Moving to Work Report
FY2018
Public Housing Division

Original Submission: January 4, 2019

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

B. Overview

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." Margaret Mead

This was our fourth full year of Rent Reform, and we continue to monitor it closely and move forward with our Step and Classic Programs. In year four, incomes and working hours continued to increase, and families engaged at a higher level with the services that we provide. We are now running one of the largest family self-sufficiency programs in the country. Our program, **Jump*start***, is well received and provides our clients with the encouragement and resources they need to reach many of their self-sufficiency goals.

As the State of Alaska's only Public Housing Authority, we continue to manage 1,612 rental units and administer almost 5,000 vouchers in Alaska. Each night we are providing over 11,000 Alaskans with a place to lay their head. AHFC PHD is in 16 locations throughout the state, most of which are only accessible by plane or boat and are separated by hundreds or even thousands of miles. With locations that are above the Arctic Circle and in rain forests that are closer to Seattle than our headquarters in Anchorage, our management costs continue to be high. Despite this fact, we strive to provide the best possible service that we can to each family that we assist and continue to reach out to all Alaskans in need to provide a housing resource.

Fiscal year 2018 provided AHFC with its tenth anniversary as a Moving to Work agency. We are grateful to Congress and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for providing a ten-year MTW extension and the opportunities that allows. As an MTW agency, we are always mindful of the three statutory goals:

1. Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures;
2. Create incentives for families with children to work, seek work, or prepare for work and become economically self-sufficient; and
3. Increase housing choices for low-income families.

Our focus this past year was on providing the tools to create incentives for families to work, seek work, or prepare for work. We have combined that with extensive case management services and partnerships with other agencies that support low income Alaskans.

"Perseverance is failing 19 times and succeeding the 20th." Julie Andrews

Our guiding principles continue to be as follows:

1. Reforms in the calculation of family income and rent shall be designed with the purpose of reducing administrative costs, making the program more transparent to the user, and ensuring changes are as close to revenue neutral as possible.

2. Provide housing assistance to the neediest, eligible populations in each community, with acknowledgement that multiple “categories” of need exist among extremely low-income families.
3. Develop or revise policies that contribute to the achievement of excellence in asset management or administration of the Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing Programs.
4. Prioritize capital expenditures dictated by physical needs assessments and the opportunity to maximize housing choice among low-income families.

B.1 FY2018 Goals

"NEVER GIVE UP, FOR THAT IS JUST THE PLACE AND TIME THAT THE TIDE WILL TURN." HARRIET BEECHER STOWE

1. Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.
2. Continue to create incentives through our **Jump*start*** program for families to work, seek work, or prepare for work.
3. Increase housing choices for low-income families.
4. Maintain stability and be supportive of our elderly and disabled families, while creating administrative efficiencies.
5. Increase the supply of affordable housing in the state of Alaska using our subsidiary, Alaska Corporation for Affordable Housing, as well as explore a Rental Assistance Demonstration application.

This past year we stayed the course with our Rent Reform program, maintaining and strengthening outside partnerships, and developing our **Jump*start*** self-sufficiency program.

"THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY TO DO IT IS TO DO IT." AMELIA EARHART

This past year, we:

- Fully implemented year four of our Rent Reform program, including moving all families in the Step program to their fourth year, rent-based subsidy schedule.
- Expanded our **Jump*start*** program statewide and enrolled over 300 participants
- Fully leased our 150 Moving Home Vouchers, a set aside voucher program in partnership with the Department of Health and Social Services for persons experiencing a disability.
- Expanded our Returning Home Program for parolee’s re-entering society by adding 20 vouchers in Anchorage. This is a referral-based program in partnership with the State of Alaska Department of Corrections.
- Received a new Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) award of 24, bringing the total number of VASH in Alaska to 286 with utilization rates in the ninety percentile.

- Continued working with our project-based voucher partners to increase our leasing rates at Loussac Place, Main Tree Apartments, Ridgeline Terrace, and Susitna Square.
- Began two new sponsor-based rental assistance contracts: a Housing First development, Forget-Me-Not Manor, in Juneau, and a facility for homeless youth, Dena'ina House, in Anchorage.

B.2 Long Term Plan

For FY2018, AHFC planned to have its goals align with its long-term plan. We believe that the inclusion of MTW and non-MTW activities clarifies our vision for AHFC and its subsidiary, ACAH. Accomplishments in the past fiscal year are shown in blue.

> ***"WITH THE NEW DAY COMES NEW STRENGTH AND NEW THOUGHTS." ELEANOR ROOSEVELT***

1. Conduct an organization review to identify overlaps or redundancies in work processes.
   a) We reorganized Public Housing Division's reporting structure to better align program areas.
   b) We conducted a staff time study to understand work processes, identify efficiencies, and provide better customer service.
2. Continue to provide a superior level of service and fine-tune the **Jump*start*** program so that our clients receive the services that produce the best results.
   a) We added staff in Fairbanks, Alaska, to cover the northern section of the state and provide more hands-on service to those communities.
   b) We continue to fine-tune our relationship with job service organizations and other state agencies.
3. Identify areas of our waiting list and communities that need more affordable housing and deliver that.

   We added units in Juneau (32 units at Forget-Me-Not Manor), Anchorage (25 units at Dena'ina House), and Matanuska-Susitna Borough (24 VASH vouchers).
4. Through careful analysis, streamline our operations to provide more time to conduct case management and analysis of other needs.
   a) Streamlined our procedure for offering our public housing units to reduce waiting list and unit turnaround times.
   b) Implemented a preference for displacement due to natural disaster in order to respond quickly to local or national events.

c) Created a team that is in the process of reviewing and revising our eligibility screening procedures and processes to promote uniformity and consistency in the application of these regulations.

5. Staff our Alaska Corporation for Affordable Housing position and empower this person to identify the pros and cons of a RAD application, locate and advocate for the best places to develop affordable housing, and find opportunities to consolidate or improve our housing offerings.

   a) Engaged a consultant to further analyze our portfolio and develop options for redevelopment, disposition, and reconfiguration of our housing stock.

   b) Continued to closely monitor partner organizations that are providing income to ACAH.

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

A. Housing Stock Information

A.1 Actual New Project-Based Vouchers

	Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based		Status at End of Plan Year		
Property Name	Planned	Actual		RAD?	Description of Project
N/A	0	0		No	N/A
N/A	0	0		No	N/A

Please describe the differences between the Planned and Actual Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based:
N/A

A.2 Actual Existing Project-Based Vouchers

	Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based		Status at End of Plan Year		
Property Name	Planned*	Actual		RAD?	Description of Project
1248 East 9th Ave	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	
Loussac Place	60	60	Leased/Issued	No	
MainTree Apartments	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	
Ridgeline Terrace	63	63	Leased/Issued	No	
Susitna Square	18	18	Leased/Issued	No	

* There was an error in the Annual Plan reporting under this section. No new project-based vouchers were planned or added during the plan year.

Please describe the differences between the Planned and Actual Existing Number of Vouchers Project-Based:
N/A

A.3 Actual Other Changes to MTW Housing Stock in the Plan Year

N/A

A.4 General Description of All Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

In addition to planned activities, CFP funds were distributed throughout all of the AMPs to make up the difference in funding the operating costs in the Public Housing program due to funding shortfalls.

B. Leasing Information

B.1 Actual Number of Households Served

Housing Program	Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased		Number of Households Served	
	Planned*	Actual	Planned	Actual
MTW Public Housing Units Leased[1]	14,606	14,235	1,217	1,186
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized[2]	51,168	49,620	4,264	4,135
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based[3]	3,187	2,415	266	201
Local, Non-Traditional: Project-Based[4]	541	731	45	61
Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership	0	0	0	0
Planned/Actual Totals	**69,502**	**67,001**	**5,792**	**5,583**

*Planned numbers have been adjusted to correct errors in classifying vouchers reported in Annual Plan.

1 – Public Housing (Planned 98% of 1,242)

2 – Moving to Work (Planned 98% of 4,351) (includes Homeownership (25), Moving Home Program (150), Returning Home Program-Anchorage (30))

3 – (Planned 98% of 271) (includes Empowering Choice Housing Program (185), Making A Home Program (20), and Returning Home Program-Balance of State (66))

4 – Karluk Manor (Planned 98% of 46) (includes Karluk Manor (46). Dena'ina House (25), and Forget-Me-Not Manor (32) added during Plan Year)

Note: NonElderly Disabled (45) and Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (286) vouchers administrative costs are supported with MTW funds; however, these are not included in the totals.

Please describe any differences between the planned and actual households served:
-Public Housing, Vouchers, Tenant-Based – the actual households served includes those households that vacated during the fiscal year. See section B.2 below. -Project-Based Voucher units were under leased this year. AHFC has met with its partners to address the underutilization. -Local Project-Based – two new sponsor-based rental assistance developments began in FY2018: Dena'ina House and Forget-Me-Not Manor. At Karluk Manor, five (5) units receive an alternate form of rental assistance and are not eligible for additional sponsor-based assistance.

Local, Non-Traditional Category	MTW Activity Name/Number	Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased*		Number of Households Served**	
		Planned^	Actual	Planned^	Actual
Tenant-Based	ECHP – 2013-2	2,176	1,718	181	143
Tenant-Based	Moving Home – 2010-10	1,764	1,648	147	137
Tenant-Based	Returning Home – 2010-9	776	516	65	43
Tenant-Based	Making A Home – 2013-2	235	181	20	15
Project-Based	Karluk – 2012-4	541	484	45	40
Project-Based	Dena'ina – 2018-2	0	36	0	19
Project-Based	Forget-Me-Not – 2018-1	0	211	0	26
Homeownership					
	Planned/Actual Totals	**5,492**	**4,794**	**458**	**423**

Households Receiving Local, Non-Traditional Services Only	Average Number of Households per Month	Total Number of Households in the Plan Year
N/A	N/A	N/A

B.2 Discussion of Any Actual Issues/Solutions Related to Leasing

Discussion of any actual issues and solutions utilized in the MTW housing programs listed.

Housing Program	Description of Actual Leasing Issues and Solutions
MTW Public Housing	AHFC has implemented a new reporting procedure to more closely monitor public housing leasing and turnaround rates.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	AHFC has implemented a new reporting procedure to closely monitor leasing and shopping rates.
Local, Non-Traditional	N/A

C. Waiting List Information

C.1 Actual Waiting List Information

As of 07/01/2018, AHFC had the following waiting list statistics.

Waiting List Name	Description	Number of Households on Waiting List	Waiting List Open, Partially Open or Closed	Was the Waiting List Opened During the Plan Year
Anchorage Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	2,289	Closed	Yes
Anchorage Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	1,457	Partially Open	Yes
Anchorage Public Housing Elderly	Community-Wide, Elderly/Disabled	949	Partially Open	Yes
Bethel Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	55	Open	Yes
Cordova Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	6	Open	Yes

Waiting List Name	Description	Number of Households on Waiting List	Waiting List Open, Partially Open or Closed	Was the Waiting List Opened During the Plan Year
Fairbanks Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	1,438	Open	Yes
Fairbanks Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	288	Open	Yes
Fairbanks Public Housing Elderly	Community-Wide, Elderly/Disabled	382	Open	Yes
Homer Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	139	Open	Yes
Juneau Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	335	Open	Yes
Juneau Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	146	Partially Open	Yes
Juneau Public Housing Elderly	Community-Wide, Elderly/Disabled	81	Open	Yes
Ketchikan Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	167	Open	Yes
Ketchikan Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	59	Open	Yes
Ketchikan Public Housing Elderly	Community-Wide, Elderly/Disabled	90	Open	Yes
Kodiak Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	63	Open	Yes
Kodiak Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	47	Open	Yes
Mat-Su Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	422	Open	Yes
Mat-Su Public Housing, Elderly	Community-Wide, Elderly/Disabled	81	Open	Yes
Nome Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	32	Open	Yes
Petersburg Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	7	Open	Yes
Sitka Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	32	Open	Yes
Sitka Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	92	Open	Yes
Sitka Public Housing, Elderly	Community-Wide, Elderly/Disabled	32	Partially Open	Yes
Soldotna Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	330	Open	Yes
Valdez Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	62	Open	Yes

Waiting List Name	Description	Number of Households on Waiting List	Waiting List Open, Partially Open or Closed	Was the Waiting List Opened During the Plan Year
Valdez Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	23	Open	Yes
Wrangell Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide, All	15	Open	Yes
Wrangell Public Housing	Community-Wide, All	26	Open	Yes

Partially open waiting lists are related to specific bedroom sizes in a community. There are no restrictions on applicant families provided they meet eligibility requirements.

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:
Applicant families may apply for one waiting list or all waiting lists in a community or communities, provided they meet the qualifications. A separate application is required for each community.

C.2 Actual Changes to Waiting List in the Plan Year

Please describe any actual changes to the organizational structure or policies of the waiting list(s), including any opening or closing of a waiting list, during the Plan Year.

Waiting List Name	Description of Actual Changes to Waiting List
All	Waiting lists are maintained by community; each community opens and closes waiting lists based on availability and the number of applicants. For Public Housing, individual bedroom size waiting lists may be opened or closed.
Anchorage Housing Choice Voucher	This waiting list opens periodically using a lottery system. The list was last opened for the month of March 2018. Approximately 2,500 applications were accepted.

D. Information on Statutory Objectives and Requirements

D.1 Seventy Five (75) Percent of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income

Income Level	Number of Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted in the Plan Year
80%-50% Area Median Income	0
49-30% Area Median Income	22
Below 30% Area Median Income	105
Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted	**127**

As shown above, 100 percent of admissions to local, non-traditional households are extremely and very-low income families.

