



September 3, 2026

Chief Data Officer
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Policy Development and Research
451 7th Street SW
Room 10276
Washington, DC 20410-0500

Re: “30-Day Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Management Review for Multifamily Housing Projects” [Docket No. FR-7107-N-17]

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the Local Housing Administrators Coalition (LHAC), I offer the following comments in response to HUD’s notice, “30-Day Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Management Review for Multifamily Housing Projects” [FR-7107-N-17].

LHAC is a coalition of Performance-Based Contract Administrators (PBCAs), entities which contract with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to administer the Project-Based Rental Assistance program. LHAC members administer PBRA developments in states that collectively account for roughly 40% of PBRA units nationally. The comments in this letter draw on the experiences of housing professionals both performing reviews as PBCAs and receiving Management and Occupancy Reviews (MORs) using HUD Form 9834 as PBRA owners and agents (O/As).

1. Background

In April 2022, HUD published a final rule governing how MORs are conducted, “Streamlining Management and Occupancy Reviews for Section 8 Housing Assistance Programs.”¹ This rule governs the methods and schedule contract administrators, including Project-Based Contract Administrators (PBCAs) use to conduct and schedule these reviews. The administration subsequently conducted MOR listening sessions in December 2025-January 2026 to inform this notice.

2. General Comments

LHAC has several general comments that apply to any decisions HUD will make regarding this MOR review form. Most of the form remains unchanged, but HUD should consider making more substantive improvements to the form to enable reviewers to best support this program. Producing a stronger form will bolster the entire Management and Occupancy Review process.

¹ 87 FR 37990. (2022). <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/06/27/2022-13426/streamlining-management-and-occupancy-reviews-for-section-8-housing-assistance-programs>.

All citations informal.



1. *LHAC applauds the decision to conduct stakeholder outreach and encourages HUD to continue doing so*—In December 2025-January 2026, HUD conducted a series of listening sessions with expert stakeholders to inform their revisions to the 9834. LHAC applauds this decision and appreciates the opportunity to weigh in. Furthermore, LHAC appreciates the clarifications to the final rule included in the recent memo dated August 21, 2026. LHAC recommends that HUD continue receiving stakeholder input to maximize the form’s effectiveness because of the rigorous and complicated MOR oversight process. Specifically, HUD should form a working group or similar organization to continue receiving feedback to maximize the effectiveness of the form.
2. *Continue revisions to maximize the form’s usefulness*—Each of the proposed changes to this draft form make marginal improvements; however, HUD should use this notice to make more substantive changes. HUD fails to address tenant-management relations accurately, MOR scheduling, physical inspection results, lookback periods, complexity for PBCAs, and subjectivity of scoring.
3. *Clarifying fair housing requirements*—In 2026, HUD revised fair housing guidance. Both HUD and PBCA reviewers will need clarification on what requirements owners must abide by regarding Fair Housing Marketing Plan submissions and other Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity provisions connected to the Violence Against Women Act that may have changed. Reviewers and owners need clarity to ensure they can comply with these important rules.
4. *Consider a PBCA-only form*—Both HUD and PBCAs perform MORs. HUD reviews criteria that PBCAs do not, and the form is built to accommodate HUD’s needs. Publishing a PBCA-specific version of the form would create a more streamlined and accessible product for both the reviews and PBRA O/As who need to read and act on 9834 findings. For this reason, HUD should publish a form PBCAs use so that stakeholders can better understand ratings and weighting and focus on relevant sections and in so doing provide the best housing possible.
5. *Improve MOR scheduling*—PBCAs report that MOR scheduling has become a challenge since the final rule. The time spent negotiating plans with HUD and implementing revisions makes the scheduling of MORs difficult for PBCAs and thus for PBRA operators as well because PBCAs plan for a full year at a time and revise this plan quarterly. The increased frequency and intensity of natural disasters exacerbates this problem, resulting in MOR postponements for Presidentially Declared Disaster (PDDs) even in counties where properties are unaffected. At the same time, PBRA O/As report that certain streamlined processes previously available that allowed policies, procedures, and forms to be shared electronically are no longer permitted. For most MORs, providing source documentation beforehand allows work to begin weeks in advance and more timely follow up on action items afterward. HUD needs to make MORs as efficient as possible since complying with scheduled inspections can be excessively time-consuming. Additionally, when PBRA developments are shifted from HUD to PBCAs or other elements of the MOR Final Rule apply, there is intense pressure placed on PBCAs to fit MORs into tight deadlines, which will cause increased pressure on housing providers. While LHAC appreciates HUD’s work to address this in its recent memo, PBCAs will remain under tight deadlines.
6. *Consider the usefulness of inspection results*—PBRA O/As report that the MOR form 9834 can emphasize items that are not immediately relevant to the quality of housing they provide. For



example, agencies may be required to remedy leasing and occupancy requirements that are no longer relevant because of the lookback period involved in the review. If O/As were expected to onboard new residents in a specific way and a resident has lived on site for years, providing technical move-in documentation years after the fact is time consuming for housing providers and not impactful for residents' housing quality or satisfaction.

