

SUBMITTED JUNE 11, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Introduction	2
II	General Housing Authority Operating Information	4
III	Proposed MTW Activities	12
IV	Approved MTW Activities	12
V	Sources and Uses of Funds	47
VI	Administrative	48

I. INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF MTW GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This 2019 Annual Report highlights the activities of Boulder Housing Partners (BHP) in our eighth year as a participant in the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program. We continued monitoring our current activities in 2019, as no new activities were proposed or implemented. All approved activities are now implemented.

Over the years under MTW, BHP has:

- implemented rent reform for households who are elderly and/or persons with a disability
- simplified the recertification tools for all households
- eliminated the 40% cap of income towards rent for Housing Choice voucher holders
- simplified the utility allowance schedule for Housing Choice voucher households
- eliminated the utility reimbursement payments
- tied the Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection to the recertification cycle (triennially for all elderly and disabled families, biennially for all work-able families)
- strengthened our partnership with the Safehouse Progressive Alliance for Non-Violence (SPAN) to offer housing and services to victims of domestic violence
- used Replacement Housing Factor Funds (RHFF) to create 1175 Lee Hill, a 31-unit community to house the chronically homeless
- increased efficient use of federal dollars by allowing project-based voucher rents to be set internally using three external factors
- increased success of the Family Self Sufficiency program by changing mobility options
- implemented a flat tiered rent structure and biennial recertifications for our Housing Choice work-able families
- eliminated the need for all Housing Choice families to report income increases prior to their next regularly scheduled recertification
- ensured that all public housing families are paying rent according to their income by eliminating the option to choose the flat rent
- created a Development and Acquisition Fund which to date has allowed us to purchase 20 additional units of affordable housing and 5.25 acres of land for future development

- converted 279 units of public housing through Section 18 Disposition and the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program, while creating 3 new community centers and renovating all units to like-new conditions
- created a new program, Bringing School Home, where we focus on families with children under the age of 6 and offer services so these children are school-ready by kindergarten

OVERVIEW OF BHP'S LONG-TERM VISION FOR THE MTW PROGRAM

As described in full detail in the 2019 MTW Annual Plan, Boulder Housing Partners will be focusing on three main areas in the coming years:

Bringing School Home

Transforming Bureaucracy

Increasing Housing Choice

Bringing School Home: Disrupting the Cycle of Poverty

We continue to focus on this very big idea and we believe that poverty continues to be a bar to learning and that quality affordable housing can change that. Focusing on the success we have shared with the I Have a Dream Foundation, BHP is taking that program to a new level by expanding services to include children at an even younger age (0 to 5). We believe that we can break the cycle of poverty in two generations by focusing on families with young children and providing services to the entire family.

Transforming Bureaucracy: People, Not Paper

We believe housing programs should be focused on the people they serve, not the paperwork required. By creating efficiencies and streamlining the processes involved in admitting qualified households to the programs, BHP strives to free up staff time to focus on the people and their needs to be self-sufficient throughout every stage of life.

Increase Housing Choice

BHP's strategic plan calls for contributing 2,000 units to the city of Boulder's affordable housing stock over 10 years. We will use every tool available to us to make this happen which includes our MTW funding flexibility.

II. GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION

A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION

i. Actual New Project Based Vouchers

Tenant-based vouchers that the MTW PHA project-based for the first time during the Plan Year. These include only those in which at least an Agreement to enter into a Housing Assistance Payment (AHAP) was in place by the end of the Plan Year. Indicate whether the unit is included in the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD).

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF VOUCHERS NEWLY PROJECT-BASED		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
	0	0			

Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based

* Figures in the "Planned" column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

** Select "Status at the End of Plan Year" from: Committed, Leased/Issued

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

N/A

ii. Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers

Tenant-based vouchers that the MTW PHA is currently project-basing in the Plan Year. These include only those in which at least an AHAP was in place by the beginning of the Plan Year. Indicate whether the unit is included in RAD.