D.2 Maintain Comparable Mix

Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)					
Family Size	Occupied Public Housing Units	Utilized HCV	Non-MTW Adjustments*	Baseline Mix Number**	Baseline Mix Percentage
1 Person	442.00	2,041.00	0	2,480	0.45
2 Person	239.00	861.00	0	1,084	0.20
3 Person	225.00	650.00	0	862	0.16
4 Person	182.00	358.00	0	526	0.10
5 Person	103.00	201.00	0	291	0.05
6+ Person	89.00	199.00	0	272	0.05
Totals	**1,280.00**	**4,310.00**	**0.00**	**5,515.00**	**1.00**

Adjustments made to Baseline Mix:

- Baseline data obtained from June 30, 2008.
- In 2010, AHFC demolished 21 Public Housing buildings containing eight 2-bedroom units, 42 3-bedroom units, eight 4-bedroom units, and two 5-bedroom units. The appropriate family sizes have been deducted.
- In 2014, AHFC demolished four Public Housing buildings on San Roberto Ave., Anchorage, containing ten 2-bedroom units and six 3-bedroom units. The appropriate family sizes have been deducted.

Please describe the justification for any "Non-MTW Adjustments" given above:
N/A

Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)				
Family Size	Baseline Mix Percentage**	Number of Households Served in Plan Year^	Percentage of Households Served in Plan Year^^	Percentage Change from Baseline Year to Current Plan Year
1 Person	0.45	3,246	0.49	7.87%
2 Person	0.20	1,142	0.17	-14.61%
3 Person	0.16	884	0.13	-17.38%
4 Person	0.10	598	0.09	-10.57%
5 Person	0.05	423	0.06	26.51%
6+ Person	0.05	394	0.06	17.84%
Totals	**1.00**	**6,687**	**1.00**	

Please describe the justification for any variances of more than 5% between the Plan Year and Baseline Year
AHFC has noticed a trend toward single-person families in its waiting lists. We believe that part of this trend can be attributed to the aging of Alaska's population. We also believe that our specialty voucher programs designed to serve vulnerable individuals (Empowering Choice, Making A Home, Moving Home, and Returning Home) are often single member families. AHFC has formed a task force to more closely study our communities and the populations that we serve during fiscal year 2019.

D.3 Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency in the Plan Year

MTW Activity Name/Number	Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency*	MTW PH Local Definition of Self-Sufficiency
2014-1 Rent Reform	146 of 720 exits (20.3%)	At exit, households are paying less than 50% of monthly income for rent and utilities.
2014-1d Jumpstart Program	29 of 112 exits (25.9%)	At exit, households are paying less than 50% of monthly income for rent and utilities.
N/A	0	N/A
Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities	0	
Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency	**175**	

* Figures should match the outcome reported where metric SS#8 is used in Section IV of this Annual MTW Report.

III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested

All proposed MTW activities that were granted approval by HUD are reported in Section IV as 'Approved Activities'.

IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted

These activities were approved by HUD in a prior year's plan. Activities are identified by their activity number, the first four digits being the fiscal year the activity was first added to the plan.

A. Implemented Activities

2010-5 HQS Inspections

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

This activity was started with Numbered Memo 12-13 dated April 17, 2012. The new policy began May 1, 2012.

- AHFC has implemented a biennial schedule instead of annual HQS inspections.
- AHFC continues to ensure a unit passes HQS before it goes under a HAP contract.
- AHFC continues to conduct inspections regarding possible HQS violations in between biennial inspections.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduce staff cost associated with annual HCV inspections	$155,312 (4,096 units as of 6/30/12)	$77,656 (reduce by 50 percent)	**2013** - $78,638 **2014** - $30,150 (3,292 inspections) **2015** - $91,725 savings (1,650 inspections) **2016** - $103,050 savings (1,348 inspections) **2017** - $86,775 (1,782 inspections) **2018** - $86,738 (1,783 inspections)	Yes

AHFC is using an average staff cost of $25.00 per hour (2015 HPS II, Level 6) to determine agency cost.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduce staff time associated with annual HCV inspections	4,096 hours per year	2,048 hours per year	2013 – 3146 hours 2014 – 1,206 hours 2015 – 3,669 hours 2016 – 4,122 hours 2017 – 3,471 hours 2018 – 3,470 hours	Yes

The baseline is set based on the number of vouchers leased as of May 1, 2012 and allowing for 1.5 hours per inspection.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	0	0		Yes

AHFC did not have errors in the execution of the annual inspection process. All annual inspections were conducted as required.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Establish an alternate HQS inspection schedule by allowing for biennial inspections. Allow inspections conducted by other AHFC HQS-qualified staff to serve as quality control inspections.

Statutory Objective

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraphs D.5 and D.7(d) (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 982.405

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2010-6 HQS Inspections on AHFC Properties

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

This activity was implemented by staff with Numbered Memo 11-11 dated March 22, 2011. It became effective April 1, 2011.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduce the cost of voucher annual inspections at AHFC properties by contracted inspectors.	$150 per inspection or $12,000 per year for 80 HQS inspections on AHFC properties.	Save $12,000 per year	Savings (difference between staff cost & contractor cost): **2011** - $3,250 **2012** - $3,250 **2013** - $2,700 (24 inspections) **2014** - $2,925 (26 inspections) **2015** - $3,713 (33 inspections) **2016** – $3,038 (27 inspections) **2017** - $2,700 (24 inspections) **2018** – $3,600 (32 inspections)	Yes

AHFC is using an average staff cost of $25.00 per hour (2015 HPS II, Level 6) to determine agency cost.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	80 hours	80 hours		Yes

The baseline and benchmark were set based on the original number of AHFC-owned units with the potential to be leased by a voucher family. No time is expected to be saved in this activity as AHFC staff accompanied the third-party inspector at all inspections.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	0	0		Yes

As an AHFC staff member accompanied the inspector, there were no errors during the inspection process. As AHFC implemented this activity in 2011 and there are no longer any third-party inspectors, AHFC does not have any data to report.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Allow AHFC staff to inspect AHFC-owned units and determine rent reasonableness instead of paying a third party to conduct these inspections. This was created to reduce costs associated with voucher holders wanting to use an AHFC voucher in an AHFC-owned property.

Statutory Objective
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraph D.2.c and paragraph D.5 (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 982.507

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No challenges; savings vary based on the number of voucher holders who decide to lease at AHFC-owned properties.

2010-7 Project-Based Vouchers – Owner-Managed Waiting Lists

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

Policy for management of project-based vouchers was issued to staff with Numbered Memo 12-32 on August 21, 2012 with a start date of September 1, 2012.

- MainTree in Homer – 10 units – came on-line in March 2012.
- Anchorage
    - Loussac Place – 60 units – the first phase came on-line in July 2012.
    - Susitna Square – 18 units – came on-line in September 2015
    - Ridgeline Terrace – 63 units – came on-line in January 2016

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	$300 (8 Issued)	$0	**2014** - $37.50 (1 failure) **2015** - $300 (8 new admissions) **2016** - $3,525 (94 new admissions) **2017** - $675 (18 new admissions) **2018** - $638 (17 new admissions)	Yes

AHFC anticipates that staff spends 1.5 hours per application to collect, post, maintain, and select an applicant family from a waiting list. AHFC used an average cost of $25.00 per hour (2015 HPS II, Level 6). AHFC is still responsible for the eligibility process and has not included that time or cost in this activity.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Decrease time to fill PBV units – Loussac Place	30 days per unit	15 days between referral and return back to owner or leasing	2012 – 7.9 days 2013 – 13 .0 days 2014 – 12.50 days 2015 – 33.86 days	Yes
Decrease time to fill PBV units – Main Tree	30 days per unit	15 days between referral and return back to owner or leasing	2013 – 19.7 days 2014 – 26.33 days 2015 – 4.0 days	Yes
Decrease time to fill PBV units – 151 units	30 days per unit	15 days between referral and return back to owner or leasing	**2016** – 18.2 days (13 turns) **2017** – 16.63 days (19 turns) **2018** – 2.29 days (17 turns)	Yes

An additional savings that cannot be calculated is the time it takes to interview families from an AHFC waiting list that would be rejected by an owner as not suitable for tenancy. Having an owner-managed waiting list insures that every family interviewed by AHFC is a successful candidate for tenancy.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	0	0		Yes

This activity is not designed to reduce staff errors with processing applications for a waiting list. This activity was designed to reduce the number of applicant families that would be approved by AHFC and then later rejected by an owner as unsuitable for tenancy.

HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	770 days per applicant	Pending		

AHFC has never run a project-based voucher waiting list, so we don't have any historical data for the time spent on this type of waiting list. We have chosen to use the average waiting list time for our 2- and 3-bedroom waiting list (average 770 days per application) in Anchorage as the baseline as those units tend to turn over faster than other units (average 40 per year). The Benchmark will have to be measured by the property manager who is a third party.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Owner management of site-based waiting lists for project-based vouchers. Owners are responsible for advertisement, collection of applications, application screening, maintaining a waiting list, and selecting applicants in the appropriate order when filling a vacant unit. AHFC continues to conduct all project-based voucher eligibility functions.

Statutory Objective

- Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures
- Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization

Attachment C, paragraph D.4 (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 983.251

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2010-9 Returning Home Program

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

This activity was started with Numbered Memo 09-30 dated November 25, 2009. The new program began November 25, 2009 for all AHFC voucher locations outside of Anchorage.

- Revised guidance to expand the pool of applicants was issued with Numbered Memo 10-41 on October 28, 2010 with an effective date of November 1, 2010. This change opened the pool of applicants to all persons under a supervision requirement selected by the State of Alaska Department of Corrections.
- Revised guidance to answer questions regarding the supervision requirement was issued with Numbered Memo 12-17 on April 18, 2012. This memo also put in place the time limit for all persons participating in the program that begin in 2009.
- Revised guidance expanding the program to AHFC's Anchorage jurisdiction was issued with Numbered Memo 15-31 on November 20, 2015 and effective December 1, 2015. This expansion made 20 coupons available for Anchorage.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increase rental assistance opportunities for families under the supervision of the State of Alaska Department of Corrections.	0	-70 per year -100 per year (July 2017)	2012 – 42 2013 – 55 2014 – 57 2015 – 52 2016 – 84 2017 – 100 2018 – 109	Yes

A study conducted by the Department of Corrections (2015 Recidivism Reduction Plan, February 2015) found that the state of Alaska's recidivism rate was highest during the first year after return to the community. Based on the recidivism rate in Alaska, only 70 out of the 210 persons in this program were expected to remain out of jail. Actual results show that 166 persons have remained in the community and have not been returned to jail.

Original Benchmark:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increase housing choice for families who are typically homeless upon release from incarceration.	0	10 per year	2010 – 3 2011 – 6	Yes

2. Description/Impact/Update

This activity was formerly called "Prisoner Re-Entry". Develop a time-limited (two years), tenant-based assistance program targeting civilian re-entry of individuals released from the prison system. The purpose of this activity is to assist with the reduction of recidivism due to prisoner homelessness upon release from incarceration.

- HOME Funding
  Operational and staff costs are supported with MTW funds. AHFC has a fee-for-service for each housing unit month. These HOME administrative fees are booked as non-MTW revenue. AHFC is following HOME rules at 24 CFR 92 for tenant-based assistance. Family annual income is calculated using the rules at 24 CFR 5.630, and families meet HOME income eligibility limits.
- MTW Funding
  AHFC expanded its program to include the Anchorage jurisdiction using MTW block grant funds. Family annual income is calculated using the rules at 24 CFR 5.630, and families meet Housing Choice Voucher income eligibility limits.

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization
Old authorization: Attachment C, paragraph D.2.d and paragraph D.3.a.
New authorization: MTW Agreement Attachment D signed January 30, 2012.

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 92.209
24 CFR 982

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
The original benchmark was to serve 10 families per year. AHFC set a new benchmark of 20 families per year in 2010 as the eligibility criteria for families was expanded to include all families meeting State of Alaska Department of Corrections release criteria. Specifically, the requirement that parolees be persons with disabilities was eliminated.

The Anchorage Program has been so successful, that AHFC has increased the number of coupons from 20 to 30 for the remainder of 2017. This increases the overall benchmark from 70 families per year to 100 per year.

AHFC was pleased to form an additional partnership with the State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Behavioral Health, to receive additional funds for rental assistance. As these funds were limited to one year, AHFC reimbursed the HOME program so that those funds could be used in a future year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2010-10 Moving Home Program

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

AHFC signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services in November 2014, renamed the activity, and put the activity through a new public comment process.

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	July 23, 2014
Reviewed by HUD	April 6, 2015

The program was issued to staff with Numbered Memo 14-33 on December 1, 2014 and was effective on that date.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increase housing opportunities for special needs populations.	0	150 per year	2015 – 5 units 2016 – 105 units 2017 – 150 units 2018 – 167 units	Yes

This program was fully leased as of November 2016.

Original Benchmarks

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase housing opportunities for special needs populations	37 families per year	37 families per year	As of 06/30/2013: QMV – 20 families leased ACMI – 11 families leased DIS-SW – 79 families leased

The original Qualified Medicaid Waiver (QMV), Anchorage Chronic Mental Illness (ACMI), and Persons with Disabilities (DIS-SW) program families were absorbed into AHFC's Classic Program. The vouchers made available under this activity are in addition to these 110 families already served.

2. Description/Impact/Update

This activity was formerly called "Use of HCV Program for Persons with Disabilities." The Moving Home Program is a referral-based rental assistance program designed to enable persons with disabilities to rent affordable housing. This program is available in every community currently offering an AHFC Housing Choice Voucher Program. Continuing operation of Moving Home is contingent upon available funding and continuing appropriations.

For the purposes of the agreement, persons with a disability who are eligible for Moving Home are very low-income households (50 percent of Area Median Income) that meet the criteria below:

- Eligible for community-based, long-term services as provided through Medicaid waivers, Medicaid state plan options, state funded services, or other appropriate services related to the target population, **and**
- Meet the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's definition of a disabled family (24 CFR 5.403), **or** are an Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority beneficiary.

The State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services refers eligible families directly to AHFC. Once an applicant family has leased, families are not required to maintain services in order to remain eligible for Moving Home continuing assistance.

