amily that includes a person with disabilities who has Medicaid Home and Community-Based Services Waivers under Section 1515(c) of the Social Security Act.” (Administrative Plan 4-12). ¹ The HCBS waivers allow people who require institutional-level care to live integrated lives in their communities rather than being warehoused in institutions such as nursing homes. The proposed changes to the Administrative Plan would eliminate this selection preference for HCBS waiver recipients, which will adversely affect low-income people with disabilities who need these waivers to remain in the community and avoid institutionalization. Because removal of this preference will force people with disabilities to live in an institution to get their needs met, the preference should be maintained. Regarding this preference, it bears mentioning that the CHA currently gives Access Living a certain amount of vouchers each year from its turn-over pool to distribute to consumers transitioning out of institutions or living in the community. These are called “Access Living Family Vouchers.” We worry that elimination of the HCBS preference includes these family vouchers. If so, this is a grave concern because these vouchers certainly enable people with disabilities to become or remain independent.	Thank you for your comment. CHA intends to assist individuals leaving institutions through new, consistent language to establish demonstration programs within the Administrative Plan and the ACOP. CHA is bringing those practices into regulatory compliance through appropriate language regarding demonstration programs.
63	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	Additionally, the proposed changes eliminate the use of a separate waiting list for the supportive housing program. (Administrative Plan 17-14). It is unclear what effect combining the wait lists would have on people who require supportive housing, which includes many people with disabilities. We presume that people who do not require supportive housing will not be placed in such housing after the waiting lists are combined. In any event, we urge the CHA to ensure that this change does not negatively affect the housing options of people with disabilities.	Thank you for your comment. You are correct that applicants who do not indicate a need for supportive housing will not be placed in such housing. This will permit applicants who have identified a need for supportive housing to be housed in supportive or non-supportive housing as such options become available.
64	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	Currently, when CHA families are displaced due to rehabilitation of their public housing unit, they receive a HCV program voucher to allow the family to relocate; under the changes to the Administrative Plan, families would merely be added or moved to the top of the HCV program waiting list. (Administrative Plan 4-8-9). This change will likely cause people with disabilities temporarily to become homeless while their public housing units are rehabbed to accommodate their disabilities, depending on how long they remain on the waiting list. This is an untenable change and should be reversed.	Thank you for your comment. Public housing families who need to move for rehabilitation related to accommodating their disabilities are still able to get a voucher. CHA removed procedural language to streamline the policy document.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
65	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	According to the proposed Lease Agreement, residents will no longer be given copies of the CHA Civil Rights Information Sheet or the CHA Reasonable Accommodation Policy and Procedure. (Lease Agreement 39). Why the CHA proposes to eliminate this practice is unclear. Although ending the practice of handing out these documents will not eliminate residents’ rights, continuing to hand them out will make residents, including people with disabilities, more aware of their rights and how to enforce those rights. According to HUD’s Disability Discrimination Study, there is widespread discrimination in the Chicago housing market against people with disabilities. (U.S. Dep’t of Housing and Urban Development, Discrimination Against Persons With Disabilities: Barriers at Every Step 42 (2005)). Therefore, the CHA should continue to distribute the Civil Rights Information Sheet and the Reasonable Accommodation Policy and Procedure documents with every CHA lease agreement.	CHA will still provide a copy of the these informational documents to residents . However, these documents will not be part of the lease contract.
66	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	The proposed changes to the Housing Choice Voucher Program Administrative Plan also eliminate family outreach to ensure the CHA makes efforts to identify and target underserved populations, which may include people with disabilities, particularly certain subsets of people with disabilities. (Administrative Plan 4-6). The changes also remove language that encourages the CHA to develop partnerships with agencies that provide services for people with disabilities, such as Access Living. (Administrative Plan 4-6). Eliminating targeted outreach and removing the emphasis on developing partnerships with organizations serving people with disabilities could diminish access to the HCV program and PH for people with disabilities (particularly subsets of people with disabilities such as people living in institutions). It is hard to understand why the CHA would endeavor to cut back on outreach to people with disabilities. Whatever the reason, doing so is a mistake and the CHA should maintain language that supports and encourages outreach and the development of partnerships with agencies providing services for people with disabilities.	Thank you for your comment. CHA's policy statement contains a strong commitment to broad and open distribution of information about wait list openings. CHA removed procedural language to streamline the document. CHA is currently inviting non-profit organizations to assist with outreach efforts associate with the upcoming wait list opening in 2014.
67	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	The proposed guest policy is that a guest can visit a family in an assisted unit for a total of 30 calendar days in a calendar year, with each visit not to exceed seven consecutive calendar days. The proposed changes eliminate the ability of families to request an exception to this policy for valid reasons, such as when “care of a relative recovering from a medical procedure is expected to last 40 consecutive days.” (Administrative Plan 3-7). Families should continue to be able to request an exception to this policy when residents with disabilities require temporary around-the-clock care from someone who does not qualify as a live-in aide. While people with disabilities presumably could request (and would be granted) a reasonable accommodation, eliminating the language regarding the exception will have a negative effect.	Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
68	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	<p>Many proposed additions to the three documents concern medical marijuana use by residents. The proposed Administrative Plan for the HCV Program notes several times that “[t]he CHA will not permit the use of medical marijuana as a reasonable accommodation.” (Administrative Plan 2-6). Additionally, current medical marijuana use, defined as the use of medical marijuana during the previous six months, is a reason for the CHA to mandatorily deny assistance. (Administrative Plan 3-22). CHA also will deny assistance to a family if any household member has engaged in medical marijuana use in the past five years. (Administrative Plan 3-23). Furthermore, the CHA Grievance Procedure will not be available to PH residents whose tenancy is being terminated because of medical marijuana use. (ACOP 76).</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.
69	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	<p>In 2011, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development issued two memorandums regarding medical marijuana use in public housing and housing choice voucher programs. (Sandra B. Henriquez, U.S. Dep’t of Housing and Urban Development, Memorandum, Medical Marijuana Use In Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs (2011), available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=med-marijuana.pdf, and Helen R. Kanovsky, U.S. Dep’t of Housing and Urban Development, Memorandum, Medical Use of Marijuana and Reasonable Accommodation in Federal Public and Assisted Housing (2011), available at http://www.nhlp.org/files/3.%20KanovskyMedicalMarijunanaReasAccomm(012011).pdf). According to the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA), new admissions of medical marijuana users are not allowed in PH and HCV programs. For existing PH and HCV residents, QHWRA requires public housing authorities to establish occupancy standards and lease provisions that allow them to terminate assistance for use of a controlled substance, including medical marijuana. However, public housing authorities have discretion to determine, on a case-by-case basis, the appropriateness of program termination of existing residents who use medical marijuana. According to one of the HUD memos, “[t]he decision of whether or not to allow continued occupancy or assistance to medical marijuana users is the responsibility of PHAs, not of the Department.” (Sandra B. Henriquez, U.S. Dep’t of Housing and Urban Development, Memorandum, Medical Marijuana Use In Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs 2 (2011), available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=med-marijuana.pdf). This language is important because it gives the CHA the discretion to house current PH and HCV residents who use medical marijuana. Given that the use of medical marijuana in Illinois will soon be legal, the CHA should give itself the authority to individually determine whether to terminate current PH and HCV residents if they use medical marijuana, rather than make it an across-the-board policy. Additionally, one of the HUD memos notes that synthetic marijuana drugs have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for medical uses and are therefore allowed in public housing and voucher programs. (Sandra B. Henriquez, U.S. Dep’t of Housing and Urban Development, Memorandum, Medical Marijuana Use In Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs 2 (2011), available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=med-marijuana.pdf). Nowhere in the three documents up for review does the CHA define medical marijuana or note that these synthetic marijuana drugs are not medical marijuana. The CHA may wish to define medical marijuana to make it clear that it does not encompass FDA-approved synthetic marijuana drugs.</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
70	Access Living – Kenneth M. Walden, Managing Attorney; Adam Ballard, Housing Policy/Organizer; Colleen Nicholson, Fellow/Attorney	<p>As noted above, many of the proposed amendments will have deleterious effects on the housing options of people with disabilities and arguably violate the CHA's obligation to affirmatively further fair housing under the Fair Housing Act. Accordingly, we urge the CHA to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Continue to give HCV waiting list preference to people with HCBS waivers; -Continue to give HCV vouchers to tenants displaced by accessibility-required rehabilitation work; -Ensure that elimination of the separate waiting list for supportive housing does not negatively affect the housing options of people with disabilities who need supportive housing; -Continue to distribute, with all lease agreements, documents relating to tenants' civil rights and the reasonable accommodation policy; -Maintain the language that encourages the CHA to form partnerships with agencies that provide services to people with disabilities; -Maintain the current guest policy; and -Grant itself the maximum discretion allowed by HUD and adopt a policy of individually determining whether to terminate PH and HCV residents who use medical marijuana, as well as clarify that synthetic marijuana is not a controlled substance. 	Thank you for your comments.