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
1175 Lee Hill	31	31	Leased/Issued	No	Permanently supportive housing for the chronically homeless
Broadway East	44	44	Leased/Issued	No	Public housing units converted in 2006
Diagonal Court	30	30	Leased/Issued	Yes	Public housing units converted in 2015
Holiday McKinney	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Permanently supportive housing for the chronically homeless
Iris Hawthorn	14	14	Leased/Issued	Yes	Public housing units converted in 2015
Kalmia	49	49	Leased/Issued	No	Public housing units converted in 2015
Manhattan	41	41	Leased/Issued	Yes	Public housing units converted in 2015
Northport	50	50	Leased/Issued	Yes	Public housing units converted in 2015
Walnut Place	95	95	Leased/Issued	No	Public housing units converted in 2015
Woodlands	35	35	Leased/Issued	No	Family Self Sufficiency Program with a partner agency

399	399
-----	-----

Planned/Actual Total Existing Project-Based Vouchers

* Figures and text in the “Planned” column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

** Select “Status at the End of Plan Year” from: Committed, Leased/Issued

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

N/A

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

Examples of the types of other changes can include (but are not limited to): units held off-line due to relocation or substantial rehabilitation, local, non-traditional units to be acquired/developed, etc.

ACTUAL OTHER CHANGES TO MTW HOUSING STOCK IN THE PLAN YEAR

BHP acquired 5 units of local, non-traditional units in 2019. BHP submitted a Public Housing Disposition Application in 2018 for 34 units of Public Housing at our Madison property. BHP received approval to disposition the Madison property on May 13, 2019. Actual disposition will occur in 2020.

iv. General Description of All Actual Capital Expenditures During the Plan Year

Narrative general description of all actual capital expenditures of MTW funds during the Plan Year.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALL ACTUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES DURING THE PLAN YEAR

BHP spent a total of \$1,674,529 in 2019: \$1,925 at Arapahoe Court for replacement decks; \$225,779 to support normal operations of Public Housing and MTW Activities and \$1,446,825 to acquire 5 units of local, non-traditional affordable housing.

B. LEASING INFORMATION

i. Actual Number of Households Served

Snapshot and unit month information on the number of households the MTW PHA actually served at the end of the Plan Year.

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED THROUGH:	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED**	
	Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
MTW Public Housing Units Leased	564	552	47	46
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized	10,692	9,919	891	827
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based	120	202	10	17
Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership	0	0	0	0
	11,376	10,673	948	890

Planned/Actual Totals

* "Planned Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased" is the total number of months the MTW PHA planned to have leased/occupied in each category throughout the full Plan Year (as shown in the Annual MTW Plan).

** "Planned Number of Households to be Served" is calculated by dividing the "Planned Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased" by the number of months in the Plan Year (as shown in the Annual MTW Plan).

^^ Figures and text in the "Planned" column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

Please describe any differences between the planned and actual households served:

Housing Choice Voucher utilization averaged 93% for the entire year. Turnover was higher than anticipated from the previous year and only small gains were made over the course of the year. Additional local, non-traditional units were acquired that had not been anticipated.

LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL CATEGORY	MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TO BE SERVED*	
		Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
Tenant-Based	N/A	0	0	0	0
Property-Based	2015-1 Affordable housing acquisition and development fund	120	202	10	17
Homeownership	N/A	0	0	0	0
Planned/Actual Totals		120	202	10	17

* The sum of the figures provided should match the totals provided for each Local, Non-Traditional category in the previous table. Figures should be given by individual activity. Multiple entries may be made for each category if applicable.

^^ Figures and text in the "Planned" column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

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

ii. 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	Households served represents an occupancy rate of 98%.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Households served shows an annual utilization rate of 93%. There was a higher than normal attrition rate in late 2018. Gains in utilization have been made and will continue to be the focus in 2020.
Local, Non-Traditional	Due to the housing market in Boulder, BHP cannot predict how many units will be acquired each year.

C. WAITING LIST INFORMATION

i. Actual Waiting List Information

Snapshot information on the actual status of MTW waiting lists at the end of the Plan Year. The “Description” column should detail the structure of the waiting list and the population(s) served.

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
Arapahoe Court	PH site-based list	526	Closed	No
Madison	PH site-based list	844	Closed	Yes
HCV Lottery	Lottery for HCV	0	Closed	Yes

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:

There are 393 applicants that are on the 1 bedroom wait list for both Arapahoe Court and Madison.

ii. 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
Arapahoe Court/Madison	Madison was open for three days in February 2019.
HCV Lottery	Lottery was open for three days in June 2019.