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment C, paragraph D.3 and D.4 (no change)

Regulation Citation
None

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2011-1 Simplification of Utility Allowance Schedules

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	May 4, 2010
Reviewed by HUD	July 12, 2010

This activity was started with Numbered Memo 11-04 dated January 20, 2011 and effective with the new utility allowance tables that began on February 1, 2011.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduce staff cost by decreasing the number of utility allowance schedules for Anchorage, Mat-Su, and Valdez.	$1,400	$600	2014 - $600 2015 - $600 2015 - $600 2016 - $600 2017 - $600 2018 - $600	Yes

AHFC has assigned a value of $25.00 per hour (2015 HPS II, Level 6) to determine agency cost.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduce staff time by creating one schedule each for Anchorage, Mat-Su, and Valdez	56 hours (8 hours per schedule)	24 hours	2012 – 24 hours 2013 – 24 hours 2014 – 24 hours 2015 – 24 hours 2016 – 24 hours 2017 – 24 hours 2018 – 24 hours	Yes

AHFC has calculated the baseline hours (seven schedules into three schedules) as follows:

- Three electric providers in Anchorage to one combined electric schedule
- Two unit type groupings in Mat-Su combined into one schedule
- Two unit type groupings in Valdez combined into one schedule

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	0	0		Yes

AHFC has set the baseline and benchmark to zero as this was implemented in 2012, and data is not available. Staff has noticed that participants are having an easier time with the leasing process by only having one utility sheet to use. Feedback from shoppers has been universally positive as many were confused by the multiple schedules and rates.

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	0	0		Yes

AHFC did not design this activity as a cost savings method, but rather as a simplification for ease of participant use. Staff noticed that paperwork turned in by families was incomplete or incorrect because they could not determine how to use the multiple utility schedules. AHFC feels that this is a revenue neutral activity.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Combine existing multiple utility allowance tables into a single utility allowance table in Anchorage, Mat-Su, and Valdez. AHFC does not plan to change its evaluation methods of local utility providers when creating a new simplified table for each area identified above.

Statutory Objective
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraph C.11 and D.2 (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 982.517

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2011-2 Local Payment Standards

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	May 4, 2010
Reviewed by HUD	July 12, 2010

This activity was delayed due to the development of AHFC's rent reform activity. AHFC decided to develop this with that activity. This was submitted as Amendment Two to the FY2013 MTW Annual Plan.

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	February 27, 2013
Reviewed by HUD	April 17, 2013

This activity was started with Numbered Memo 14-01 issued January 13, 2014 and effective on February 1, 2014.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	0	0		Yes

AHFC anticipates that this will be a revenue neutral activity as staff will still survey local rental markets as well as consider additional rental market data gathered by the State of Alaska. AHFC will then compare that data to Fair Market Rents to determine an appropriate payment standard.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	0	0		Yes

AHFC anticipates that this will not impact time devoted to this task as staff will still survey local rental markets as well as consider additional rental market data gathered by the State of Alaska. AHFC will then compare that data to Fair Market Rents to determine an appropriate payment standard.

Original Metric

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Reduce voucher turn-back rate to less than five (5) percent.	Currently, a 21.8 percent turn-back rate.	Less than five (5) percent for inadequate payment standard	2017 – 1,954 issued; 440 expired (22.52% turnback)

2. Description/Impact/Update

This activity proposes establishing payment standards that do not rely on HUD's Fair Market Rents for AHFC housing choice voucher jurisdictions. AHFC will continue to examine each market on an annual basis to determine if the payment standard is appropriate. AHFC will also ensure that it establishes a payment standard that reflects, not leads, the market. As one of its tools, staff will use an annual, independent study conducted by AHFC's Planning and Program Development Department in cooperation with the State of Alaska Department of Labor. This study surveys Alaska's communities and landlords about its housing markets including vacancy rates, market conditions, rentals, and utilities. Staff will also continue to collect its own survey data on rentals in the local market.

Statutory Objective

- Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures
- Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization

Attachment C, paragraph D.2.a. (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 982.503.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2011-3 Project-Based Vouchers – Waiver of Tenant-Based Requirement

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	May 4, 2010
Reviewed by HUD	July 12, 2010

This policy was implemented with the development of Loussac Place in July 2012.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Decrease cost to examine and brief families.	2.0 hours per family to examine and brief.	0	**2012** - $0 **2013** – Savings $683 **2014** – Savings $400 **2015** – Savings $500 (10 units) **2016** – Savings $750 (15 units) **2017** – Savings $800 (16 units) **2018** – Savings $850 (17 units)	Yes

Savings are based on a cost of $25.00 per hour (2015 HPS II, Level 6) with an average of eight (8) vacancies per year at current project-based voucher properties.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Decrease staff time to examine and brief families.	2.0 hours per family to examine and brief.	0	2012 - 0 2013 – 16 hours 2014 – 16 hours 2015 – 20 hours (10 units) 2016 – 30 hours (15 units) 2017 – 32 hours (16 units) 2018 – 34 hours (17 units)	Yes

Savings are based on an average of eight (8) vacancies per year at current project-based voucher properties.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Waive the requirement to provide a tenant-based voucher to a family upon termination of project-based voucher assistance. AHFC monitors the turnover at project-based voucher developments.

Statutory Objective

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

Authorization

Attachment C, paragraph D.1 (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 983.205(2)(d), 983.257, and 983.260

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2011-5 Project-Base Vouchers at AHFC Properties and Exceed 25 Percent Limit per Building

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	May 4, 2010
Reviewed by HUD	July 12, 2010

This policy was implemented with the development of MainTree Apartments and Loussac Place in July 2012.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #4: Displacement Prevention

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	0	0		

AHFC will not be displacing any families; this will only impact those families that choose to no longer live at the project-based voucher development. New developments are trending towards a townhouse-style of development with five or less units per building. The building cap limits the number of units that can be made available for families at 50 percent or less of area median income. AHFC wants to ensure that families have a wide variety of units from which to choose without worrying about the number of project-based vouchers in each building.

Original Benchmark:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increase the number of affordable housing units.	0	60	2012 – 10 units 2013 – additional 60 units; Total 70 units 2014 – 4 additional units; Total 74 units 2015 – 74 units 2016 – 81 additional units; Total 155 units	Yes

2012 – MainTree; 2013 – Loussac Place; 2014 – 1248 East 9th Avenue; 2016 – Ridgeline Terrace (63) and Susitna Square (18)

2. Description/Impact/Update

Allow AHFC to project-base vouchers (PBV) at market rental properties it owns and exceed the building cap in project-based voucher developments. This waiver was requested as part of the development to replace public housing units at Loussac Manor. In accordance with PBV policy, rent to owner will be determined by an independent entity approved by HUD.

- 1248 East 9th Avenue contains four affordable housing units in one building (two efficiency and two one-bedroom units). Two of the four units are fully accessible. All units are subsidized and were available for occupancy November 2013. Units were fully leased as of January 31, 2014.

- Loussac Place contains 120 affordable housing units of which 60 are project-based vouchers. The vouchers are distributed throughout the bedroom sizes (one through four) in a variety of buildings throughout the development. Based on the configuration of the development (townhouse-style units), it would have been impossible to successfully use project-based vouchers without this waiver. The units have been fully occupied since November 2012.
- MainTree Apartments contains 10 affordable housing units reserved for persons with developmental disabilities. The units have been fully occupied since 2012, and all are subsidized with a project-based voucher.
- Susitna Square contains 18 affordable housing units in three buildings. All units are subsidized with project-based vouchers and were available for occupancy on September 1, 2015. Units were fully leased as of June 30, 2016.
- Ridgeline Terrace contains 70 affordable housing units in several buildings. Sixty-three units have project-based voucher assistance attached and were available for occupancy on January 8, 2016; 53 units were leased as of June 30, 2016.

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraphs D.1.e , paragraph D.7.a , and paragraph D.7.b (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 983.56

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2012-1 Raise HCV Maximum Family Contribution at Lease-Up to 50 Percent

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors April 20, 2011
Reviewed by HUD June 21, 2011

This activity was implemented with Numbered Memo 12-09 on February 14, 2012 with a start date of February 16, 2012. This activity is included as part of AHFC's reasonable rent plan (Activity 2014-1). Reference activity 2014-1h.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	0	0	**2014** – 87.8 percent in better neighborhood **2015** – 87.6 percent in better neighborhood **2016** – 87.3 percent in better neighborhood **2017** – 87.4 percent in better neighborhood **2018** – 89.8 percent in better neighborhood	Yes

Alaska does not have any designated poverty zones, but does have neighborhoods with a concentration of lower rents. As of the date of this report, of the 2,638 families leased in Anchorage's jurisdiction, 11.2 percent of families are leased in lower rent neighborhoods. AFHC does not have any baseline data as this measurement was added after the implementation of the activity.

Original Metrics:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increase the number of voucher clients able to lease due to increased income contribution from families.	0	No rejections due to units being more than 40 percent of income.	2012 – 24 Leased 2013 – 29 Leased 2014 – 25 Leased	Yes

2. Description/Impact/Update

Waive HUD regulations at 24 CFR 982.508 which limit a family to paying no more than 40 percent of their adjusted monthly income toward their rental portion. A family that is subject to Moving to Work rules will be allowed to pay up to 50 percent of monthly income. Those families on the traditional HUD family contribution rules will use the 40 percent calculation.

Statutory Objective

Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraph D.2.a. (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 982.508

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
With the implementation of 2014-1 Reasonable Rent and Family Self-Sufficiency Initiative, this activity was modified to account for Step Program families that would be transitioning to a fixed HAP subsidy. Once on a fixed subsidy amount, these families will no longer be subject to a maximum family contribution if they decide to move. The family will decide if their required contribution is affordable.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2012-2 Nonpayment of Rent

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 20, 2011
Reviewed by HUD	June 21, 2011

AHFC implemented its new Public Housing Program Residential Lease Agreement effective January 1, 2012 with Numbered Memo 12-03. With Numbered Memo 12-04 issued on January 4, 2012, all public housing families with examinations beginning March 1, 2012 were required to sign the new lease.

A letter was sent to all public housing residents in July 2013 to remind them of their lease provision and the new shortened period to pay their late rent. In addition, the grace period for payment of rent was extended to the seventh (7^{th}) calendar day of each month. AHFC began this activity on September 1, 2013 with Numbered Memo 13-36.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	0	0	0	

AHFC does not expect to save any money as a result of this task. Staff must still perform the necessary tasks to process an eviction. We expect the savings to the agency to come from a lower balance owed by tenants due to the shorter nonpayment of rent period.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	0	0	0	

AHFC anticipates that this will be a time neutral activity as staff must still process the same paperwork in order to evict a family.

Year	Court-Ordered Evictions	Nonpayment Rent	Nonpayment Utilities	Good Cause	Avg. Days (Rent) to Request Eviction	Avg. Days (Rent) from NTQ to Vacate
2014	38	24	4	10	15.8	32.2
2015	53	38	0	15	11.6	27.4
2016	20	15	0	5	14.8	43.0
2017	39	37	0	2	16.8	30.4
2018	30	28	1	1	21.1	48.4

Original Metric

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Reduce the amount of rent owed by vacated tenants	36 percent of annual vacated tenant debt is rent.	Reduce rent to 25 percent of annual vacated tenant debt	Tenant notification was in July 2013 with a start date set for September 1, 2013.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Waive HUD regulations at 24 CFR 966.4(l)(3)(i)(A) that require AHFC to allow 14 days for tenants to cure nonpayment of rent. The nonpayment of rent period was shortened to seven days to match the Alaska Landlord-Tenant Act. A new lease with the new timelines was offered to each family at their annual anniversary appointment before implementation for all tenants.

Statutory Objective

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

Authorization

Attachment C, paragraph C.9.b. (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 966.4(l)(3)

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2012-4 Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance Program, Karluk Manor

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	October 26, 2011
Reviewed by HUD	November 18, 2011

This activity was approved in conjunction with AHFC's request for a second amendment to its Moving to Work Agreement to add Attachment D to allow for the "broader uses of funds".

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increased rental assistance made available to households at or below 50 percent of area median income.	0	35 units Increase to 46 units-7/1/15	**2014** - 34 units as of year end; average for year is 35 units **2015** – 40 units as of year end; average for year is 36 units **2016** – 41 units as of year end; average for year is 40 units **2017** – 45 units as of year end; average for year is 45.5 units **2018** – 41 units as of year end; average for year is 40 units	Yes

As of the end of the year, only 41 of 46 units were eligible for sponsor-based rental assistance as the other five units had another form of rental assistance. Research shows that the average HAP per unit is:

- 2014 - $512.38
- 2015 - $499.09
- 2016 - $523.64
- 2017 - $507.97
- 2018 - $590.06

Original Metric

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Serve 35 chronic homeless individuals with a physical or mental disability, substance abuse, or chronic health condition.	0	Fill 35 units each year	AHFC monitors the occupancy each month to ensure payment equivalent to 35 vouchers. For FY2013 average HAP per month is $20,115 or $575 per voucher per month. 35 units occupied each month.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Fund rental assistance outside Section 8 rules consistent with 'broader uses of funds' authority in Attachment D of the Agreement. Provide the funding equivalent of 35 project-based voucher units for rental assistance at a Housing First development, Karluk Manor. Karluk Manor's 46 units are fully leased, and AHFC continues to monitor the funding requests each month.

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization
Attachment D of the MTW Agreement signed January 30, 2012.

Regulation Citation
PIH Notice 2011-45

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

Effective July 1, 2015, assistance was extended to all 46 units at Karluk Manor. Records each month show that all individuals at Karluk Manor are income eligible under voucher income limits. Those units occupied by persons with Housing Choice Voucher assistance are excluded.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2013-1 Making A Home Program

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors April 4, 2012
Reviewed by HUD June 25, 2012

A Memorandum of Agreement was executed in July 2012. The program began with Numbered Memo 12-27 dated October 24, 2012 and was effective on November 1, 2012.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Serve 40 youth aging out of foster care through direct referral from the State of Alaska Office of Children's Services	0	40 per year	2013 – 15 leased 2014 – 21 leased 2015 – 17 leased 2016 – 15 leased 2017 – 18 leased 2018 - 25 leased	No

HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	0	0		

AHFC does not have any baseline or benchmark data for this metric as this was a population that was not traditionally served by AHFC in the past. The program was developed because AHFC felt that this population was not utilizing rental assistance and was becoming part of the homeless population.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Activity was formerly named "Youth Aging Out of Foster Care." A time-limited (three years), tenant-based rental assistance program targeting youth ages 18 to 24 aging out of Alaskan foster care. The program serves direct referrals from the State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services, Office of Children's Services.