71	Jeffrey Wiseman	<p>The purpose of this letter is to comment regarding proposed changes to the Chicago Housing Authority's (CHA) Public Housing Lease regarding Smoking (subsection (a) of Section 23 and referred to as House Rules) . It is my understanding the CHA intends to designate all new construction and/or rehabilitated properties as smoke-free. The proposed restriction is opposed for the following three reasons: 1. The proposed language states "Smoking is prohibited at all buildings and properties designated as a smoke-free living environment." One can assume that in due time this will be the majority of CHA's public housing portfolio. It is unreasonable to prohibit the use of smoking materials within one's housing unit, assuming the individual is of appropriate age and the smoking materials are legal in nature. Smoking tobacco, whether in the form of cigarettes, cigars or pipes is a legal activity. Restricting such behavior within the confines of one's home is a violation of privacy. 2. Outside of possible pressure at the municipal government level, it is unclear why CHA is advancing such restriction. Especially, in the absence of evidence or reasoning to why, after close to eighty years, smoking within residential units has been generally of little concern to the agency. 3. In the event the proposed changes are approved, the restriction prohibiting smoking on porches and patios is draconian and serves little purpose other to inconvenience and ostracize the individual by requiring him to return to ground level and locating 25 feet (an arbitrarily-decided distance) in order to smoke.</p>	The smoking policy applies to properties built, acquired or rehabbed in 2014 or later. CHA has proposed this smoking policy in response to HUD guidance on this topic as well as best practices in multifamily housing.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
72	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law	<i>HCV Administrative Plan – Count 24 – Glossary description of “Notifications”</i> The proposed language is confusing in that it appears to alternate between describing notification of information received by CHA, and information sent from CHA. It appears to unfairly allow CHA to satisfy its notification requirements by methods that will remain unavailable to program participants, who still must always provide written notification. We support CHA’s efforts to modernize its methods of communication, but such efforts should bilaterally benefit the CHA and program participants.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will continue to explore additional ways it can streamline operations in the HCV program.
73	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law	<i>HCV Administrative Plan – Count 27 – Scheduling of HQS inspections</i> The proposed change to allow flexibility of scheduling of annual inspections is appropriate, but provides far less flexibility to the proposed program participant (7 days) than CHA (one month). A family should be allowed greater flexibility, such as permitting a rescheduled inspection within 7 days or the same month as the initial or last completed annual inspection, whichever is later. Limiting a family to only 7 days to reschedule does not adequately account for a family who may be out of town for vacation or other family matters such as attending ill family members.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will continue to explore options aimed to streamline operations.
74	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law	<i>HCV Administrative Plan – Count 30 – Exception Payment Standards</i> We disagree that exception payment standards should be approved on a unit-by-unit basis. Rather, exception payment standards should be approved for leases of any unit in an exception area.	Thank you for your comment.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
75	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law	<p><i>HCV Administrative Plan – Count 32 – Guest Policy</i></p> <p>The list of items that CHA proposes can be used as verification of unauthorized occupancy should be clarified or described in a way that ensures flexibility in the CHA's consideration of evidence. A program participant should not be punished for the actions of a third party that are beyond the control of the participant. For example, a participant has no control over a third party who obtains an ID using the participant's address. A third party may also sign in to a building to visit more than one resident of a building. It should be clear that a family is not automatically in violation of rules prohibiting an unauthorized occupancy if one of the listed methods of verification is met. Limiting one guest to a 7-day visit is unnecessarily restrictive. The CHA should not impose a limit to a guest's occupancy that complies with the overall reasonable annual restrictions on guests.</p> <p><i>ACOP – Count 9 – Guest policy</i></p> <p>Limiting one guest to a 7-day visit is unnecessarily restrictive. The CHA should not impose a limit to a guest's occupancy that complies with the overall reasonable annual restrictions on guests.</p>	Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.
76	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law	<p><i>HCV Administrative Plan – Count 61 – FSS Termination</i></p> <p>We strongly oppose CHA's proposed change to terminate assistance for a family who fails to successfully complete the FSS program. FSS rules should reflect that participation is voluntary and families should be encouraged to participate. The treat of assistance termination would intimidate families and likely discourage their participation in FSS.</p>	The proposed changes to the FSS program refers to termination of participation in the FSS program, it does not refer to termination from the housing program.
77	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law	<p><i>ACOP – Count 11 – Unauthorized residents</i></p> <p>The list of items that CHA proposes can be used as verification of unauthorized occupancy should be clarified or described in a way that ensures flexibility in the CHA's consideration of evidence. A program participant should not be punished for the actions of a third party that are beyond the control of the participant. For example, a participant has no control over a third party who obtains an ID using the participant's address. A third party may also sign in to a building to visit more than one resident of a building. It should be clear that a family is not automatically in violation of rules prohibiting an unauthorized occupancy if one of the listed methods of verification is met.</p>	Thank you for your comment. This proposed change is to clarify the types of documents used to verify occupancy.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
78	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law	<i>ACOP – Count 30 – Criminal use of weapons</i> The CHA should clarify that only criminal convictions will be considered when conducting background checks, and not mere allegations or arrests.	Thank you for your comment. The <u>Landers</u> case did not prohibit the use of arrests in determining suitability of an applicant. In particular, the court agreed with CHA “that evidence of conviction is not a prerequisite for denying an application for public housing.” The court further stated it did not dispute CHA’s ability to reject an applicant based on a criminal record that includes convictions and arrests. Based on federal regulations, CHA is within policy. If an applicant feels that a denial based on arrests and/or conviction documentation is unjust, they have an opportunity to mitigate the denial of tenancy.
79	Jeremy Bergstrom Senior Staff Attorney, Housing Justice Sargent Shriver	The Shriver Center is aware that LAF has also provided comments on CHA’s proposed changes to its HCV Administrative Plan, ACOP, Moving to Work Amendments, and Lease Agreement. The Shriver Center adopt LAF’s comments in addition to our own.	Thank you for your comment.
80	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	My name is Michelle Gilbert. I'm an attorney for Legal Assistance Foundation. I represent Public housing And Housing Choice Voucher tenants, as well as the Legal Assistance Foundation to submit written comments. I'm here tonight on my own time to make two comments about what I feel. The first is the change in the guest policy for HCV tenants. I'm a mother. I'm a daughter. I'm a wife. I know people have family. They have commitments. There were times when my son was a child when my mother spent more than seven days in our home because someone needed to watch him between school and camp. Knowing them, I know HCV tenants are people just like the rest of us, and sometimes life intervenes. You have a guest more than seven days. I'm very disappointed that we would be moving towards a point instead of away from a point where CHA is going to be checking in these clauses as to how long a guest stays. That proposed change just sets up the possibility for tenants losing their voucher assistance for what any other person would do if they need help with a family member. There are some other guests that I understand that it would change to make it more like a public housing lease, in which I would respond it would be better to make the time longer for both and not shorter for	Thank you for your comment. CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
81	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Absence Policy:</i> There are other changes, and this is probably procedural, where the family absent from the unit seems to take out reasons why families are absent, like military service or children in foster care. Perhaps that's meaningless.	CHA has removed procedural language in order to streamline the policy documents.