7. *Prepare strategically for the implementation of the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2016 (HOTMA)*—the HUD 9834 form will be impacted by HOTMA. Updating the questions and instructions to align with HOTMA before the compliance date will create incorrect findings. Using a form that is not aligned with HOTMA after the HOTMA compliance date will also result in incorrect findings. HUD should align MORs and HOTMA through the following steps: update new forms to comply with HOTMA, update TRACS 203A, and align the 9834 with the new HOTMA requirements.
8. *Emphasize consistency*—Improve the consistency and uniformity of MOR outcomes which in turn will mean better housing for residents and reduced regulatory burdens for owners. First, scheduling should be consistent. PBRA O/As who converted through RAD report extreme inconsistency in frequency of MORs. One agency with high MOR scores remains unsure why the project receives an MOR annually while another has not received an MOR since converting under RAD nearly a decade before. With reduced HUD staffing, PBCAs could assist HUD by assuming RAD PBRA properties more quickly.

Additionally, both PBCAs and PBRA O/As report subjectivity in the form. This discretion on the part of reviewers is fine as long as it is useful and clear. At times, staff completing MORs need to use their best judgment to establish scores. When this scoring is not explained and overly flexible, it confuses agencies and does not provide action steps they can use. When HUD has shifted from the Uniform Physical Condition Standard (UPCS) to the National Standards for the Physical Inspection of Real Estate (NSPIRE) protocol, PHAs responded favorably to the way the regulations imposed clear and consistent standards that make each inspection standardized and predictable. PHAs know what HUD values under NSPIRE and can prioritize those same standards. Though the MOR is prescriptive in how PBCAs must conduct the review—causing them to be time-consuming—the concise instructions and scoring guidelines make them more subjective than the NSPIRE protocol.

Subjective scoring means new agents have weaker guidance into what HUD values. At the same time, because of the risk-based model of MOR scheduling, MOR scores are increasingly important and should be as objective and consistent as possible. The MOR process should result in changes that make housing a better experience for residents.

HUD should replace the current subjective category ratings and revert to the previously used basic ratings of superior, above average, satisfactory, below average and unsatisfactory.

3. Specific Comments

LHAC has the following comments on specific language included in the proposed rule.



1. *The form's tenant/management relations review provisions remain unrealistic*—PBCAs play a vital role in ensuring tenant concerns are heard and addressed. Tenants generally raise concerns about the physical condition of the property and other tangible management items that impact their housing experience. The proposed Category F should include questions that apply to the factors impacting resident relations, such as the volume and severity of complaints, general physical condition, unit conditions, crime and safety, and measures of management customer service and responsiveness.
2. *Revise the following sections of the form:*
 - *Category A: General Appearance & Security*—HUD should compare the community features required under the HAP Contract, HUD 92264 and other governing documents versus what is actually offered on site. The form should also include General Appearance inside of the units including unit features required under governing documents.
 - *Category F: Tenant Management Relations*—HUD should revise the form to encompass a better picture of what tenant and management relations are at the property by adding questions included in the previous specific comment and whether or not the OA has posted the PBCAs contact information and encourage residents to voice concerns to the office or the PBCA.
 - *Addendum C*—This list is not comprehensive enough and does not allow for the PBCA to add additional documents needed for the MOR Review
 - *Addendum E*—This is a new addendum, however it does not add clarity to the review and will only add additional time to complete the review. Throughout the document, in places where the Addenda are referenced, the new Addendum E is missing or not included (See also the Introductory instructions)
3. *General Formatting:* Many of the boxes are too small to enter appropriate text needed to complete the document (TCD etc.). In numerous places, the font sizes are irregular. In many of the newly added questions, Yes/No/NA boxes are missing.

4. Conclusion

LHAC hopes HUD can use these comments to make more substantive improvements to the Management and Occupancy Review process via a stronger form.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this notice.

Sincerely,

Layla Hayavi
Chair, LHAC