Due to the success of the TBRA Parolee/Probationer program with the Alaska Department of Corrections, AHFC partnered with the State of Alaska Office of Children's Services to provide a similar program for youth aging out of foster care.

- HOME Investment Partnership Program funds pay for the monthly HAP for coupons leased outside the Anchorage jurisdiction. Operational and staff costs are supported with MTW funds. AHFC has developed a fee-for-service for each housing unit month. These HOME administrative fees are booked as Non-MTW revenue. AHFC is following HOME rules at 24 CFR 92 for tenant-based assistance. Family annual income is calculated using the rules at 24 CFR 5.630.
- The State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services provides an annual allotment to assist ten youth families in Anchorage. The number of families assisted

each year is contingent upon available funding. For purposes of consistency and administrative efficiencies, family annual income is calculated using the rules at 24 CFR 5.630.

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization
Attachment D of the MTW Agreement signed January 30, 2012 allows for "broader uses of funds." AHFC will rely on that authority to use MTW block grant funds to partially offset administrative costs to support this HOME-funded activity.

Regulation Citation
None

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
Due to the success of the Anchorage program, the Department of Health and Social Services provided additional funding to increase the number of youth served in Anchorage to 15 each month.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2013-2 Empowering Choice Housing Program (ECHP)

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 4, 2012
Reviewed by HUD	June 25, 2012

- This activity began with Numbered Memo 12-40 issued and effective on November 8, 2012 for the voucher program.
- This activity for locations without a Housing Choice Voucher Program began with Numbered Memo 12-42 issued and effective on November 16, 2012 for preferential placement on public housing program waiting lists in Bethel, Cordova, and Nome.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	0	$1.0 million (to match AHFC's contribution)	2013-$1.34 million 2014-$1.5 million 2015-$1.5 million 2016-$1.2 million 2017 $1.5 million 2018 $1.5 million **Total - $8.54 million**	Yes

AHFC's block grant HAP is supplemented by an additional appropriation from the State of Alaska to increase the number of ECHP vouchers available to families. These additional funds would not be available to AHFC for rental assistance without this program.

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Serve 100 families displaced due to domestic violence by referral from the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault.	0	100 families per year	2013 – 57 leased 2014 – 146 leased 2015 – 174 leased 2016 – 190 leased 2017 – 142 leased 2018 – 226 leased	Yes

This program is responsible for leveraging additional funds from the State of Alaska to provide additional units of housing not previously available to AHFC through traditional federal funding.

HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	0	0	2014 (Anch only) – 66 days 2015 (Anch only) – 30 days 2016 (Anch only) – 50 days 2017 (Anch only) – 172 days 2018 (Anch only) – 89 days	

AHFC does not have baseline data for the actual decrease in waiting list time. Also, AHFC does not maintain a waiting list for ECHP vouchers for voucher locations outside of Anchorage.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	0	N/A	185 – all are eligible	Yes

AHFC provides a waiver to families to move to any AHFC voucher community upon issuance of a voucher to assist with safety issues.

Original Metric

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Serve 150 families with monies provided by the State of Alaska. Serve 100 families with monies provided in AHFC's MTW Block Grant.	0	250 per year	As of 06/30/2013, 57 families were leased in nine voucher communities. An additional 38 were shopping.

In June and July 2013, the average HAP decreased to approximately $765 per unit. As of the end of September 2013, HAP was averaging $716 per unit. AHFC and its partners anticipate an increase in the leasing rates for FY2014 to get closer to an increased leasing of 250 families.

2. Description/Impact/Update

In partnership with the State of Alaska Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault and the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (ANDVSA), a set aside of MTW vouchers to exclusively serve families displaced due to domestic violence and sexual assault. This is a time-limited (36 months) program for families referred directly from the ANDVSA member agency. This program is available in every community currently offering an AHFC Housing Choice Voucher Program.

For those communities without a Voucher Program (Bethel, Cordova, Nome), AHFC offers preferential placement on its Public Housing Program waiting lists for families displaced due to domestic violence. The ANDVSA member agency is responsible for referring those families.

Statutory Objective

Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization

Attachment C, paragraph B.1.b.iv, paragraph D.2.d, and paragraph D.4. (no change)

Regulation Citation

None

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2014-1 Reasonable Rent and Family Self-Sufficiency Initiative

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	February 27, 2013
Reviewed by HUD	September 10, 2013

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

Setting an income-based rent of 28.5 percent allows AHFC to break even in its first year of operation under the new model. Conservative estimates put annual HAP savings at approximately $1.5 million per year for the voucher program once families begin to transition from Year 2 to Year 3 (projected savings are based on AHFC paying 50 percent of the current payment standard).

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	February 2014 – 3,719 units leased at $635.14 per unit month	$0 in year 1 $1.5 million in year 2	**June 2015** – 3,861 units leased at $628.59 per unit month **June 2016** – 4,240 units leased at $642.25 per unit **June 2017** – 4,361 units leased at $634.19 per unit **June 2018** – 4,276 units leased at $624.61 per unit	Yes

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	1.0 hours per annual examination	0 hours in Year 1 0.5 hours in Year 2	**2015** – No Change **2016** – 2,609 annuals for 4,240 units (savings of 1,631 hours) **2017** – 2,751 annuals for 4,361 units (savings of 1,610 hours) **2018** – 3,149 annuals for 6,145 units (savings of 2,996 hours)	Yes

The period February 2014 through July 2015 included a full examination of all public housing and housing choice voucher families as AHFC transitioned them to the rent reform model. No time was anticipated to be saved.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage. This is based on internal quality assurance reviews.	HCV 2014 • New admission – 96% error free • Annuals – 95% error free	HCV • New admission – 98% error free • Annuals – 90% error free	**HCV 2015** • New admission – 96% error free • Annuals – 96% error free **HCV 2016** • New admission – 85% error free • Annuals – 95% error free **HCV 2017** • New admission – 95% error free • Annuals – 93% error free **HCV 2018** • New admission – 94% error free • Annuals – 91% error free	Yes

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage. This is based on internal quality assurance reviews.	PH 2014 • New admission – 95% error free • Annuals – 91% error free	PH • New admission – 98% error free • Annuals – 90% error free	**PH 2015** • New admission – 97% error free • Annuals – 92% error free **PH 2016** • New admission – 93% error free • Annuals – 91% error free **PH 2017** • New admission – 93% error free • Annuals – 87% error free **PH 2018** • New admission – 94% error free • Annuals – 87% error free	No

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase) – Public Housing	2014 – $6,053,708	$0	2015 - $6,406,741 2016 - $7,139,706 2017 - $7,434,274 2018 - $7,747,657	Yes

This metric reflects the increase in Public Housing dwelling rent income. We do not expect any savings in this category as any gains in dwelling rents are offset by decreases in HUD subsidy. Increases do indicate increases in family income.

SS #1: Increase in Household Income

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	2014 All Wages – 1,540 individuals averaging $11,623 each	More than 1,540 individuals earning an average of $16,120	**2015 All Wages** – 1,821 individuals averaging $9,563 each **2016 All Wages** – 2,221 individuals averaging $19,898 each **2017 All Wages** – 2,729 individuals averaging $20,616 each **2018 All Wages** – 2,593 individuals averaging $22,596 each	Yes

This captures data for all rent reform participants. Data for those enrolled in the Jumpstart Program only are stated in this metric under activity 2014-1d. Minimum wage as of 01/01/2014 was $7.75 per hour. Baseline is calculated as one adult working full-time (40 hours) at the minimum wage of $7.75.

SS #2: Increase in Household Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	0	$1,500 for savings match program	**2016** – 174 individuals have savings greater than $10,000. Average savings are $37,801 **2017** – 177 individuals have assets greater than $10,000. Total assets are $10,142,271. **2018** – 151 individuals have assets greater than $10,000. Total assets are $9,694,118.	Yes

This captures data for all rent reform participants. Data for those enrolled in the Jumpstart Program only are stated in this metric under activity 2014-1d.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	0	Increase families with full-time employment		
(1) Employed Full- time (2) Employed Part-time (3) Educational Program (4) Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other – Wages that are less than part-time	2014 (1) 594 persons (2) 845 persons (3) 0 (4) 0 (5) 0 (6) 0		**2015** (1) 1,086 persons (2) 530 persons (3) 0 (4) 0 (5) 0 (6) 0 **2016** (1) 1,246 persons (2) 549 persons (3) 0 (4) 0 (5) 0 (6) 424 persons **2017** (1) 1,629 persons (2) 622 persons (3) 0 (4) 0 (5) 0 (6) 474 persons **2018** (1) 1,715 persons (2) 509 persons (3) 0 (4) 0 (5) 185 (6) 365 persons	Yes

This captures data for all rent reform participants. Data for those enrolled in the Jumpstart Program only are stated in this metric under activity 2014-1d. Minimum wage as of 01/01/2014 was $7.75 per hour.

- Full-time is calculated as one adult working 40 hours per week at the minimum wage of $7.75.
- Part-time is calculated as one adult working 20 hours per week at the minimum wage of $7.75.
- Wage Less Than Part-time is calculated as one adult working less than 20 hours per week at the minimum wage of $7.75.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	2014 – 318 families receiving an average of $7,864 each. Total $2,482,402.	A reduction	**2015** – 299 families receiving an average of $7,857 each. Total $2,349,380. **2016** – 427 individuals receiving an average of $7,967 each. Total $3,401,872. **2017** – 537 individuals receiving an average of $8,065 each. Total $4,331,064. **2018** – 454 individuals receiving an average of $8,274 each. Total $3,756,332.	No

This captures data for all rent reform participants. Data for those enrolled in the Jumpstart Program only are stated in this metric under activity 2014-1d. Our Bridge hardship policy encourages those families that have not investigated their eligibility for benefits to see if they can qualify to reduce the impact of financial hardships.

SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	0	0	0	See 2014-1d

Please see the metric under 2014-1d. This is not measured for all rent reform participants.

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	February 2014 – $635.14 per unit month	A reduction	**June 2015** – $628.59 per unit month **June 2016** - $642.25 per unit **June 2017** - $633.10 per unit month **June 2018** - $624.61 per unit month	Yes

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase) – Public Housing	2014 – $6,053,708	$0	**2015** - $6,406,741 **2016** - $7,139,706 **2017** - $7,531,970 **2018** - $7,787,903	Yes

- Setting an income-based rent of 28.5 percent allows AHFC to break even in its first year of operation under the new model.
- This metric reflects the increase in Public Housing dwelling rent income. We do not expect any savings in this category as any gains in dwelling rents are offset by decreases in HUD subsidy. Increases do indicate increases in family income.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	0	20 percent of exits are below the shelter burden	**2017** – 943 families exited; 205 were self-sufficient (21.7%) **2018** – 832 families exited; 175 were self-sufficient (21.0%)	Yes

This measures the shelter burden of those families that end their program participation each year and whether the shelter burden is less than 50 percent. This captures data for all rent reform participants. Data for those enrolled in the Jumpstart Program only are stated in this metric under activity 2014-1d.

2. Description/Impact/Update

This activity addresses the MTW Agreement requirement to establish a reasonable rent policy designed to encourage employment and self-sufficiency by participating families (MTW Agreement, Section III).

- Housing Choice Voucher – This activity was issued to staff on January 13, 2014 with Numbered Memo 14-01. New admission families began effective February 1, 2014; transitioning families began with annual examinations effective May 1, 2014 and later.
- Public Housing Program – This activity was issued to staff on April 21, 2014 with Numbered Memo 14-09. New admission families began effective May 1, 2014; transitioning families began with annual examinations effective August 1, 2014 and later.

Statutory Objective

- Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures
- Give incentives to families with children whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training, educational, or other

programs that assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self–sufficient
- Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraph C.4 and paragraph C.11 (no change)
Attachment C, paragraph D.2 and paragraph D.3 (no change)

Regulation Citation
As listed under each sub-activity below.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
Further clarification of sub-activities for the hardship process, conversion of existing FSS accounts, and voucher portability for Step Program families was sent to HUD with amendments 1 and 2 to the FY2014 MTW Plan.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1a Population Definitions

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
As listed under 2014-1 above.

2. Description/Impact/Update
AHFC is using the following definitions as part of its rent reform activity.

1. **Classic Program Family** is defined as 100 percent of adult household members are either a person with a disability (as defined in 24 CFR 5.403) or 62 years of age or older. These families may include a live-in aide (as defined in 24 CFR 5.403), minors, or full-time dependent students.
2. **Full-Time Student** is defined as a dependent adult under the age of 24 who is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education and meets the school's definition of full-time enrollment. AHFC will continue to disregard any income earned by an individual while full-time student status is maintained.
3. **Set Aside Program Family** – these are families using special purpose or direct referral vouchers that use AHFC's simplified income calculation method. This includes the Empowering Choice Housing Program, Moving Home Program, NonElderly Disabled Vouchers, Port-in Vouchers, Project-Based Vouchers, and

Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers. As of January 10, 2016, AHFC began absorbing all incoming portable vouchers and classifying families into the Step and Classic programs.

4. **Step Program Family** is defined as any household that does not meet the definition of a Classic Program family.

Authorization
Public Housing – Attachment C, paragraph C.2. (no change)
Housing Choice Voucher – Attachment C, paragraph D.4. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver
HUD definitions of Working Family, Disabled Family, Elderly Family, and Full-Time Student at 24 CFR 5.403 and 24 CFR 5.612 are used to define Classic Program participants.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1b Minimum Rent

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
As listed under 2014-1 above.

2. Description/Impact/Update
This supporting activity establishes a minimum rent in exception to HUD regulations. HUD regulations require AHFC to establish a minimum monthly rent for the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs that does not exceed $50 per month. AHFC has set the following minimum rents as part of its rent reform activity.