82	Michele Gilbert, Supervisory Attorney, LAF Housing Practice Group	<i>Hearings:</i> Generally the last point I would like to make, service providers and tenants have asked repeatedly just to put the number, the phone number of Legal Aid on the notices for hearing, which are not asking to provide it to our needs. Just give us a phone number. We can all help to settle cases and obviate the need for hearings. What is wrong with that?	CHA provides the information upon request. CHA will consider other options for providing this information.
83	Charles Barlow	I just wanted to speak to something I addressed this morning at the Board Of Commissioners meeting in relation to the number of documents that have public comments. It's really unprecedented with regard to so many documents at one time. This part of the hearing is about 522 pages of documents of which we have 30 days to make comments. As many of us as CHA staff know, I'm an academic researcher, and I'm trying to do my utmost to do the best I can on those changes. I'm 50 pages into the document, and we are already halfway through the comment period and we have 7,000 words of comments just as far as the documents. At the central advisory meeting, Mr. Titleman said it was possible for CHA to extend the comment period, and I'm wondering if that option can be explored so the public, myself, residents, and others would have the opportunity to write the comments that we wish to write in a more reasonable timeframe. Other people have other things to do beyond just writing comments on CHA documents.	CHA continuously works to improve and adapt the public comment process as necessary. The proposed changes out for public comment were only a portion of the documents. In addition to redlined versions of the documents which indicated specific proposed changes, CHA provided documents summarizing the changes proposed for the HCV Administrative Plan, ACOP and Public Housing Lease.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
84	Charles Barlow	And then my last comment for today is in relation to the notification to residents and the public about these public comment hearings. We can see it's more CHA staff here than there are the public. I think that speaks to perhaps a shortcoming in the efforts to notify the public. I know that you wrote it on the website. I'm not sure about anything else. I know that the residents at large want to -- were not notified by mail or any other means. I think in the future, it would be great to have a more extensive notification policy in the future.	CHA continuously works to improve and adapt the public comment process as necessary. Announcements for the public comment process appeared on CHA's website and in the Chicago Defender (June 25 and July 2) and Chicago Sun-Times and Hoy newspapers (June 27-July 3, weekdays only). In addition, CHA provides information to property managers, service providers, HCV contractors and the CAC/LAC for posting in offices/common areas and to distribute to residents upon request.
85	Kathy Dunbar	I know these proposals are unfair and a violation of families right to reside in a manner in which allows them to decide what to do in their home or out. That's how I feel.	Thank you for your comment. CHA is already in communication to address this matter. Please contact the HCV Call Center at (312) 935-2600 or e-mail hcv@thecha.org for follow-up and resolution (if not already resolved).
86	Charles Barlow	I applaud the Chicago Housing Authority for offering three public comment hearings for the public comment process for the Proposed FY2014 MTW Annual Plan Amendment and Updates to the ACOP and HCV Administrative Plan, instead of the more typical single hearing. However, I am disappointed that the public comment hearings occurred so soon after the release of the draft documents. Consequently, members of the public had very limited time in which to read the draft documents in advance of the opportunity to offer oral comments.	Thank you for your comment. The public comment period took place from June 27-July 28, 2014. Comments could be made through a variety of options throughout this period. Oral comments could be made at public hearings as well as by phone. Furthermore, comments were accepted through email, fax or mail.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
87	Charles Barlow	Members of the public were only granted two (2) minutes to make a comment at each public comment hearing, or four (4) minutes total if another member of the public yielded their time. Given that the Chicago Housing Authority released more than 500 pages of draft documents, it was impossible for any member of the public to make substantive oral comments in the time allotted.	Thank you for your comment. CHA follows a standard process for conducting public hearings. Public hearings are not the only medium for comment on proposed documents during the public comment period. The actual proposed changes were substantially less than 500 pages and summaries were provided.
88	Charles Barlow	Will the Chicago Housing Authority please confirm how residents of its public housing program, Housing Choice Voucher program residents, and members of the public were notified of the public comment period and the documents released for public comment? As I understand, residents were not informed via any mailings etc., and notice was only posted on the Chicago Housing Authority's website. It is unreasonable to expect residents to check this website (www.thecha.org) with any regularity, and therefore many residents and members of the public were simply unaware of the existence of the public comment period.	Announcements for the public comment process appeared on CHA's website and in the Chicago Defender (June 25 and July 2) and Chicago Sun-Times and Hoy newspapers (June 27-July 3, weekdays only). In addition, CHA provides information to property managers, service providers, HCV contractors and the CAC/LAC for posting in offices/common areas and to distribute to residents upon request. CHA also provides hard copies of public comment documents to the CAC/LAC.
89	Charles Barlow	Given that the Chicago Housing Authority elected to release so many draft documents for public comment, I do not believe that a period of thirty (30) days was sufficient to allow extensive comments on the full range of draft documents. Indeed, the Chicago Housing Authority released more than 500 pages of draft documents as part of this process. It would have been more reasonable to release each of the four documents individually, with its own thirty (30) day comment period. I believe that this was a very intentional action by the Chicago Housing Authority to limit the opportunity and ability for members of the public to make comments on the draft documents. The need to move forward with the draft documents is a weak excuse. I am deeply disappointed. Indeed, I was unable to comment on any part of the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan as a result of lack of time.	Only portions of the documents out for public comment contained the proposed changes. In addition to redlined versions of the documents which indicated specific proposed changes, CHA provided documents summarizing the changes proposed for the HCV Administrative Plan, ACOP and Public Housing Lease.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
90	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states on its Public Notice ~Copies of the Proposed FY2014 MTW Annual Plan Amendment and updates to the ACOP, Residential Lease Agreement, and HCV Administrative Plan are available until July 28, 2014 (5 p.m.) at the following locations: CHA and HCV Administrative Offices 60 E. Van Buren St " I visited the CHA and HCV Administrative Offices on July 2nd to collect copies of the Proposed FY2014 MTW Annual Plan Amendment and updates to the ACOP, Residential Lease Agreement, and HCV Administrative Plan. I visited both the HCV Administrative Office on the east side of the building, as well as the Corporate Office on the west side of the building. No one that I spoke with on the east side of the building were aware of the public comment period, and suggested I try the west side of the building. Upon speaking with the security staff, the Receptionist from the Chicago Housing Authority came downstairs to speak with me. She informed me that documents were not available, despite what the Public Notice stated, and that I would need to contact Nathaniel Tortora-the Freedom of Information Act Officer for the Chicago Housing Authority-to request documents. Once I had made the journey back home, I contacted Nathaniel via e-mail, and he responded the same day stating "We will mail you these documents, they will be placed in the mail today. Sorry again for the inconvenience." I have yet to receive the documents that were allegedly placed in the mail on July 2nd. Of course, I understand that mail can be lost; however, I believe that the Chicago Housing Authority consciously decided to not send the documents in order to limit the amount of time I had available to comment on hard copies of the draft documents. I wrote to Nathaniel Tortora again via e-mail on July 9th , informing him that I would be at the Chicago Housing Authority's Corporate Offices that afternoon for Board of Commissioners Committee Meetings, and demanded that hard copies be made available for my collection. Hard copies were provided to me on July 9th, some eight days after I visited the Chicago Housing Authority to collect copies in accordance with the Public Notice. This is completely unacceptable, and I request an explanation for this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Hard copies of the documents proposed for public comment are generally available at 8am on the first day of the public comment period. Unfortunately, for this comment period, hard copies of the document were not available in CHA's lobby until July 1. CHA apologizes for the inconvenience, however the documents were available for review on CHA's website at the start of public comment on June 27.</p> <p>CHA did intend to mail hard copies of the document per this request, however the mailing was delayed. CHA later arranged to provide hard copies on July 9, and the copies were provided.</p>
91	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states on its Public Notice ~IICopies of the Proposed FY2014 MTW Annual Plan Amendment and updates to the ACOP, Residential Lease Agreement, and HCV Administrative Plan are available until July 28, 2014 (5 p.m.) at the following locations: ... Central Advisory Council Office 243 E. 32M St.". Hard copies of the Proposed FY2014 MTW Annual Plan Amendment and updates to the ACOP, Residential Lease Agreement, and HCV Administrative Plan were in fact not delivered to the Central Advisory Council until the evening of July 8th , some twelve days after the documents were supposed to be available according to the Public Notice. Even then, the Chicago Housing Authority did not provide a sufficient number of copies to distribute to members of the public and Chicago Housing Authority residents. Instead, the Chicago Housing Authority provided only enough copies for the Local Advisory Council Presidents. This is completely unacceptable, and I request an explanation for this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The documents were initially emailed to the CAC on July 26, and hard copies were delivered on July 8. CHA will consider providing additional copies for the CAC office for future public comment periods.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
92	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority advertised three public comment hearings on its public notice. One of these hearings-held at the Major Adams Community Center, on July 15th at 6pm-listed the incorrect address on the public notice. The address listed was "125 S Hoyne, 60612~ when in fact the address is 125 N Hoyne. Why was this incorrect? I believe that the Chicago Housing Authority should extend the comment period and offer this public comment hearing on another date, listing the correct address on the public notice.	CHA apologizes for this error. There are numerous ways to provide comments, other than public hearings, during the public comment period. CHA is unaware of instances in which someone was unable to find the correct location for this hearing.
