A Brief Summary of HUD's 2019 RAD Evaluation Methodology

National Low Income Housing Coalition
October 24, 2019

The following is a very brief summary of the methodology used by HUD for the tenant-impact evaluation presented in *Final Report: Evaluation of HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD)* released in October 2019.

Selecting Projects

Just 298 completed resident surveys from 18 RAD projects from the early days of the Demonstration are reflected in the evaluation. Of the 18 RAD projects, 13 (72%) were in the South: 6 in Alabama, 3 in North Carolina, 2 in Georgia, 1 in Mississippi, and 1 in Virginia. (The researchers used the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of the South, which includes Maryland. Three of the 18 projects were in Maryland. NLIHC is not including Maryland in the South, however, because NLIHC is not considering Baltimore or Montgomery County as "southern" in nature.) Table C-1 of Appendix C contains the list with specific project names and locations. This preponderance of projects in the South reflects the fact that HUD disproportionately authorized conversions to RAD in the South during the early stages of the program. The evaluation states that this sample does not likely reflect the current universe of RAD projects.

Researchers set out to identify a representative sample of the universe of the first round of 260 public housing properties. The evaluators sought to study 24 projects (the same number as evaluated for the physical conditions, financial performance, and PHA post-conversion experience components of the report). The goal was to have a mix of PHAs of different sizes: "large" (1,250 or more units), "medium" (250 to 1,249 units), and "small" (fewer than 250 units). Researchers also aimed for a mix of PHAs with different Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) scores for each size category: "high" (score greater than 90), "standard" (score between 60 and 90), and "substandard" (score lower than 60).

Ultimately, only 19 properties started the evaluation because too few properties reached the stage of having a RAD Conversion Commitment (RCC), when property was likely to make it to closing and full RAD conversion. Importantly, no large substandard PHA is included. Although one medium substandard PHA was include, it ultimately did not close in time; hence, only 18 projects were evaluated. Of the 18, four were from large PHAs, nine from medium PHAs, and five from small PHAs.

Selecting Residents

Out of the 18 RAD projects, 298 completed surveys were analyzed. Among the original 19 projects, there were 2,548 residents, of whom 1,669 were invited to participate in the evaluation. Ultimately 522 residents agreed to participate, 318 of whom completed a 20-page survey (Appendix B). Because one of the 19 projects did not close in time, however, researchers analyzed only 298 completed surveys.

The report reminds readers that researchers were not able to survey any residents from properties with substandard inspection scores in large or medium PHAs, and so the results are not representative of those populations.