1. **Classic Program family** – the minimum rent is $25. Because AHFC is anticipating that these families will not have wage earners and have fixed income sources, staff felt that it was more reasonable to set a $25 rate. AHFC does not require a waiver for this proposal.
2. **Step Program family** – the minimum rent is $100. Staff felt that this was a more reasonable minimum rent that prepares the family for the increase in their monthly rental obligation in year 2.

Authorization
Public Housing – Attachment C, paragraph C.11. (no change)
Housing Choice Voucher – Attachment C, paragraph D.2.a. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver
HUD regulations at 24 CFR 5.630.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1c Utility Reimbursement Payments

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
As listed under 2014-1 above.

2. Description/Impact/Update
HUD regulations require AHFC to establish utility allowance schedules for each Voucher and Public Housing jurisdiction, to update those schedules annually, and to pay a utility reimbursement payment when the utility allowance exceeds the family contribution. This supporting activity eliminates utility reimbursement payments for the Voucher and Public Housing programs. Families that may need an adjustment of their subsidy due to unusual or excessive utility requirements may ask for a hardship. See supporting activity 2014-1l for a discussion of the hardship policy.

Authorization
Public Housing – Attachment C, paragraph C.11. (no change)
Housing Choice Voucher – Attachment C, paragraph D.2.a. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver
- Housing Choice Voucher - HUD regulations at 24 CFR 982.517.
- Public Housing – HUD regulations at 24 CFR 960.253, 965.502 through 965.506, and 966.4.
- Both – HUD regulations at 24 CFR 5.632.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1d Jumpstart Program

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
As listed under 2014-1 above. With Numbered Memo 14-10 issued and effective on April 29, 2014, AHFC began transitioning HUD FSS enrollments to the MTW FSS program. Existing participants were allowed to graduate and receive accumulated escrow balances as part of this transition process.

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	July 29, 2015
Reviewed by HUD	December 16, 2015

The Jumpstart Program replaced the MTW-Family Self-Sufficiency Program. Enrollment in the traditional Family Self-Sufficiency Program was suspended with Numbered Memo 15-18 issued and effective on June 1, 2015. Any enrollments in process were converted to the new MTW FSS program effective August 1, 2015. New enrollments to the Jumpstart Program began November 1, 2015.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

Data for the metrics below are provided for families enrolled in the Jumpstart Program only. For overall program metrics, see the metrics under Activity 2014-1.

Baseline data was gathered as of 12/31/2013 using the data for individuals enrolled in the HUD FSS program prior to the implementation of the rent reform activity. AHFC chose this starting point as with the implementation of rent reform, the escrow savings account was eliminated.

As of June 30, 2016:
- Families enrolled in case management (level 1) – 322
- Families enrolled in incentives only (level 2) – 105

As of June 30, 2017:
- Families enrolled in case management (level 1) – 486
- Families enrolled in incentives only (level 2) – 302
- Total Jumpstart enrollment – 788 families

As of June 30, 2018:

- Families enrolled in case management (level 1) – 550
- Families enrolled in incentives only (level 2) – 323
- Total Jumpstart enrollment – 873 families

SS #1: Increase in Household Income

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	FY2014 – 0 No wage information was available in the old FSS program	30 percent of individuals will have earned income	**2016** – 286 individuals with average income of $16,396 **2017** – 491 individuals with average income of $19,544 **2018** – 621 individuals with average income of $21,525	Yes

Minimum wage as of 01/01/2014 was $7.75 per hour. Baseline is calculated as one adult working full-time (40 hours) at the minimum wage of $7.75 ($16,120 per year).

SS #2: Increase in Household Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	0 (zero)	$1,500 for savings match program	**2016** – 4 persons with $912 **2017** – 69 families enrolled with total savings of $20,209 **2018** – 59 families enrolled with total savings of $34,513	Yes

Families have up to five years to contribute to a savings account to be eligible for the savings match incentive.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full- time (2) Employed Part-time (3) Educational Program (4) Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other - Wages that are less than part-time	2014 (1) 16 persons (2) 41 persons (3) 32 persons (4) 78 persons (5) 52 persons (6) 0	Increase families with full-time employment	**2015** – Not under Jumpstart yet **2016** (1) 80 persons (2) 72 persons (3) 59 persons (4) 59 persons (5) 186 persons (6) 45 persons **2017** (1) 273 persons (2) 139 persons (3) 107 persons (4) 201 persons (5) 339 persons (6) 78 persons **2018** (1) 250 persons (2) 193 persons (3) 206 persons (4) 317 persons (5) 133 persons (6) 440 persons	Yes

- Full-time is calculated as one adult working 40 hours per week at the minimum wage of $7.75 ($16,120).
- Part-time is calculated as one adult working 20 hours per week at the minimum wage of $7.75 ($8,060).
- Educational Program: persons seeking a high school diploma, GED, or post secondary opportunities. These are persons that are actively working on this goal.
- Job Training Program: persons seeking vocational training, job search activities, and job retention activities. These are persons that are actively working on this goal.
- Other Work is calculated as one adult working less than 20 hours per week at the minimum wage of $7.75 (less than $8,060).

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	2013 – 22 of 109 families (20.2%) on TANF	20 percent of enrolled families receive TANF	**2016** – 50 of 383 families (13.1%) on TANF **2017** – 85 of 788 families (10.8%) on TANF **2018** – 106 of 865 families (12.3%) on TANF	Yes

Our Bridge hardship policy encourages those families that have not investigated their eligibility for benefits to see if they can qualify to reduce the impact of financial hardships.

SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	2014 - 109 families	600 families	**2016** – 383 families **2017** – 788 families **2018** – 897 families	Yes

Enrollment in Jumpstart began November 1, 2015. AHFC paid the following incentives in 2017 to Jumpstart families:

- Educational Rewards: paid $30,114 to 68 individuals
- Savings Match: paid $7,003 to 11 families
- Tuition Payments: pad $273,594.43 to 166 individuals
- Work Rewards: paid $35,250 to 105 individuals

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	February 2014 – $635.14 per unit month	A reduction	See 2014-1 SS #6	

Please see this metric under 2014-1 for all rent reform participants. AHFC does not measure the subsidy costs for Jumpstart families only.

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Pending

Please see this metric under 2014-1 for all rent reform participants. AHFC does not measure the subsidy costs for Jumpstart families only.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	0 (zero)	20 percent of exits are below the shelter burden	**2017** – 115 families exited; 22 were self-sufficient (19.1%) **2018** – 112 families exited; 29 were self-sufficient (25.89%)	Yes

This measures the shelter burden of those families that end their program participation each year and whether the shelter burden is less than 50 percent. These participants have exited in advance of year 5 of their contract.

2. Description/Impact/Update

This activity was formerly called Family Self-Sufficiency Program. AHFC has operated a voluntary Family Self-Sufficiency Program since 1994. In order to meet the needs of families participating in the Step Program, AHFC expanded its program to all its Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher jurisdictions, as well as increasing the number of families eligible to participate. This new FSS Program is called Jumpstart. Jumpstart offers two service levels for families:

- Case Management (level 1) – these families sign a participation agreement, develop an Individual Training and Services Plan, receive individualized coaching and goal-setting services, and are eligible for monetary incentives.
- Incentives Only (level 2) – these families sign a participation agreement and receive counseling regarding available monetary incentives.

Statutory Objective

Give incentives to families with children whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training, educational, or other programs that assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self–sufficient

Authorization

Attachment C, paragraph E. (no change)

Regulation Citation

Jumpstart is operated under the regulations at 24 CFR 984 and regulations at parts 5, 882, 887, 960, 966, and 982 (except where specifically exempted by this Plan). Requested waivers are:

- 24 CFR 984.103 – Definition of self-sufficiency; AHFC has developed its own definition
- 24 CFR 984.105 – Minimum program size; AHFC will be expanding the size and jurisdictions under the Jumpstart Program
- 24 CFR 984.202 – Program Coordinating Committee composition; AHFC will be establishing an alternate composition for this committee based on AHFC's geographic challenges
- 24 CFR 984.203 – Family selection; AHFC has defined Jumpstart family selection priorities
- 24 CFR 984.303 – Contract of Participation; AHFC has developed two Agreements for its Jumpstart participants – Jumpstart Participation Agreement (Level 1) and Jumpstart Incentive Eligibility Agreement (Level 2)
- 24 CFR 984.303(a) – Signature of head of household; AHFC is adding a procedure for an alternate head of household
- 24 CFR 984.303(b)(2) – Independence from welfare assistance; AHFC is waiving this condition for fulfillment of a Jumpstart Agreement
- 24 CFR 984.303(b)(4) – Suitable employment; Any adult family member who signs the Agreement can fulfill this requirement.
- 24 CFR 984.303(c) – Contract term; the Jumpstart Agreement will coincide with the Step Program family's subsidized housing term (this may be less than 5 years)
- 24 CFR 984.303(d) – Contract extension; AHFC Jumpstart staff may extend an Agreement at their discretion or if authorized by the Bridge Committee
- 24 CFR 984.303(d)(5)(iii) – Consequences of noncompliance; AHFC will not terminate a family's rental assistance for failure to comply with their Agreement
- 24 CFR 984.303(g) – Completion; An Agreement is complete when the family has fulfilled all of its obligations under the Agreement and the family must be in good standing with AHFC the month they complete the Agreement
- 24 CFR 984.304 – Total tenant payment; AHFC will calculate total tenant payment in compliance with policy in its Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan and Public Housing Program Admissions and Occupancy Policy
- 24 CFR 984.305 – FSS Account; AHFC will not offer an FSS Account. AHFC has developed an alternate system of incentives
- 24 CFR 984.306 – Residency and portability requirements; families are not eligible to port Jumpstart participation. Families are not eligible to port FSS Program participation into AHFC's jurisdiction. AHFC will not accept FSS Account balances from other PHAs. Jumpstart incentives must be earned while in an AHFC jurisdiction.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
Numbered Memo 18-18 dated April 20, 2018 and effective May 1, 2018 increased the amount of incentives available to a Level 1 Case Management family to $5,000. AHFC also changed its incentive rules to allow a Level 1 family to receive all its incentives in Tuition Assistance.

For families wishing to participate in the Savings Match incentive, AHFC requires that these families complete a financial literacy requirement.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1e Family Choice of Rent and Flat Rents

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
As listed under 2014-1 above.

2. Description/Impact/Update
This supporting activity waives the annual requirement to offer a public housing family the choice of a flat or income-based rent. AHFC currently sets a contract rent rate for its Public Housing units. This contract rent replaces the flat rent. If a family's income rises to a point where their required income-based contribution would exceed the contract rent, AHFC offers the family the contract rent.

AHFC will ensure that it establishes a contract rent that reflects, not leads, the market. As one of its tools, staff will use an annual, independent study conducted by AHFC's Planning and Program Development Department in cooperation with the State of Alaska Department of Labor (DOL). This study surveys Alaska's communities and landlords about its housing markets including vacancy rates, market conditions, rentals, and utilities.

AHFC will continue to compare the fair market rent, current family rent contributions, local rental market vacancy and rental rates, and local advertising materials when selecting a reasonable contract rent. AHFC will also continue to add an affordability factor as these rents are meant for low-income families. As an internal control, AHFC will set its contract rents within 15 percent of the State of Alaska Department of Labor market survey rate.

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraph C.11. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver
HUD regulations at 24 CFR 960.253.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1f Ineligible Noncitizen Proration

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
As listed under 2014-1 above.

2. Description/Impact/Update
This supporting activity offers an alternate methodology for prorating the assistance available to families with ineligible noncitizen members. Current regulations require:

- Public Housing - AHFC must formulate a "maximum" subsidy each year and update it.
- Voucher - AHFC can give families an estimated figure of their prorated subsidy, but the final figure depends upon the gross rent of the unit rented.

Both procedures are administratively burdensome for the low numbers of ineligible noncitizens in AHFC's portfolio. For a family with ineligible noncitizen members in the household, AHFC will deduct $50 from the family's subsidy as long as the ineligible noncitizen members reside in the household.

Authorization

- Attachment C, paragraph C.4 and paragraph C.11. (no change)
- Attachment C, paragraph D.2.a and D.3.a. (no change)

Regulation Citation
HUD regulations at 24 CFR 5.520.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1g Annual Recertification Requirement

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
As listed under 2014-1 above.

2. Description/Impact/Update
This supporting activity develops an alternate recertification schedule for families subject to rent reform activities. AHFC continues to require all families to report changes in family composition within ten business days. AHFC continues to pull the Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) report to track income and how the rent reform activity is affecting its clientele.

- **Classic Program** – these families receive a triennial (every three years) examination. In the no examination years for Public Housing, AHFC continues to verify household composition and certify compliance with community service obligations.
- **Step Program** – these families receive an income examination at time of admission to determine eligibility under income limit guidelines and set their income-based rent for the first year. AHFC does not conduct any additional income verification processes unless the family requests a hardship. Each year, AHFC discusses the EIV report with the family, and the family self-certifies to its accuracy. AHFC reports these figures on the 50058.
- **Set Aside Program** – these families receive an income examination every year.

Authorization

- Public Housing - Attachment C, paragraph C.4 and paragraph C.11. (no change)
- Housing Choice Voucher - Attachment C, paragraph D.1.c, D.2.a, and D.3.b. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver

- Public Housing – HUD regulations at 24 CFR 960.257.
- Housing Choice Voucher – HUD regulations at 24 CFR 982.516

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1h Annual and Adjusted Annual Income Calculation

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

As listed under 2014-1 above.

2. Description/Impact/Update

This supporting activity develops an alternate methodology for calculating a family's annual income. AHFC does not deviate from the following regulations:

- Determination of income sources and which sources are included or excluded as part of a family's annual income.
- Determination of asset sources and when an asset becomes annual income.
- Determination of when a welfare benefit reduction affects annual income.

AHFC has previously requested waivers for the following regulations and has absorbed them into this activity.

- Activity 2010-2 raises the asset threshold from $5,000 to $10,000. Now moved under supporting activity 2014-1j.
- Activity 2010-3 eliminates the Earned Income Disallowance program for persons with disabilities and families engaging in work activities. Now moved under supporting activity 2014-1k.

As part of this plan, AHFC is implementing the following waivers. Families that believe they suffer from a financial hardship due to the elimination of these allowances are able to request a hardship (see supporting activity 2014-1l of this Plan).