93	Charles Barlow	Many of the provisions included in the draft documents are favorable. However, none of the changes go far enough, and the recommendations of the Central Advisory Council in their '2012 Strategies and Recommendations Report' have largely been ignored during the process of revisions to all documents as part of the public comment period. Why has the Chicago Housing Authority chosen to ignore these recommendations? All recommendations made within this Report have come from extensive research and at the request of residents who live in the Chicago Housing Authority's properties.	Thank you for your comment. CHA did provide direct feedback on the CAC's recommendations during the strategic planning process. CHA looks forward to having additional policy discussions with the CAC on items that may not have been included during this first round of UHP.
94	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The resident may be granted the chance to enter into a reasonable payment agreement based upon the resident's monthly adjusted income and payment history" (emphasis added) (page 5). The use of this language suggests that there is some element of luck as to whether or not a resident is permitted to enter into a reasonable payment agreement. What factors contribute to the Chicago Housing Authority's decision as to whether or not a resident is permitted to enter into a reasonable payment agreement? Why can't residents always be granted the option to enter into a reasonable payment agreement?	CHA adheres to HUD guidance in regards to repayment agreements in public housing. CHA has clarified the language.
95	Charles Barlow	In the interest of clarity and transparency of policies, it would be helpful if the Chicago Housing Authority could present specific instances of "When appropriate, a hardship exemption will be granted" (page 8). The Chicago Housing Authority states that a 'hardship suspension' will be granted "due to financial hardship" (page 8) but fails to state the acceptable reasons for residents to be suffering financial hardship. Can this be included?	CHA did not propose any changes to this policy.
96	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Failure to pay the retroactive charge may result in termination of tenancy" (page 8). If the retroactive charge is unreasonably high due to misrepresentation or failure to report, will the resident be granted an opportunity to enter into a 'reasonable payment agreement' (as on page 5) and pay the retroactive charge over a period of several months, as needed?	CHA adheres to HUD guidance in regards to repayment agreements in public housing. Thank you for your comment.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
97	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The resident shall have the right to allow individual guests or visitors for a period of up to 30 calendar days in a calendar year; however, each visit cannot exceed seven consecutive calendar days" (page 9). Are residents permitted to have more than one guest or visitor at any one time? Is the 30 calendar day maximum applicable to the total number of guests and visitors in a given calendar year, or is the 30 day calendar maximum applicable per guest or visitor?	CHA has reconsidered the proposed guest policy and CHA now recommends that the Board adopt a policy that allows guests to stay for 14 consecutive days. As previously proposed, the policy allows for exceptions to this rule. Residents are permitted to have more than one guest at a time. The 30 calendar day maximum is applicable per each individual guest.
98	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Visitors banned for such behavior, will be restricted from entering CHA properties." The comma is not necessary. This statement is not clear. Does the ban apply to entry to all Chicago Housing Authority properties, or just the individual property where the incident occurred? In the case of developments with multiple buildings, will the resident be barred from the individual building where the incident occurred, or the entire development? If the banned visitor is a Chicago Housing Authority resident, and the ban is applicable to all Chicago Housing Authority properties, what consequences will this resident suffer? If the banned visitor is a Chicago Housing Authority resident of the property where the incident occurred, how will this be dealt with?	A visitor may be banned from a specific property or all CHA properties which is dependent upon the severity of the disturbance they caused. A CHA resident cannot be a visitor at the property in which they reside.
99	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Engaging in any drug-related criminal activity on or off CHA premises. For purposes of the Lease, the term drug-related criminal activity means the illegal manufacture, sale, distribution, use, possession, storage, service, delivery or cultivation of a controlled substance, including medical marijuana" (page 15). This provision is not clear. Is the Chicago Housing Authority stating that the term drug -related criminal activity means "the illegal manufacture, [illegal] sale, [illegal] distribution, [illegal] use, [illegal] possession, [illegal] storage, [illegal] service, [illegal] delivery or [illegal] cultivation of a controlled substance, including medical marijuana" or is the Chicago Housing Authority stating that any and all acts of manufacture, sale, distribution, use, possession, storage, service, delivery, or cultivation of controlled substances, including medical marijuana constitutes drug-related criminal activity? The legal use or possession of medical marijuana does not constitute a drug-related criminal activity in accordance with state and local laws, and the Chicago Housing Authority does not hold the authority to define drug-related criminal activity in this manner. Chicago Housing Authority residents in legal possession of a medical marijuana card are permitted, by law, to possess and use medical marijuana. The Chicago Housing Authority can, I suppose, ban this medical substance on its properties, but I expect that this violates an individual's rights. This would be disappointing, and appropriate legal action ought to be taken against the Chicago Housing Authority to remedy this situation. Overall, though, the Chicago Housing Authority does not have the authority to define criminal activities and this Lease provision ought to be amended.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
100	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "To personally refrain from and to cause resident authorized members, guests and other persons under the residents' control to not display, use, control, or possess anywhere on or near CHA property any firearms, ammunition, or other weapons in violation of Federal, State, and local laws" (page 15). Public Act 98-63, the Firearm Concealed Carry Act, became state law last year (430 ILCS 66). This law requires an Illinois Concealed Carry License to carry a concealed firearm in Illinois. If a Chicago Housing Authority resident is in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Carry License they are not violating the law and should be permitted to carry a concealed firearm. However, the Chicago Housing Authority states that "it shall be a lease violation to Display, intentionally or unintentionally, a weapon while on or near CHA Property, or Hide or conceal, intentionally or unintentionally, a weapon on one's person or belongings while on CHA Property" (page 15). How can the Chicago Housing Authority constitute the legal possession of a concealed firearm as a lease violation? In not permitting Chicago Housing Authority residents to exercise their right to possess a concealed firearm when in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Firearms license, the Chicago Housing Authority introduces the enhanced possibility of endangering the safety of all Chicago Housing Authority residents. Once it becomes known that residents are not allowed to carry a concealed firearm, even if in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Firearms license, Chicago Housing Authority residents are at increased risk of violence and will not be in a position to protect themselves against non-Chicago Housing Authority residents who are aware of this policy. Why is this a provision of the Lease? Additionally, what jurisdiction and authority does the Chicago Housing Authority have for what occurs "near CHA property"?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA will review the language for clarity purposes but will maintain the policy.</p>
101	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "Live-in aides have no rights as remaining family members regardless of the familial relationship and upon the death, eviction, departure, or abandonment of the assisted resident family member, the live-in aide must leave the unit. Failure to leave is cause for eviction" (page 18). What is the timeframe permissible for a live-in aide to leave the unit? Is the failure of a live-in aide to leave cause for eviction of the live-in aide or the entire household? This is not clear.</p>	<p>This is a procedural question. Procedures are not included in policy documents.</p>
102	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "CHA encourages and recommends that resident obtains renters insurance". Will the Chicago Housing Authority offer advice and guidance during the process of selecting the best available option for obtaining renters insurance? If so, how can residents seek this advice and guidance? If not, why not?</p>	<p>Residents who are interested in obtaining renter's insurance may seek information from an appropriate third party.</p>
103	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "CHA will request work orders for items found to be in disrepair and residents will be given a 30 day notice for any housekeeping violations" (page 22). What does this 30 day notice period entail? What are the obligations and expectations of the resident during this time? The Chicago Housing Authority later on the same page makes reference to a "30 day cure period" but does not define this. What does this entail?</p>	<p>This is a procedural question. Procedures are not typically described in policy documents.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
104	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Exceptions may be made for documented victims of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking" (footnote 2, page 24). Elsewhere the Chicago Housing Authority has used similar language but with the inclusion of "sexual assault". Why is sexual assault not included as a potential exception in this instance?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
105	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The resident falsifies documents or provides misleading documents regarding any resident authorized member's illegal use of a controlled substance (including medical marijuana" (page 24). Chicago Housing Authority residents in legal possession of a medical marijuana card are permitted, by law, to possess and use medical marijuana. However, the possession and use of medical marijuana is considered a drug-related criminal activity elsewhere in the Lease, even though it is permissible in accordance with the law. Why is this the case?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.