- Elimination of the annual $400 allowance for an elderly/disabled family.
- Elimination of the allowance of $480 for each minor dependent in a household.
- Elimination of the medical allowance for out-of-pocket expenses for elderly/disabled families.
- Elimination of the handicap allowance for out-of-pocket expenses that allow a person with disabilities to engage in work activities.
- Elimination of the childcare allowance for out-of-pocket expenses for care of minors under the age of 13 to allow an adult household member to engage in work activities.

Authorization

- Attachment C, paragraph C.4 and paragraph C.11. (no change)
- Attachment C, paragraph D.2.a and D.3.a. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver

- Both Programs - HUD regulations at 24 CFR 5.611, 24 CFR 5.617, and 24 CFR 5.628
- Public Housing - 24 CFR 960.225 and 24 CFR 966.4(b)(1)
- Housing Choice Voucher – 24 CFR 982.503, 24 CFR 982.505, and 24 CFR 982.508

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2014-1i Portability

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	August 21, 2013
Reviewed by HUD	December 31, 2013

This activity was issued with Numbered Memo 14-01 on January 13, 2014.

- Families were allowed to port under the traditional HUD rules before their first annual examination for transition to rent reform.
- AHFC was administering vouchers as of February 1, 2014 and classified those families into the Set Aside Program.
- AHFC absorbed all families that ported into AHFC as of August 1, 2014. These families were allowed to retain their right to port out under traditional HUD rules before their first annual examination for transition to rent reform.
- AHFC began absorbing all port-in families as of August 1, 2015. Policy change was issued with Numbered Memo 15-12 issued on April 20, 2015.
    - New port-in families as of August 1, 2015 are classified into the Step or Classic Program.
    - Families in the Set Aside Program were allowed to retain their right to port out under traditional HUD rules before their first annual examination for transition to rent reform.

2. Description/Impact/Update

This supporting activity changes AHFC's Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan requirements that Step Program families must meet before allowing a family to port AHFC's voucher to another housing authority's jurisdiction. These changes do not impact current HUD regulations regarding portability for Nonelderly Disabled (NED) Vouchers or Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Vouchers. AHFC also continues to offer portability under current HUD regulations to all MTW tenant-based voucher holders that are classified as Classic Program families.

AHFC did not make any changes to the rules governing port-in vouchers, except to streamline the calculation of family income as specified in Activity 2014-1h. AHFC continues to enforce the regulations regarding nonresident applicants under 24 CFR 982.353(c). AHFC also continues to enforce the regulations regarding income eligibility under

24 CFR 982.353(d). AHFC did not make any changes to the regulations under 24 CFR 982.355 regarding administration by receiving PHAs.

AHFC proposes the following limitations for Step Program families seeking to port a voucher from AHFC's jurisdiction.

- **Absorption by the Receiving PHA** – if a receiving PHA is absorbing vouchers, the Step Program family may port their tenant-based voucher if they meet the requirements under 24 CFR 982.353(b).
- **Reasonable Accommodation** – if a Step Program family needs to move their tenant-based voucher to another PHA's jurisdiction in order to accommodate a family member with a disability, AHFC will allow those with appropriate documentation. The family must meet the requirements under 24 CFR 982.353(b).
- **VAWA Protections** – if a Step Program family needs to move their tenant-based voucher to another PHA's jurisdiction in order to receive protections afforded under the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), AHFC will allow those with appropriate documentation. The family must meet the requirements under 24 CFR 982.353(b).

Authorization
Housing Choice Voucher - Attachment C, paragraph D.1.g. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver
Housing Choice Voucher – 24 CFR 982.353

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1j Income from Assets

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

This was implemented on October 26, 2009 with Numbered Memo 09-28. This was formerly numbered as Activity 2010-2 and updated as part of the FY2018 Annual Plan. This was wrapped into Activity 2014-1 because it is part of the AHFC rent calculation method.

Previous Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HCV - Decrease cost of performing asset verifications for small asset accounts	$9,432 – 2,985 asset transactions (as of 12/10/09)	$8,500 (reduce time by 10 percent)	2010 – 1,580 transactions 2011 – 182 transactions 2012 – 104 transactions	Yes
PH - Decrease cost of performing asset verifications for small asset accounts	$3,311 - 1,048 asset transactions (as of 12/10/09)	$2,980 (reduce time by 10 percent)	2010 – 771 transactions 2011 – 43 transactions 2012 – 53 transactions	Yes

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HCV - Decrease time spent performing asset verifications for small asset accounts	PH – 1,048 clients with assets entered (as of 12/10/2009)	87.33 staff hours	2010 – 64.25 hours 2011 – 3.58 hours 2012 – 4.42 hours	Yes
PH - Decrease time spent performing asset verifications for small asset accounts	HCV – 1,580 clients with assets entered (as of 12/10/2009)	248.75 staff hours	2010 – 131.67 hours 2011 – 15.17 hours 2012 – 8.67 hours	Yes

2. Description/Impact/Update

AHFC allows a family to self-certify total family assets up to $10,000 and excludes the income generated from a family's total assets when assets total less than $10,000.

Authorization

Attachment C, paragraphs C.11 and D.2.a. (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 5.609

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2014-1k Earned Income Disallowance

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

This was implemented on October 26, 2009 with Numbered Memo 09-28. As of the FY2012 MTW Report, no enrollees remained. This was formerly numbered as Activity 2010-3 and updated as part of the FY2018 Annual Plan. This was wrapped into Activity 2014-1 because it is part of the AHFC rent calculation method.

Previous Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

In order to calculate a time savings, AHFC calculated that staff spent an average of 20 hours total per adult during an EID activity. Once all participants completed their enrollment, measurement of this activity ceased. It is difficult to provide a measure of actual time saved for an activity that no longer occurs.

AHFC did observe that a short-term incentive does not appear to encourage families to increase current earnings or secure long-term employment.

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HCV - Decrease the cost associated with EID calculations	$9,859 (13 clients)	$2,465 (reduce costs by 75 percent)	2010 - $1,517 2011 - $5,309 2012 - $0 2013 - $0 2014 - $0	Yes
PH - Decrease the cost associated with EID calculations	$21,992 (29 clients)	$5,498 (reduce costs by 75 percent)	2010 - $6,067 2011 - $18,959 2012 - $0 2013 - $0 2014 - $0	Yes

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HCV - Decrease staff time associated with EID calculations	260 hours (13 clients at 20 hours each)	65 hours (reduce times by 75 percent)	2010 – 40 hours 2011 - 140 hours 2012 - 0 hours 2013 - 0 hours 2014 - 0 hours	Yes

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PH - Decrease staff time associated with EID calculations	580 hours (29 clients at 20 hours each)	145 hours (reduce times by 75 percent)	2010 - 160 hours 2011 - 500 hours 2012 - 0 hours 2013 - 0 hours 2014 - 0 hours	Yes

2. Description/Impact/Update
Eliminate the Earned Income Disallowance (EID) and its associated tracking/paperwork times. Existing clients were allowed to finish the program.

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraphs C.11 and D.2.a. (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 5.617 and 960.255

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-1l Hardship Policy and Process

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended
Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors January 8, 2014
Reviewed by HUD April 30, 2014

The Bridge Process was implemented with the rent reform activity 2014-1:
- On February 1, 2014 for Housing Choice Voucher families
- On May 1, 2014 for Public Housing Program families

This was formerly listed in the Appendix of the Annual Plan and updated as part of the FY2018 Annual Plan. This was wrapped into Activity 2014-1 as establishing a method for families to grieve an adverse impact due to a rent reform activity is an MTW Agreement obligation.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Outcome
Bridge Request Statistics	0	**2014** – 33 requests • 10 approved for Bridge Committee • 23 did not meet qualifiers
	0	**2015** – 183 requests • 75 approved for Bridge Committee • 8 approved for rent change outside the Bridge Process due to disability or other circumstances
	0	**2016** (through June 30) – 298 requests • 80 approved for Bridge Committee • 35 approved for rent change outside the Bridge Process due to disability or other circumstances
Bridge Request Statistics	0	**2017** – Old Procedure • 178 requests, 105 approved for Bridge Committee • 97 approved by Bridge Committee at cost of $76,325 **2017** – New Procedure • 330 requests • 118 did not meet qualifiers • 199 granted; 0 (zero) to Bridge Committee • Cost of $225,738
	0	**2018 – 446 requests** • 153 were incomplete or did not meet qualifiers • 90 staff decisions were appealed • 362 qualified and received a rent deduction • 6 approved for rent change outside the Bridge Process due to disability or other circumstances • Hardship cost $450,408

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Outcome
Safety Net Statistics	0	02/01/2014 through 06/30/2015 • 170 safety net exceptions processed

2. Description/Impact/Update

As a Moving to Work agency, AHFC must develop a reasonable rent policy that encourages employment and self-sufficiency. AHFC refers to this policy as Rent Reform. As part of this overall rent reform, AHFC must also adopt a hardship policy to meet the individual needs of families that request a modification to, exemption from, or temporary waiver to:

- Family requirements under Moving to Work Activity 2014-1 Reasonable Rent and Family Self-Sufficiency; or
- A family's requirement to pay a minimum rent under 24 CFR 5.630; or
- AHFC's elimination of interim examinations under Moving to Work Activity 2014-1.

AHFC's hardship policy is called the Bridge Process. The temporary hardship policy for families transitioning from the traditional rent calculation method to AHFC's rent reform model had access to a one-time "Safety Net". Each of these hardship policies is summarized below. AHFC continues to offer a Minimum Rent Exemption procedure for those families subject to the minimum rent.

Tier 1

These requests are processed by each local AHFC office. If a family meets the qualifying conditions, staff has the authority to grant a temporary reduction of rent to address the family's hardship. Hardships include:

- Permanent Loss of a Household Member with Income – AHFC will remove the individual and their associated income. If the family is on an income-based formula, the family's contribution is recalculated. If the family is on the Step schedule and experiencing a shelter burden, they may qualify for a temporary reduction of rent as listed in the Safety Net below.
- Safety Net – Unanticipated Income Loss causes a shelter burden for the family. Staff may grant a reduction of the family portion to 50 percent of monthly income for a period of three months. The family is also referred to the Jumpstart program for a consultation and possible enrollment.
- Safety Net – Short-Term Medical/Health Condition of an employed adult which results in the loss of income. Staff may grant a reduction of the family portion to 50 percent of monthly income for a period of three months.

Tier 2

This level of review is for families with hardship circumstances that exceed staff authority to grant and to provide a level of review for families that disagree with the relief offered at Tier 1. Review at this level also includes recommendations for family requests to appear before the Bridge Committee. Hardship relief that can be granted at this level includes:

- Medical or Child Care Expense Allowance – an allowance for out-of-pocket expenses can be considered when the expenses cause a shelter burden in excess of 50 percent of family monthly income. A reduction of the family portion to 50 percent of monthly income for a period of six months can be granted. Persons with disabilities who request the medical expense deduction are handled through the reasonable accommodation process.
- Extension to Tier 1 Safety Net – if a family's initial reduction of rent for three months is not sufficient, the family can ask for an additional three months. If the extension is needed due to the unanticipated loss of income, the family must be an active Jumpstart participant and receive their recommendation for an extension.

Review of Determinations Under Tier 2

This level of review is for families that disagree with the relief offered at Tier 2. Review at this level also includes recommendations for family requests to appear before the Bridge Committee.

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraphs C.11 and D.2.a. (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 5.617 and 960.255

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
Beginning in November 2016, AHFC refined the Bridge Policy to a three-tiered process to expedite the processing of family requests (shown above). This change was distributed to staff with Numbered Memo 16-27 issued October 20, 2016 and effective November 1, 2016.

The Safety Net period for unexpected loss of income was extended from two months to three months effective February 20, 2017. This was distributed to staff with Numbered Memo 17-10 on February 20, 2017.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-3 PBV Inspection Requirements

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	February 27, 2013
Reviewed by HUD	September 10, 2013

This activity began with Numbered Memo 14-27 issued on September 22, 2014 and effective on October 1, 2014.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks
AHFC will measure the success of this activity by analyzing the number of failed inspections at PBV properties as a percentage of the inspections conducted in a particular period.

- The baseline is zero as PBV units are new to AHFC's portfolio.
- AHFC will count the number of inspections conducted during the period under review. AHFC will look at the number of failed inspections as a percentage of the total inspections at a particular development. AHFC will also examine the types and severity of fails to see if they are owner or tenant caused.
- AHFC will increase its inspection requirements if a property experiences more than a 20 percent fail rate for major fail items.

AHFC will examine its computer records to determine the number of move-in, annual, complaint, and quality assurance inspections at each PBV property. AHFC will also review the number of failed inspections, the types of fails (minor or major), and the owner's responsiveness to the failed inspections.

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	0	0	0	

AHFC anticipates that this will be a revenue neutral activity as staff will still perform inspections whether it be voucher, audit, or quality assurance staff.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	0	0	0	

AHFC anticipates that this activity will not result in time savings as staff will still perform inspections whether it be voucher, audit, or quality assurance staff.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	0	0	0	

AHFC does not have errors for completion of annual or quality assurance inspections. All are completed as required, and AHFC does not anticipate that this will change.

2. Description/Impact/Update

For project-based voucher (PBV) developments, AHFC requires flexibility when determining the number of annual and quality control inspections. The number required may vary depending on the development configuration and number of PBV units.

AHFC is basing its initial and annual inspection requirement on the needs of each individual development. AHFC reserves the right to inspect any time it suspects that the owner is not in compliance with Housing Quality Standards (HQS) or if the fail rate reaches 20 percent at the development. AHFC will continue to investigate tenant complaints regarding the condition of a PBV unit. AHFC will also continue to conduct the initial property and unit inspections before entering into a HAP Contract for the development.

AHFC has an additional quality assurance process for those developments with PBV and Low Income Housing Tax Credit Programs, as AHFC's Internal Audit Department conducts reviews of the property that include unit inspections. AHFC's quality assurance staff will review Internal Audit's findings and consider those inspections as part of its inspection universe.