106	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The resident fails to supply information necessary to complete re-examination, including but not limited to Social Security numbers and Employer Identification Numbers" (page 24). Chicago Housing Authority residents are required to provide such numbers upon initial admission and occupancy of a Chicago Housing Authority unit. These numbers do not change, so why does the Chicago Housing Authority constitute the failure to provide such numbers as grounds for the termination of the Lease? Once such numbers are provided by the resident at initial admission and occupancy, they should not need to be requested again.	CHA did not propose any changes to this policy.
107	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to "medical marijuana" (page 26). I wish to reiterate my previous comments on the legality of the provisions made within this Lease in relation to the use of medical marijuana by individuals in lawful possession of a medical marijuana card. How can the Chicago Housing Authority constitute the use and possession of legally obtained medical marijuana as grounds for the termination of this Lease?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
108	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "Resident, the resident's authorized members, visitors/guests, or persons under the resident's control, are in violation of the lease, Section 8.(n)(4) involving firearms, ammunition, or other weapons anywhere on CHA property" (page 27). Public Act 98-63, the Firearm Concealed Carry Act, became state law last year (430 ILCS 66). This law requires an Illinois Concealed Carry License to carry a concealed firearm in Illinois. If a Chicago Housing Authority resident is in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Carry License they are not violating the law and should be permitted to carry a concealed firearm. However, the Chicago Housing Authority states that "it shall be a lease violation to Display, intentionally or unintentionally, a weapon while on or near CHA Property, or Hide or conceal, intentionally or unintentionally, a weapon on one's person or belongings while on CHA Property" (page 15). How can the Chicago Housing Authority constitute the legal possession of a concealed firearm as a lease violation? In not permitting Chicago Housing Authority residents to exercise their right to possess a concealed firearm when in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Firearms License, the Chicago Housing Authority introduces the enhanced possibility of endangering the safety of all Chicago Housing Authority residents. Once it becomes known that residents are not allowed to carry a concealed firearm, even if in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Firearms License, Chicago Housing Authority residents are at increased risk of violence and will not be in a position to protect themselves against non-Chicago Housing Authority residents who are aware of this policy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy.</p>
109	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "The resident, any authorized members, guests, or person under the resident's control conducts political or religious recruitment (evangelizing) activities on CHA property" (page 28). This is a new provision in the draft FY2014 Residential Lease Agreement. On what grounds has this new provision been proposed? Why does the Chicago Housing Authority deem this necessary? Are residents not entitled to voice their political and religious views freely? I do not think the Chicago Housing Authority is authorized to suppress the rights to freedom of expression.</p>	<p>CHA is clarifying this language to state that political or religious recruitment is not permitted in common areas of properties.</p>
110	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "Exceptions will be made for instances related to reasonable accommodations or VAWA" (page 29). What is VAWA? Why is this not defined?</p>	<p>VAWA refers to the Violence Against Women's Act. The Act is referenced in Section 11 (I) of the Lease and Chapter I (E) of the ACOP.</p>
111	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "When the CHA is required to offer the resident the chance for a grievance hearing and the resident has made a timely request, the tenancy shall not terminate, until the time for the tenant to request a grievance hearing has expired" (emphasis added) (page 31). The use of this language suggests that there is some element of luck as to whether or not a resident is permitted to participate in a grievance hearing. What factors contribute to the Chicago Housing Authority's decision as to whether or not a resident is permitted participate in a grievance hearing? Why can't residents always be granted the option to participate in a grievance hearing?</p>	<p>There is no element of luck in determining whether a resident qualifies for a grievance hearing. CHA has clarified the language.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
112	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Residents will be notified of revisions to the lease before the revision is scheduled to take effect" (page 31). What is the timeframe for this notification? Why is the timeframe not stated? Under the current wording, this provision would be satisfied if residents were notified of revisions the day prior to revisions being scheduled to take effect, and this is not acceptable.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will take this into consideration.
113	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Religious recruitment (evangelizing) is not considered employment and/or activity that satisfies the work requirement" (pages 32-33). Why not? If a resident is paid for such recruitment activities why does this not satisfy the CHA Work Requirement? Why isn't political recruitment referenced here, as is the case on page 28 of this Lease? Is political recruitment a permissible activity to satisfy the CHA Work Requirement?	CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing work requirement policies. This language was added to the Lease to be consistent with the ACOP. Political recruitment does not satisfy the CHA work requirement.
114	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Religious recruitment (evangelizing) activity does not satisfy the volunteer/self-sufficiency requirements" (page 33). Why not? Why isn't political recruitment referenced here, as is the case on page 28 of this Lease? Is political recruitment a permissible activity to satisfy the Community Service and Economic Self-sufficiency Requirement?	CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing Community Service and Economic Self-Sufficiency Requirement policies. This language was added to the Lease to be consistent with the ACOP. Political activities are excluded from community service.
115	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority has elected to discontinue the provision of certain attachments and information to the lease (page 39). Why have these items been excluded from the lease? Residents have a right to be fully informed.	CHA will still provide a copy of the these informational documents to residents. However, these documents will not be part of the lease contract.
116	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (VAWA), signed into law January 5, 2006, which establishes the rights of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, living in federally funded housing" (page 1). However, elsewhere in the ACO?, the Chicago Housing Authority also makes reference to "sexual violence" Why is "sexual violence" not included here?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
117	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The CHA shall not deny admissions to any applicant or assistance to any resident on the basis that the applicant or resident is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking, if the applicant or resident otherwise qualifies for assistance or admission" (page 2). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority has amended similar statements to include the additional term of "sexual assault". Why is the term "sexual assault" not included here?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
118	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The CHA will not permit the use of medical marijuana as a reasonable accommodation" (page 2). Chicago Housing Authority residents in legal possession of a medical marijuana card are permitted, by law, to possess and use medical marijuana. However, the possession and use of medical marijuana is considered a drug-related criminal activity in the FY2014 Residential Lease Agreement, even though it is permissible in accordance with the law. Why is this the case? Why won't the Chicago Housing Authority permit the legal use of medical marijuana as a reasonable accommodation?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.
119	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The CHA and its private property management companies must keep information regarding Victims of Domestic Violence, Sexual Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, or Stalking confidential and in accordance with Privacy Laws" (page 5). What "Privacy Laws" is the Chicago Housing Authority referencing here?	CHA is referencing privacy provisions in the Violence Against Women Act and other confidentiality laws.