Statutory Objective

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

Authorization
Attachment C, paragraph D.5 and paragraph D.7.d. (no change)

Regulation Citation

- HUD regulations at 24 CFR 983.103(c) for turnover inspection requirements.
- HUD regulations at 24 CFR 983.103(d)(1) for annual inspection random sample requirements.
- HUD regulations at 24 CFR 983.103(d)(2) for annual inspection failed unit inspection requirements.
- HUD regulations at 24 CFR 983.103(e)(2) for failed inspection follow-up requirements.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2014-4 Ridgeline Terrace and Susitna Square

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	February 27, 2013
Reviewed by HUD	September 10, 2013

AHFC subsidy began for these two developments in accordance with their HAP Contracts. Staff received policy guidance with Numbered Memo 16-29 issued December 20, 2016 and effective on January 1, 2017.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks
CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)	0		$24.5 million	Yes

Construction of these two developments would not have been possible without the flexibility provided under Moving to Work.

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Add new units of housing for seniors at or below 80 percent of area median income.	0	20 new units in Mountain View	20 units	Yes
Add new units of housing for families at or below 80 percent of area median income.	0	50 new units in Mountain View	50 units	Yes
Add new units of housing for families at or below 80 percent of area median income.	16 public housing family units on San Roberto Avenue	18 new units on San Roberto Avenue	18 units	Yes

HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	16 units of family housing at 80 percent of area median income	16 units of family housing at 60 percent of area median income	18 units	Yes

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	0	70	88	Yes

2. Description/Impact/Update

This activity was formerly named Mountain View and San Roberto Development. AHFC has updated the name to match the newly named developments. AHFC used its MTW funds and its development expertise to support affordable housing acquisition and development. AHFC also pursued disposition and redevelopment of its current Public Housing portfolio through its subsidiary entity, Alaska Corporation for Affordable Housing (ACAH).

- Susitna Square (18 units, 18 project-based vouchers) was ready for occupancy September 1, 2015.
- Ridgeline Terrace (70 units, 63 project-based vouchers) was ready for occupancy January 8, 2016.

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families

Authorization
- Attachment C, paragraph D.3.a
- MTW Agreement Attachment D signed January 30, 2012.

Regulation Citation
- MTW Agreement Attachment D signed January 30, 2012.
- AHFC will follow the guidance set forth in PIH Notice 2011-45.

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 27, 2016
Reviewed by HUD	May 17, 2016

AHFC increased the income limits for eligible families to match the tax credit admission guidelines. These developments are funded with a combination of funds including Low Income Housing Tax Credits and Project-Based Vouchers. The LIHTC program allows admission of families up to 60 percent of area median income. The changes were submitted as Amendment 2 to the FY2018 Moving to Work Plan.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

2015-1 Modify Reasonable Rent Procedure for 5 Percent FMR Decrease

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	May 14, 2014
Reviewed by HUD	April 6, 2015

This activity was implemented on March 20, 2017 with Numbered Memo 17-13. Effective April 1, 2017, AHFC began this new process. There were no changes to the payment standard in this reporting period.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Pending

Overall, rental costs are increasing in Alaska rental markets, and we do not anticipate savings from the current HUD regulations. AHFC feels that larger savings are generated by the Step Program and its fixed subsidy schedule.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Pending

AHFC does not expect any savings in staff time as staff will continue to conduct rent reasonableness and examine their local rental markets.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	2016 – 0 percent	2 percent or less	**2017** – 0 percent **2018** – 1.41 percent	Yes

AHFC does not anticipate a decrease in the error rate for this task as a result of this activity. We do gather data regarding the error rate of an inaccurate payment standard as part of our internal quality assurance and will report that data here.

2. Description/Impact/Update

Current HUD regulations require a PHA to re-determine rent reasonableness within 60 days of a five percent decrease in the Fair Market Rent (FMR) for any unit under contract. Under Moving to Work Activity 2011-2, Local Payment Standards, AHFC sets each voucher jurisdiction's payment standard to respond to local market conditions. These are monitored annually and any changes of 5 percent or more in the local market require an adjustment of the payment standard. Payment standard evaluation and adjustment will not typically occur at the same time that HUD publishes revised FMRs.

AHFC will continue to evaluate rent reasonableness prior to signing any new HAP contracts for families that wish to move and for landlord rent increase requests. For those families that are renewing their HAP Contract for their current unit, AHFC will conduct rent reasonableness as part of each family's regular examination process. The revised payment standard and rent reasonableness would coincide with the effective date of the family's examination.

AHFC expects that this activity will have minimal impact to families as Step Program families receive a reduced percentage of the payment standard each year, and Classic Program families receive triennial examinations.

Statutory Objective

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

MTW Authorization and Need

Attachment C, paragraph D.2.c (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 982.507(a)(2)(ii)

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2018-1 Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance, Forget-Me-Not Manor

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	July 26, 2017
Reviewed by HUD	August 18, 2017

This activity was implemented on February 20, 2018 with Numbered Memo 18-10. Effective March 1, 2018, AHFC issued the policy for this new program. Our partner submitted their first billing statement effective November 1, 2017.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increased rental assistance made available to households at or below 50 percent of area median income.	0	32 units	**2018** – 30 units as of year end	Yes

Research shows that the average HAP per unit is:

- 2018 - $763.41

2. Description/Impact/Update

Fund rental assistance outside Section 8 rules consistent with 'broader uses of funds' authority in Attachment D of the Agreement. Provide the funding equivalent of 32 project-based voucher units at a Housing First development, Forget-Me-Not Manor.

This development is on target to be fully leased, and AHFC continues to monitor the funding requests each month.

Statutory Objective

Increase housing choices for low-income families

MTW Authorization and Need

Attachment D of the MTW Agreement signed January 30, 2012.

Regulation Citation

PIH Notice 2011-45

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

This development was originally named Alder Manor in AHFC's FY2018 Plan.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

No comments at this time.

2018-2 Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance, Dena'ina House

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	October 25, 2017
Reviewed by HUD	November 29, 2017

This activity was implemented on May 21, 2018 with Numbered Memo 18-24. Effective June 1, 2018, AHFC issued the policy for this new program. Our partner submitted their first billing statement effective May 1, 2018.

Metrics, Baselines, Benchmarks

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Increased rental assistance made available to households at or below 50 percent of area median income.	0	25 units	**2018** – 19 units as of year end	Pending

Research shows that the average HAP per unit is:

- 2018 - $688.06

2. Description/Impact/Update

Fund rental assistance outside Section 8 rules consistent with 'broader uses of funds' authority in Attachment D of the Agreement. Provide the funding equivalent of 25 project-based voucher units at a development providing homeless youth with supportive services, Dena'ina House.

This development is on target to be fully leased, and AHFC continues to monitor the funding requests each month.

Statutory Objective

Increase housing choices for low-income families

MTW Authorization and Need

Attachment D of the MTW Agreement signed January 30, 2012.

Regulation Citation

PIH Notice 2011-45

3. Actual Non-Significant Changes

No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

4. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

5. Actual Significant Changes
No changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

6. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies
No comments at this time.

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

2016-1 Section 811 Sponsor-Based Assistance

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 29, 2015
Reviewed by HUD	September 14, 2015

2. Description
Formerly called the Housing First Sponsor-Based Assistance RFP. Under the Moving to Work Demonstration Program, approved housing authorities have the authority to fund rental assistance outside of Section 8 and 9 regulations under the 1937 Housing Act. Since this activity was first proposed in AHFC's FY2018 Annual Plan, AHFC has received a grant from HUD for Section 811 rental assistance. AHFC has begun housing individuals who meet the criteria under the Section 811 grant. To date, the Public Housing Division has not provided additional subsidy in the form of project-based vouchers.

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families.

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment D of the MTW Agreement signed January 30, 2012.

Regulation Citation
PIH Notice 2011-45

Anticipated Impact
The goal is with the addition of regular subsidy payments, a nonprofit group will be able to leverage additional funds to either develop or improve a property as well as pay for necessary supportive services.

Sponsor-based assistance will allow AHFC to expand rental assistance to vulnerable populations that may not pass the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) screening criteria contained in the AHFC Administrative Plan due to their chronic homelessness, lack of financial resources, and references necessary to secure private sector rental housing.

Metrics

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	0	50 units at 50% of AMI	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Pending

To date, there have been no applications or proposals for project-based vouchers under the Section 811 grant. Benchmarks will be set once a proposal has been evaluated and selected.

3. Actions Taken Toward Implementation

AHFC has solicited two previous proposals for the award of these funds with unsuccessful responses. AHFC did develop a partnership for use of the Section 811 grant funds. At this time, the partner agency does not desire additional project-based voucher units.

C. Activities on Hold

2010-13 Homeownership Program

1. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved by the AHFC Board of Directors	April 23, 2009
Reviewed by HUD	August 6, 2009

Original Benchmarks

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Reduce administrative costs of the homeownership program.	$6,250 per participant	$1,562 per participant	Lack of available funds has postponed implementation.

2. Description

Offer down payment assistance in lieu of a monthly HAP payment. AHFC currently has 24 homeowners receiving assistance for homeownership under a HAP plan. AHFC suspended applications for this program in 2008, when administrative costs exceeded planned expenses. The Board of Directors approved the permanent closure on March 9, 2011.

Statutory Objective

- Give incentives to families with children whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training, educational, or other programs that assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self–sufficient
- Increase housing choices for low-income families

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment C, paragraph D.8.a (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 982.625

3. Actions Taken Toward Implementation
AHFC is currently conducting a study of its current voucher allocation and available funding. Staff is also exploring the possibility of other funding sources that may be available to fund the down payment while using MTW funds to cover the administrative cost. Activity is on hold pending the outcomes of these two activities.

D. Closed Out Activities

2010-1 Reexamination of Income

1. Description
Transition elderly and disabled families on fixed income to a biennial examination schedule. This activity was implemented by staff with Numbered Memo 10-45 on December 7, 2010. After comments from staff, AHFC implemented this for elderly/disabled Public Housing residents only with Numbered Memo 11-08 on January 27, 2011.

Statutory Objective
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment C, paragraph C.4 (changed, HCV eliminated)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 960.257

2. Closure Reason
This activity is closed as AHFC's reasonable rent activity implements an alternate annual family income calculation. This activity has been incorporated into MTW Activity 2014-1 Reasonable Rent and Family Self-Sufficiency Initiative. This activity is completed.

Final Outcomes and Lessons Learned
Staff reported positive results from reducing the number of annual examinations for families with all adults on fixed income. Success in this activity lead to the use of a

triennial examination schedule for Classic Program families. We also learned that the more complicated rent calculation method proposed under this activity was difficult to administer. This lead to the development of the simple 28.5 percent calculation under activity 2014-1.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity

No comments at this time.

Summary Table

Because this activity was changed from all elderly/disabled households to just Public Housing elderly/households, the original benchmark was revised.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Number of reexaminations a year	Zero	Reduction of 1,300 reexaminations a year	Modified in January 2011

Revised Metric	Baseline	Revised Benchmark	Outcome
Staff time to perform annual examinations for a population on fixed income	Zero	Reduction of hours spent in reexamination of 100 percent elderly/disabled families.	462 families are 100 percent elder/disabled. This equates to a savings of 347 staff hours every year (1.5 hrs/exam x (462 ÷ 2) exams/yr.).

2010-4 Rent Simplification

1. Description

Alternate rent structure. This activity began with non-MTW activity Interim Reexamination Policy and MTW activities 2010-2 and 2010-3. This activity was closed in the FY2013 MTW Report for the period ending June 30, 2013.

Statutory Objective

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

MTW Authorization and Need

Attachment C, paragraph C.11 and paragraph D.2.a (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 5.609

2. Closure Reason

With the implementation of Activity 2014-1 Reasonable Rent and Family Self-Sufficiency, this activity was no longer needed.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

Staff reported positive results from former activity 2010-2 (Asset Threshold) as it decreased staff time verifying small asset balances. It also decreased error rates for posting and updating small asset balances. Positive results from this activity encouraged the incorporation of former activity 2010-2 into activity 2014-1 as 2014-1h.

Former activity 2010-3 (EID Elimination) showed immediate results in the decrease of staff administrative time. AHFC wanted to incentivize families to increase income from wages, but past results from the Earned Income Disallowance did not produce long-term results by encouraging families to retain employment once the disallowance period ended. AHFC considered these results when evaluating how to better incentivize families to retain employment. AHFC decided to incorporate former activity 2010-3 into activity 2014-1h and provide incentives related directly to employment as well as a plan to gradually increase family responsibility for rent.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity

No comments at this time.

Summary Table

This activity was never fully developed, so no benchmarks or outcomes are available.

2010-8 Live-In Aides

1. Description

Restructure the live-in aide program to coordinate with the state-funded agencies that provide most of the live-in aides for low-income Alaskans.

Statutory Objective

Increase housing choices for low-income families

MTW Authorization and Need

Attachment C, paragraph D.4 (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 982.316

2. Closure Reason

PIH Notice 2009-22 revised guidance issued in 2008-20. With issuance of revised guidance, the waiver was not needed. Activity completed.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

AHFC never instituted this activity as the PIH notice was issued prior to development or implementation of this activity.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity

No comments at this time.

Summary Table
This activity was never fully developed, so no benchmarks or outcomes are available.

2010-11 Project-Based Voucher Assistance in Transitional Housing

1. Description
Project-base vouchers for no longer than 24 months in transitional housing that serves homeless or hard-to-serve populations. AHFC is serving part of the homeless population through its Returning Home Program (2010-9), Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance Program at Karluk Manor (2012-4), Forget-Me-Not Manor (2018-1), and Dena'ina House (2018-2), Making A Home Program (2013-1), and Empowering Choice Housing Program (2013-2).

Statutory Objective
Increase housing choices for low-income families

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment C, paragraph B.4 (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 983.53

2. Closure Reason
AHFC has not pursued project-based vouchers in a transitional facility as AHFC has targeted voucher funds to specific, vulnerable populations (persons displaced due to domestic violence, persons with disabilities receiving state-funded services, homeless veterans, homeless youth, and two Housing First developments). AHFC continues to speak with its community partners for possible opportunities using this flexibility.