120	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "A victim may submit unconventional evidence to document domestic, sexual violence, dating violence or stalking" (page 5). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to "sexual assault as a new inclusion to the ACOP. Why is no reference to "sexual assault" made here?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
121	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "applicants who can provide documentation that they have been displaced by domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking or need to move from their present housing because of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence or stalking" (page 10). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to "sexual assault" in similar provisions of the ACOP. Why is "sexual assault" not mentioned here?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
122	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The applicant must supply the documentation at the time of the screening. Failure to provide the documentation within 10 days will result in removal of the veteran's preference" (page 11). Is this 10 calendar days, or 10 business days? This is not clear.	The policy refers to 10 calendar days.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
123	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Any household member is currently engaging in illegal use of a drug, including the distribution, possession, sale or use of medical marijuana" (page 15). Chicago Housing Authority residents in legal possession of a medical marijuana card are permitted, by law, to possess and use medical marijuana. However, the possession and use of medical marijuana is considered a drug-related criminal activity in the FY2014 Residential Lease Agreement, even though it is permissible in accordance with the law. Why is this the case? Why won't the Chicago Housing Authority permit the legal use of medical marijuana by applicants for housing?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.
124	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Applicants are encouraged to inform the CHA of any history of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking if the applicant believes it may affect his/her screening" (page 17). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to "sexual assault.". Why is this term not included here?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
125	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states «An applicant who is a victim of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking will have a reasonable opportunity to present information regarding his/her status as a victim" (page 17). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to victims of "sexual assault" . Why is this term not included here?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
126	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The CHA will determine if domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking is a factor in the unfavorable results of screening" (page 18). Elsewhere in the same paragraph, the Chicago Housing Authority twice makes reference to "sexual assault". Why is sexual assault not referenced here as well?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
127	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Generally, two people are expected to share a bedroom" (page 18). The Central Advisory Council recommended in its '2012 Strategies and Recommendations Report' that the Chicago Housing Authority "Revise occupancy policy regarding two persons per bedroom regardless of gender" (page 29). The Central Advisory Council requested that the following provisions be added to the ACOP, and I wish to express my support for these recommendations: (a) Separate bedrooms should be allocated for persons of the opposite sex (other than adults who have a spousal relationship and children under age five; and (b) Separate bedrooms may be allocated to minor children under with an age difference of eight years or more. Of note, the Charlotte Housing Authority's general policy assigns one bedroom to two people within the following guidelines: (a) separate bedrooms should be allocated for persons of the opposite sex (other than adults who have a spousal relationship and children under age five; (b) Separate bedroom may be allocated to minor children with an age difference of eight years or more; and, (c) Live in attendants will generally provided with a separate bedroom. Please can the Chicago Housing Authority consider this request? It is not appropriate for minors of vastly different ages, or of different genders, to share a bedroom. I am very disappointed that the Chicago Housing Authority has ignored this recommendation from the Central Advisory Council.	Thank you for your comment. CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing occupancy standards which comply with HUD guidelines.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
128	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Refusal of a unit offer solely because an applicant is waiting for a larger unit for which they may also qualify is not good cause for refusal" (page 19). Such a rejection is arguably reasonable for situations where a smaller unit would necessitate the sharing of a bedroom by two children of different genders and/or age groups. It is disappointing that the Chicago Housing Authority is continuing with the policy of considering a household appropriately housed when two children of different ages and/or genders share a bedroom.	Thank you for your comment. CHA is not proposing any changes to the existing occupancy standards which comply with HUD guidelines.
129	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "A list and description of CHA's demonstration programs and initiatives can be found in "The CHA Demonstration Program and Special Initiatives Overview" posted on the CHA website" (page 19). As of July 23rd, no such page appears to exist on the Chicago Housing Authority website. Why not? Where is it? This is a new section within the draft ACOP, and it is troubling that the new materials referenced in the draft documents out for public comment are not readily accessible to the public. In the unlikely event it does exist-I spent over an hour looking-it is certainly not in a readily visible place and ought to be clearly posted on the Homepage of the Chicago Housing Authority website.	Demonstration and pilot programs are subject to CHA Board approval. Upon Board approval, program information will be made available on CHA's website.
130	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The family demonstrates that accepting the offer will place a family member's life, health or safety in jeopardy. The family must provide documentation of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, stalking, or hate crimes, and other situations of non-random violence that put a resident's life in danger" (page 23). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority has made reference to "sexual assault", but sexual assault is not mentioned here. Why not?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
131	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Other documentation or investigations" (page 29). Can the Chicago Housing Authority provide examples of other documentation or investigations that would be sufficient to verify unauthorized occupancy? As it stands, this provision in the ACOP is vague. <i>The same comment was made in reference to page 30 of the ACOP.</i>	Thank you for your comment.
132	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "All properties built, acquired or rehabbed by CHA after FY2014 will be smoke-free" (page 32). What date is this? Elsewhere (but not in the ACOP or Residential Lease Agreement), the Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to January 1 2014; however, this date is not "after FY2014". Please clarify.	The smoking policy applies to properties built, acquired or rehabbed in 2014 or later.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
133	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "The CHA prohibits displaying, controlling, using, or possessing any firearms, ammunition, or other weapons anywhere on or near CHA property by applicants ore residents" (page 32). Public Act 98-63, the Firearm Concealed Carry Act, became state law last year (430 ILCS 66). This law requires an Illinois Concealed Carry License to carry a concealed firearm in Illinois. If a Chicago Housing Authority resident is in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Carry License they are not violating the law and should be permitted to carry a concealed firearm. However, the Chicago Housing Authority states that ~it shall be a lease violation to Display, intentionally or unintentionally, a weapon while on or near CHA Property, or Hide or conceal, intentionally or unintentionally, a weapon on one's person or belongings while on CHA Property" (FY2014 Residential Lease Agreement, page 15) and that "It shall be in violation of the CHA public housing program to: i. Display, intentionally or unintentionally, a weapon while on or near CHA Property, or ii. Hide or conceal, intentionally or unintentionally, the weapon while on or near CHA property. How can the Chicago Housing Authority constitute the legal possession of a concealed firearm as a lease violation? In not permitting Chicago Housing Authority residents to exercise their right to possess a concealed firearm when in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Firearms License, the Chicago Housing Authority introduces the enhanced possibility of endangering the safety of all Chicago Housing Authority residents. Once it becomes known that residents are not allowed to carry a concealed firearm, even if in lawful possession of an Illinois Concealed Firearms License, Chicago Housing Authority residents are at increased risk of violence and will not be in a position to protect themselves against non-Chicago Housing Authority residents who are aware of this policy. Why has this been included as a provision of the ACOP? Additionally, what jurisdiction and authority does the Chicago Housing Authority have for what occurs "near CHA property"?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA will review the language for clarity purposes but will maintain the policy.</p>
134	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "A transfer requested by a resident and approved by the CHA to resolve problems of a life-threatening nature that are not related to unit or building conditions, including but not limited to removing residents from dangers of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, stalking, or hate crimes, and other documented situations of non-random violence that put a resident's life in danger" (page 35). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority has made reference to "sexual assault" when detailing similar provisions of the ACOP. Why is sexual assault not mentioned here?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.</p>
135	Charles Barlow	<p>The Chicago Housing Authority states "The CHA shall take into consideration issues of personal safety when transferring families to/from buildings. The family must provide documentation of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, stalking, or hate crimes, and/or other situations of non-random violence that put a resident's life in danger when contesting transferring to/from a building or area of the city" (page 37). Elsewhere the Chicago Housing Authority has used similar language but with the inclusion of "sexual assault". Why is sexual assault not included in this instance?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.</p>

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
136	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Property managers may provide less than the 30 calendar day notice for mandatory administrative transfers in which the resident is in danger from domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, stalking, or hate crimes, and/or other situations of non-random violence or some medical condition that is not life-threatening but may be exacerbated by their current unit or location" (page 37). Elsewhere the Chicago Housing Authority has used similar language but with the inclusion of "sexual assault". Why is sexual assault not included in this instance?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
137	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states its policy for "Split Family Transfers" in Section V (Transfer Policy), Part G (Split Family Transfers), on pages 39 and 40. The Central Advisory Council recommended in its '2012 Strategies and Recommendations Report' that the Chicago Housing Authority "Revise occupancy policies regarding split families" (page 29). The Central Advisory Council requested that the (following provisions be added to the ACOP, and I wish to express my support for these recommendations: (a) Allow resident requested split transfer for relocating families to enable the splitting family the option of receiving a public housing unit or an HCV; and, (b) Allow split family transfers for overcrowded households not covered by the Relocation Rights Contract or Post 10/1/99 Relocation Rights Contract housing in instances where CHA does not have a unit large enough to accommodate the family. Please can the Chicago Housing Authority consider this request? I am very disappointed that the Chicago Housing Authority has ignored this recommendation from the Central Advisory Council.	Thank you for your comment. CHA is not proposing any changes to the split transfer policy.