Final Outcomes and Lessons Learned
No comments at this time.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity
No comments at this time.

Summary Table
This activity was never fully developed, so no benchmarks or outcomes are available.

2010-12 Local Preferences

1. Description
Remove a homeless or substandard housing preference from a family that refuses to accept an offer of one or more Public Housing units.

Statutory Objective
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment C, paragraph C.2 (no change)

Regulation Citation
24 CFR 982.205

2. Closure Reason
On July 1, 2012, AHFC altered its application process to remove the availability of preferences in favor of a list that is ranked by date and time of application. AHFC honored those families who applied for a preference-based waiting list. AHFC exhausted its last preference-based waiting list in FY2017. This activity is closed.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned
AHFC had proposed this activity as families with homeless preferences were declining a public housing unit offer while they "waited" for a voucher. AHFC never instituted this activity as we eliminated preferences from all our waiting lists. As those lists were being exhausted and closed, the need for this activity diminished.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity
No comments at this time.

Summary Table
This activity was never fully developed, so no benchmarks or outcomes are available.

2010-14 AHFC Alternate Forms

1. Description
Using HUD forms as a base, develop customized AHFC forms to coincide with MTW activities. All custom forms are forwarded to the MTW coordinator for review.

Statutory Objective
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment C, paragraph D.1 (no change)

2. Closure Reason
As suggested by HUD, this activity is closed with the publication of the FY2015 Annual Plan. AHFC will continue to develop forms that are based on HUD forms and will identify those needed forms as part of each activity.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned
Not applicable. AHFC does continue to develop custom forms for use with activities. Custom forms are submitted as part of AHFC's activities.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity
No comments at this time.

Summary Table
At the time of this activity, no benchmarks or outcomes were developed.

2011-4 Establish a Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance Program

1. Description
Serve additional families through a program that mirrors the Voucher Program with savings from HAP efficiencies.

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment D signed by HUD on January 30, 2012

2. Closure Reason
After advice from the MTW office in 2011, AHFC discovered this was a two-part process. As each opportunity is identified, AHFC will seek individual approval. This activity is closed.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned
Not applicable. AHFC continues to develop specialized programs for difficult-to-house and vulnerable families. As each population is identified, AHFC provides details in each activity.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity
No comments at this time.

Summary Table
At the time of this activity, no benchmarks or outcomes were developed.

2012-3 Waiver of Automatic Termination of HAP Contract

1. Description
Waive HUD regulations at 24 CFR 982.455 that require AHFC automatically terminate a HAP contract 180 days after the last housing assistance payment to the owner.

MTW Authorization and Need
Attachment C, paragraph D.1.a and paragraph D.2.d. (no change)

Regulation Citation

24 CFR 982.455 and language in the Housing Assistance Payments Contract, Part B, Section 4, Term of HAP Contract.

2. Closure Reason

With the implementation of Activity 2014-1 Reasonable Rent and Family Self-Sufficiency Initiative, AHFC provided time-limits to its work-able families. The remaining population, Classic Program families, consist of elderly and disabled families. These are the most vulnerable families, and AHFC does not wish to place restrictions on these families.

This activity is closed as part of the submission of the FY2018 Annual Plan.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

AHFC implemented its rent reform activity prior to implementation of this activity. As a result, no baselines or benchmarks were developed.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity

No comments at this time.

Summary Table

At the time of this activity, no benchmarks or outcomes were developed.

2013-3 Income Limits

1. Description

In order to address community concerns about services to those most disadvantaged due to inadequate access to decent, safe, and sanitary housing, AHFC is proposing to lower its income limits to serve those populations most in need.

Statutory Objective

Increase housing choices for low-income families

MTW Authorization and Need

- Attachment C of the MTW Agreement, paragraph C.5 (Public Housing admission) (no change)
- Attachment C of the MTW Agreement, paragraph D.3 (Housing Choice Voucher admission) (no change)

Regulation Citation

In the Moving to Work Agreement (Section II.D), AHFC agreed to ensure that at least 75 percent of families assisted are very low income (50 percent of area median income) families. AHFC continues to measure this compliance each year as part of its annual reporting process.

2. Closure Reason

This activity has been incorporated into AHFC's Moving to Work planning process. With the implementation of set asides for vulnerable populations, AHFC feels it has addressed the need for affordable housing for its poorest and most vulnerable families.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

AHFC's certification as part of its Annual Report demonstrates that AHFC continues to serve the poorest families in its jurisdictions.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity

No comments at this time.

Summary Table

This was achieved through development of the Empowering Choice Housing Program (Activity 2013-2), Making A Home Program (Activity 2013-1), Moving Home Program (Activity 2010-10), Returning Home Program (Activity 2010-9), and Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance Programs (Activities 2012-4, 2018-1, and 2018-2).

2014-2 Use of TIC Sheets for PBV Income Calculations

1. Description

For project-based voucher (PBV) developments that also utilize Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program financing, AHFC would like to substitute the LIHTC Tenant Income Certification (TIC) for income and asset verification and determination of subsidy.

Statutory Objective

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures

MTW Authorization and Need

Attachment C, paragraph D.2.a. and paragraph D.3. (no change)

Requested Regulation Waiver

HUD regulations at 24 CFR 983.2(c)(6)(ii) which refers to 24 CFR 982.516.

2. Closure Reason

AHFC began talks with the operator for its project-based vouchers and discovered after further consultation that AHFC staff would prefer to mirror traditional Classic and Step Program calculations for ease of administration. AHFC began the process of converting its current traditional project-based voucher families to a streamlined rent calculation instead.

This activity is closed as part of the submission of the FY2018 Annual Plan.

Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

Initial cooperation with third-party managers of properties with project-based vouchers demonstrated that this might be an administrative efficiency that AHFC could implement. Further discussions with these managers after implementation of rent reform revealed that these managers liked AHFC's Classic and Step program models. AHFC has since implemented these models for new developments (Ridgeline Terrace and Susitna Square) and implemented the streamlined calculation method (2014-1h) for existing project-based locations.

Describe any Statutory Exceptions that Might Have Provided Benefit to Activity
No comments at this time.

Summary Table
At the time of this activity, no benchmarks or outcomes were developed.

V. MTW Sources and Uses of Funds

A. Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

A.1 Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

These are being submitted electronically to HUD in accordance with the Financial Assessment System guidelines.

A.2 Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

These are being submitted electronically to HUD in accordance with the Financial Assessment System guidelines.

A.3 Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

AHFC is not using this flexibility at this time.

B. Local Asset Management Plan

B.1 Did the MTW PHA allocate costs within statute in the Plan Year?

Yes

B.2 Did the MTW PHA implement a local asset management plan (LAMP) in the Plan Year?

No

B.3 Did the MTW PHA provide a LAMP in the appendix?

No

B.4 If the MTW PHA has provided a LAMP in the appendix, please provide a brief update on implementation of the LAMP.

Not applicable.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Reviews, Audits, and Inspections

A.1 Office of Housing Choice Voucher Programs Quality Assurance Division Review

In July 2017, the Office of Housing Choice Voucher Programs Quality Assurance Division conducted a Moving to Work Restricted Net Position (RNP) and Cash Validation Review at AHFC. The primary purpose of this review was to determine the total amount of HCV housing assistance payment originated funds that remain unexpended and may be available to be transitioned to the HUD Held Reserves (HHR). The scope of the review covered the following:

- Determining the portion of the AHFC MTW assets which represent the HCV HAP originated Restricted Net Position as of March 2016, June 2016, September 2016, December 2016, March 2017, and April 2017
- Determining the portion of the MTW restricted cash that may be transitioned to the HHR as per the U.S. Department of Treasury cash management requirements
- Determining the appropriateness of non-HAP expenses paid using HAP funds
- Evaluating current and non-current liabilities that are impacting the calculated HCV RNP and cash available account balances

The report contains no findings or concerns.

A.2 External Auditors

AHFC's 2018 fiscal year was audited by BDO USA, LLP. As part of this audit, a sampling of program files from the public housing, housing choice voucher, and multifamily housing programs were selected for review. AHFC received a clean opinion that showed no material weaknesses or findings.

A.3 Internal Auditors

AHFC's Internal Audit department conducted the following audits of Public Housing Program locations and programs:

- Fairbanks Asset Management Property 275, Multifamily property Golden Towers, and the Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Ketchikan Asset Management Property 279
- Jumpstart Program

B. Evaluation Results

B.1 Internal Quality Assurance

In addition to the regular (biannual) reviews submitted by staff for the periods July through December and January through June, PHD Quality Assurance conducted the following independent reviews during this period.

- Anchorage Asset Management Property 271
- Anchorage Asset Management Property 274
- Anchorage Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Bethel Asset Management Property 257
- Cordova Asset Management Property 216
- Homer Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Ketchikan Asset Management Property 279 and Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Kodiak Asset Management Property 265 and Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Nome Asset Management Property 260
- Petersburg Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Seward Multifamily Housing Property Glacier View
- Soldotna Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Valdez Asset Management Property 263 and Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Wasilla Asset Management Property 244 and Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Wrangell Asset Management Property 213 and Housing Choice Voucher Program

PHD Quality Assurance conducted the following independent reviews of our partners:

- Homer – MainTree Apartments (project-based vouchers)
- Anchorage
  - Adelaide Apartments (S8 Moderate Rehabilitation SRO)
  - Loussac Place (project-based vouchers)
  - Ridgeline Terrace (project-based vouchers)
  - Susitna Square (project-based vouchers)
  - Karluk Manor (sponsor-based rental assistance eligibility and administration and supervisory Housing Quality Standards inspections)

PHD Quality Assurance also conducted a new hire reviews for six employees working in the Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs.

B.2 Step Program Evaluation

The goals of the evaluation are to maintain a systematic approach to collecting, analyzing, and using information to answer key questions about Step's efficiency and efficacy. Main areas of focus include housing income changes and employment status, current and projected shelter burden, and identification of data gaps and program recommendations.

The evaluation, conducted quarterly, measures current program data against baselines obtained in September 2014. AHFC utilizes household shelter burden (housing costs compared to income) as a measure of housing affordability. The evaluation looks at data for the entire Step population (all families participating in the quarter) with specific sub-populations (Rural, Economic Impact Areas, Single Caregivers with more than Two Children and Families who Transitioned into Step with implementation of the program).

Household Income
As of June 30, 2018, average household income for Step participants has increased 50% (from $19,929 to $29,817) and average household earned income has increased 74% (from $11,997 to $20,775). Families reporting full-time employment (at least 32 hours per week at minimum wage), has increased from 40% to 56%. Families reporting at least part-time employment have increased from 54% to 71%.

Shelter Burden
As of June 30, 2018, current average household shelter burden, for all Step households equaled 29.3 percent. Anticipated average shelter burden at program exit for all participants was anticipated to be 51.4%. For the subgroup of households nearing end of participation in the 5 year program, (those who are in the 4th and 5th year) shelter burden at exit is anticipated to be 46.7 percent.

At Risk Families
Three of the four groups (Rural communities, Economic Impact Areas, and those families who transitioned into the program in 2014) are achieving income gains and anticipated shelter burden at approximately the same, or better, rate as the Step population as a whole. One group, Single Caregivers with 2 or more Dependents (Single Caregivers), identified as potentially needing greater case management support and time to achieve self-sufficiency. These families are now referred to Jumpstart for assistance earlier in their participation. As of June 30, 2018, anticipated average shelter burden at exit for this sub-population was anticipated to be the greatest at 65.5%. AHFC has formed a task force to explore an additional hardship process for families not ready to enter the private market at the end of Year 5.

Jumpstart
Families identified through the examination or hardship process as anticipated to pay a 50% or greater shelter burden are referred to Jumpstart (AHFC's self-sufficiency program) for case management support and financial incentives. During the initial five years of a family's Step participation, Jumpstart is voluntary. Step program enrollment on June 30, 2018 was 19 percent of Step households.

B.3 Organizational Review

AHFC's rent reform activity resulted in the need for PHD to examine its internal organization and structure to best support its frontline staff. AHFC engaged a consultant to help identify its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. A reorganization of the Public Housing Division was completed.

PHD also conducted strategic planning sessions to develop PHD's vision, mission statement, and goals. The current voucher allocation task force is part of this process.

C. MTW Statutory Requirement Certification

For FY2018, AHFC admitted 1,005 new families from the waiting lists. Of those:

- 818 (81.4 %) were extremely low income (30 percent of area median income)
- 172 (17.1 %) were very low income (50 percent of area median income)
- 15 (1.5 %) were low income (greater than 50 percent and less than 80 percent of area median income)

Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) certifies:

> At least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families;
>
> We continue to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined;
>
> A comparable mix of families (by family size) is served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

D. MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data

Not applicable.

E. Appendix

E.1 Alaska Corporation for Affordable Housing (ACAH)

The Alaska Corporation for Affordable Housing (ACAH) is a nonprofit subsidiary of the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation formed for the acquisition, development, management, or operation of affordable housing. ACAH's purpose is to undertake the types of affordable housing and services that are not open to AHFC directly, but which support AHFC's mission of providing affordable housing and services to individuals and groups in need. Properties developed through ACAH are positioned to leverage private sector resources such as low-income housing tax credits and debt financing.

During this period, ACAH hired an operations and development manager to direct the operations of ACAH and investigate affordable housing opportunities in the state. ACAH is actively researching available funding, partners, and opportunities for additional affordable housing developments.

E.2 Non-MTW Activities

AHFC submits these activities to its Board of Directors for approval as part of its overall Plan. These activities fall within current authority granted under HUD regulations and do not require HUD MTW approval.

2011N-6 Elder Housing Preference

Description

Mimic the policies governing the Section 8 Multifamily project-based assistance units that AHFC owns and operates to allow for an elderly super-preference, with a clause reserving at least ten percent of the units for younger, disabled households.

Status

AHFC is monitoring its use of the “super elderly” preference at its buildings in Fairbanks and Anchorage. AHFC will be investigating elder/disabled buildings in other communities to research if this option is appropriate for those communities. Activity is ongoing.