138	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The splitting family is given the option of a public housing unit or a HCV" (page 40). Does the option of a public housing unit include units in mixed-income/mixed-finance communities? If so, can this be made explicit? If not, why not?	Thank you for your comment. CHA is not proposing any changes to the split transfer policy.
139	Charles Barlow	On the RED-LINED VERSION of the FY2014 Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP), there is a comment, ~Comment [TND1]" on page 42, stating ~Legal & LBR are looking into this to determine whether CHA can verify CSSR compliance during reexams, or, if it needs to stay on an annual basis. Has this been determined yet? Why were the draft documents released for public comment when issues like this one have not been resolved at the time of releasing the documents?	CHA continues to finalize implementation plans for biennial and triennial re-examinations, including the frequency of verifying compliance with the community service requirement.
140	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "If there is any change in rent, the lease will be amended during the interim re-examination or a new lease will be executed during the annual re-examination, and a Notice of Rent Adjustment will be issued prior to the effective date of the rent adjustment" (page 43). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program (page 42). Why is the language of "Annual Re-examination" (page 43) used here? Should this not instead state "Scheduled Re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will make changes to the language as necessary.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
141	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Compliance with community service activities is monitored on an annual basis" (page 46). Is this still the case given that the Chicago Housing Authority has elected to move to biennial or triennial re-examination, with the exception for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42) where re-examinations will continue on an annual basis? If not, please clarify. This is not clear.	CHA continues to finalize implementation plans for biennial and triennial re-examinations, including the frequency of verifying compliance with the community service requirement.
142	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "At each annual re-examination, non-exempt residents and adult authorized members of the household must present a completed documentation form of activities performed over the previous 12 months" (page 48). Is this still the case given that the Chicago Housing Authority has elected to move to biennial or triennial re-examination, with the exception for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42) where re-examinations will continue on an annual basis? If not, please clarify. This is not clear.	CHA continues to finalize implementation plans for biennial and triennial re-examinations, including the frequency of verifying compliance with the community service requirement.
143	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "If, at the annual re-examination, the resident remains non-lease compliant due to violation of the requirements ... " (page 48). Is this still the case given that the Chicago Housing Authority has elected to move to biennial or triennial re-examination, with the exception for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program~ (page 42) where re-examinations will continue on an annual basis? Should this state "If, at the next scheduled re-examination, the resident..."? If not, please clarify. This is not clear.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will make changes to the language as necessary.
144	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "An interim re-examination does not affect the date of annual re-examination" (page 50). Is this still the case given that the Chicago Housing Authority has elected to move to biennial or triennial re-examination , with the exception for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42) where re-examinations will continue on an annual basis? Should this state "An interim reexamination does not affect the date of the next scheduled re-examination"? If not, please clarify. This is not clear.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
145	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Less than a 30 day written notice, if necessary, is allowable to correct the error" (page 50). How will this "written notice" be sent-via postal mail, e-mail, in person, etc.? This is not clear. Please clarify.	This is a procedural question. Procedures are not included in policy documents.
146	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Less than a 30 day written notice, if necessary, is allowable to correct the error" (page 50). Is this 30 calendar days, or 30 business days? This is not clear. Please clarify.	The language refers to 30 calendar days.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
147	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Residents that report no source of income are required to complete an income re-examination every 90 days, in accordance with Section VI,B.7. Reporting is required until income increases or it is time for the next regularly scheduled annual re-examination, whichever occurs first" (page 51). Is this still the case given that the Chicago Housing Authority has elected to move to biennial or triennial re-examination, with the exception for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42) where re-examinations will continue on an annual basis? Should this state " ... Reporting is required until income increases or it is time for the next regularly scheduled re-examination"? If not, please clarify. This is not clear.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
148	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "If an interim is requested within 30 days of the beginning of the annual re-examination process, the interim must be completed in accordance with Section VI.E., and the information gathered can also be used to complete the annual re-examination process" (page 51). Is this still the case given that the Chicago Housing Authority has elected to move to biennial or triennial re-examination, with the exception for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42) where re-examinations will continue on an annual basis? Should this state (excluding other corrections offered in previous comments) "If an interim is requested within 30 days of the beginning of the scheduled re-examination process, the interim must be completed in accordance with Section VI.E. , and the information gathered can also be used to complete the scheduled re-examination process\ or similar? If not, please clarify. This is not clear.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
149	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "D. CHA Work Requirement Verification at Annual Re-examination~ (page 55). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "Annual Re-examination" (page 55) used here? Should this not instead state "Scheduled Re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. The reference to this Section (VIII. D.) is also incorrect. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
150	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "During the annual re-examination , the property manager will determine whether each resident and adult authorized family member of the resident's household, age 17 up to age 54, is in compliance with the CHA Work Requirement through a combination of employment, school attendance, or performance of volunteer or community service-(page 55). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 55) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled reexamination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
151	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Either the victim or the caregiver for a victim of violence, including but not limited to domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, and stalking" (page 55). Elsewhere, when the Chicago Housing Authority has adopted similar language, the term "sexual assault" has been included. Why is "sexual assault" not included in this provision?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
152	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "If the Safe Harbor request occurs during the annual re-examination, the Safe Harbor request date will be the lease effective date" (page 55). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 55) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
153	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states " If there is a third Safe Harbor request, it will coincide with the lease re-examination process (120 days before the next lease effective date)" (page 56). This is no always longer correct given that this timeframe of the third request falling 120 days prior to the lease re-examination process is only applicable to annual re-examinations. If the household is to be re-examined under biennial re-examination, or otherwise, this is incorrect. The Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
154	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The choice of flat rent may only be offered at admission and annual re-examination" (page 59). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual reexamination" (page 59) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled reexamination"- given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? If this is the case, the Chicago Housing Authority presents a contradiction by saying "Each year, beginning at admission, the CHA will offer each resident the choice between paying the income-based rent or the flat rent applicable to the unit the resident will occupy" (page 59) if "the choice of flat rent may only be offered at admission and [scheduled] re-examination" (page 59). This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
155	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority is required to raise flat rents if they fall below HUD-established minimums, as reported in PIH 2014-12 (HA). Why is this HUD Notice, and its subsequent effects, not discussed in this section of the ACOP?	Thank you for your comment. HUD policy changes are otherwise communicated to residents when appropriate.
156	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "All residents will be notified in advance of any changes to the flat rent schedules" (page 59). What is the timeframe for this notification? "In advance" is vague. How will residents be notified? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Residents are notified timely and effectively as appropriate for the change.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
157	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "The choice of flat rent may only be offered at admission and annual re-examination" (page 59). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual reexamination" (page 59) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled reexamination"- given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? If this is the case, the Chicago Housing Authority presents a contradiction by saying "Each year, beginning at admission, the CHA will offer each resident the choice between paying the income-based rent or the flat rent applicable to the unit the resident will occupy" (page 59) if "the choice of flat rent may only be offered at admission and [scheduled] re-examination" (page 59). This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
158	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Families are required to participate in an annual re-examination in order to ensure that unit size is still appropriate and the CHA Work Requirement or Community Service Requirements/Economic Self-Sufficiency Programs (if applicable) are met" (page 59). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 59) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
159	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "If a family is currently paying flat rent, the CHA will annually inquire whether the resident wants to continue to pay flat rent" (page 59). However, the Chicago Housing Authority earlier states "The choice of flat rent may only be offered at admission and [scheduled] re-examination" (page 59), which may no longer be annual given that the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL reexamination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). This is not clear. Please clarify.	CHA is clarifying this language to state that households who choose flat rent will be on a biennial re-examination schedule.
160	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states " If a resident paying flat rent is reduced to income-based rent between annual re-examinations due to a hardship ..." (page 59). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 59) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify	CHA is clarifying this language to state that households who choose flat rent will be on a biennial re-examination schedule.
161	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states " If a resident paying flat rent is reduced to income-based rent between annual re-examinations due to a hardship ..." (page 59). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 59) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify	CHA is clarifying this language to state that households who choose flat rent will be on a biennial re-examination schedule.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
162	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Income verification is conducted by the CHA during admissions, interim re-examination, and annual re-examination" (page 61). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 61) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
163	Charles Barlow	Why has "Annual" from the title "A. Annual Income 24 CFR § 5.609" (page 61) been removed? "Annual income" is defined in no uncertain terms by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as noted by the Chicago Housing Authority, and I see no need to strike out "Annual" here, nor elsewhere in this document. In any case, not all instances of "annual" have been struck out, providing further confusion. Please clarify, and justify grounds for the removal of the word "Annual".	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
164	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "CHA will accept a family's declaration of the amount of assets of less than \$5000, and the amount of income expected to be received from those assets" (page 61), but later contradicts this statement by stating "Where the family has net family assets equal to or less than \$5,000, CHA will continue to request supporting documentation (e.g. bank statements) from the family to confirm the assets or the amount of income expected to be received from those assets" (page 61). This is not clear. Please clarify. The Chicago Housing Authority states families can self-certify, but later states that families cannot and must instead provide supporting documentation (e.g. bank statements) as is the case for assets in excess of \$5,000 where the Chicago Housing Authority states "Where the family has net family assets in excess of \$5,000, CHA will obtain supporting documentation (e.g. bank statements) from the family to confirm the assets" (page 61).	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
165	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to "50058 (PIH 2-13-04)" (page 62). However, on the previous page, the Chicago Housing Authority makes reference to "HUD Form 50058 (PIH 2013-03)" (page 61). PIH 2-13-04 does not appear to exist. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
166	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "At initial admission and at each subsequent annual re-examination the CHA shall offer the resident a choice of paying either the income-based rent or the flat rent applicable to the unit they will occupy" (page 66). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program"(page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 66) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
167	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Those opting to pay flat rent will be required to recertify their income every three years" (page 67). However, this is a contradiction of what is stated elsewhere by the Chicago Housing Authority: "Families paying flat rents are required to recertify income biennially" (page 59). This is a contradiction and is not clear. Please clarify.	CHA is clarifying this language to state that households who choose flat rent will be on a biennial re-examination schedule.
168	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Those opting to pay flat rent will be required to recertify their income every three years, although they are still required to participate in an annual re-examination in order to ensure that the unit size is still appropriate and the CHA Work Requirement or the Community Service Requirements/Economic Self-Sufficiency Programs (if applicable) are met" (page 67). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual reexamination" (page 67) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	CHA is clarifying this language to state that households who choose flat rent will be on a biennial examination schedule.
169	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "At the time of annual re-examination, the resident must update the Alternative Care of Pet Statement and registration ... "(page 71). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program"(page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination"(page 71) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
170	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "There is an exemption to providing 15 calendar days written notice when the head of household is a victim of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking" (page 75). Elsewhere in this document, including in this paragraph, the Chicago Housing Authority also mentioned "sexual assault", Why is this not mentioned here in this sentence? Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
171	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "When the head of household, and/or their household members are victims of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, and must leave the unit due to their status as a victim of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking, the victim or another household member shall inform property management within 72 hours but no longer than 30 days from the date of departure, after alternative housing or shelter is found" (page 75). The first part of this sentence makes reference to "sexual assault" but the second part of the sentence does not. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
172	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "Any violent or drug-related criminal activity, including the distribution, possession, sale or use of medical marijuana on or off such premises" (page 76). Chicago Housing Authority residents in legal possession of a medical marijuana card are permitted, by law, to possess and use medical marijuana. However, the possession and use of medical marijuana is considered a drug-related criminal activity in the FY2014 Residential Lease Agreement, even though it is permissible in accordance with the law. Why is this the case?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/Organization	Comment	CHA Response
173	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "10. Anniversary Date -This is 12 months from the effective date of the family's last annual re-examination or, during a family's first year in public housing, from the effective date of the family's initial examination (admission)" (page 78). However, the Chicago Housing Authority elsewhere states ANNUAL re-examination is ONLY for "Families participating in the FSS or Homeownership Program" (page 42). Why is the language of "annual re-examination" (page 78) used here? Should this not instead state "scheduled re-examination," given that it can be annual, biennial, or triennial, depending on the resident's circumstance? This is not clear. Please clarify.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
174	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "17. Bifurcation -With respect to a public housing lease, means to divide a lease as a matter of law such that certain members of the lease who engage in criminal acts of domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence or stalking can be evicted or removed from the lease while the remaining family members' lease and occupancy rights are allowed to remain intact" (page 79). Elsewhere, the Chicago Housing Authority has included the term "sexual assault" for similar provisions. Why is the term "sexual assault not included in this definition?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
175	Charles Barlow	In definition 27 (Dating Violence), the Chicago Housing Authority states "See also Domestic Violence, Sexual Violence/Sexual Abuse and Stalking" (page 79). There is no definition for "Sexual Violence/Sexual Abuse". Definition 84 is for "Sexual Violence/Sexual Assault" and definition 27 should reflect this terminology.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
176	Charles Barlow	In definition 36 (Domestic Violence), the Chicago Housing Authority states "See also Sexual Violence/Sexual Abuse, Dating Violence, and Stalking~ (page 80). There is no definition for "Sexual Violence/Sexual Abuse". Definition 84 is for "Sexual Violence/Sexual Assault" and definition 36 should reflect this terminology.	Thank you for your comment. CHA will update this language as necessary.
177	Charles Barlow	The Chicago Housing Authority states "37. Drug-Related Criminal Activity -The illegal manufacture, sale, distribution, use or possession of a controlled substance with intent to manufacture, sell, distribute, or use the drug. This includes the distribution, possession, sale or use of medical marijuana" (page 80). Chicago Housing Authority residents in legal possession of a medical marijuana card are permitted, by law, to possess and use medical marijuana. Under what authority does the Chicago Housing Authority consider that the legal possession and use of medical marijuana constitutes a "drug-related criminal activity"?	Thank you for your comment. CHA will maintain this policy that is consistent with HUD policy.
178	Charles Barlow	Unfortunately, given the very limited time granted by the Chicago Housing Authority to make comments as part of this public comment process, I was unable to give sufficient review to the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan. However, I wish to apply any and all comments made to provisions within the FY 2014 Moving to Work Annual Plan, the FY2014 Residential Lease Agreement, and the FY2014 Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy to any and all applicable sections of the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan. I would like to publicly express my disappointment with the Chicago Housing Authority in releasing such a considerable volume of documents for public comment concurrently and with such limited public comment period. In my view, this was a very intentional move on the part of the Chicago Housing Authority to limit in-depth commentary on the full range of draft documents.	CHA has received your comment.

ACOP/Lease/HCV Administrative Plan Public Comment Grid: June 27-July 28, 2014

Policy Doc Grid Comment #	Individual/ Organization	Comment	CHA Response
179	Charles Barlow	Charlie Barlow submitted 38 comments that were requests for documents that were not out for public comment.	The purpose of public comment is to provide opportunities for feedback on proposed changes to CHA policies. Only documents with proposed changes, which require public comment processes, are released for public comment.
180	Charles Barlow	Charlie Barlow submitted 5 duplicate comments which were removed.	Thank you for your comments.
181	Charles Barlow	Charlie Barlow submitted 155 comments regarding clarifications of CHA policies and procedures that were not proposed as policy changes for public comment.	Thank you for your comments.
182	Charles Barlow	Charlie Barlow submitted 67 comments regarding typos as well as grammar and formatting suggestions.	Thank you for your comments. CHA will consider changes as necessary.