D. INFORMATION ON STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND REQUIREMENTS

i. 75% of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory requirement that at least 75% of the households assisted by the MTW PHA are very low income for MTW public housing units and MTW HCVs through HUD systems. The MTW PHA should provide data for the actual families housed upon admission during the PHA’s Plan Year reported in the “Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based”; “Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based”; and “Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership” categories. Do not include households reported in the “Local, Non-Traditional Services Only” category.

INCOME LEVEL	NUMBER OF LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL HOUSEHOLDS ADMITTED IN THE PLAN YEAR
80%-50% Area Median Income	4
49%-30% Area Median Income	7
Below 30% Area Median Income	5

16

Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted

ii. Maintain Comparable Mix

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory requirement that MTW PHAs continue to serve a comparable mix of families by family size by first assessing a baseline mix of family sizes served by the MTW PHA prior to entry into the MTW demonstration (or the closest date with available data) and compare that to the current mix of family sizes served during the Plan Year.

BASELINE MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (upon entry to MTW)					
FAMILY SIZE	OCCUPIED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS	UTILIZED HCVs	NON-MTW ADJUSTMENTS*	BASELINE MIX NUMBER	BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE
1 Person	188	268	0	456	49.03%
2 Person	17	145	0	162	17.42%
3 Person	23	61	0	84	9.03%
4 Person	46	66	0	112	12.04%
5 Person	46	42	0	88	9.46%
6+ Person	10	18	0	28	3.01%
TOTAL	330	600	0	930	100.00%

* “Non-MTW Adjustments” are defined as factors that are outside the control of the MTW PHA. An example of an acceptable “Non-MTW Adjustment” would include demographic changes in the community’s overall population. If the MTW PHA includes “Non-MTW Adjustments,” a thorough justification, including information substantiating the numbers given, should be included below.

Please describe the justification for any “Non-MTW Adjustments” given above:

No adjustments have been made to the baseline. In 2015, BHP converted 283 units of public housing to housing choice vouchers. These households are now included under the Housing Choice voucher program.

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	49%	461	50%	1%
2 Person	17%	152	16%	-6%
3 Person	9%	83	9%	-1%
4 Person	12%	68	7%	-39%
5 Person	9%	48	5%	-45%
6+ Person	3%	40	4%	43%
TOTAL	100%	852	92%	-8%

** The “Baseline Mix Percentage” figures given in the “Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)” table should match those in the column of the same name in the “Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)” table.

^ The “Total” in the “Number of Households Served in Plan Year” column should match the “Actual Total” box in the “Actual Number of Households Served in the Plan Year” table in Section II.B.i of this Annual MTW Report.

^^ The percentages in this column should be calculated by dividing the number in the prior column for each family size by the “Total” number of households served in the Plan Year. These percentages will reflect adjustment to the mix of families served that are due to the decisions of the MTW PHA. Justification of percentages in the current Plan Year that vary by more than 5% from the Baseline Year must be provided below.

Please describe the justification for any variances of more than 5% between the Plan Year and Baseline Year:

BHP has made no decisions to directly affect the changes to the mix of families served. New households are admitted to the Housing Choice Voucher program based on a lottery system.

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

Number of households, across MTW activities, that were transitioned to the MTW PHA’s local definition of self-sufficiency during the Plan Year.

MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY*	MTW PHA LOCAL DEFINITION OF SELF SUFFICIENCY
2013-3 Partnership with SPAN	0	Moving to market rate or homeownership
2016-1 Flat tier rent for work able families	3	Moving to market rate or homeownership
2016-2 Rent reform for elderly and persons with disabilities households	0	Moving to market rate or homeownership
2016-4 Bringing School Home Referral Process	0	Moving to market rate or homeownership
	0	<i>(Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities)</i>
Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency	3	

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

III. PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES

All proposed activities that have been granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as 'Approved Activities'.

IV. APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES

IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY 2012–4

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2012–4, Rent Simplifications for all Households, was approved and implemented in 2012. The activity has not been amended.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

The goal of this activity was to implement a series of changes to simplify the income and asset verification process for all families. This activity:

- allows households to provide asset and income documentation;
- excludes income from assets and allows for self–certification of assets that total \$50,000 or less; and
- limits total household assets to \$50,000 or less upon admission to the public housing and Housing Choice programs.

This was not a rent reform activity and no hardship created. However, an exception policy was created in relation to the asset limit upon admission. If households qualify for the exception based on five criteria, they are allowed admission to the program. The five criteria include: household is classified as elderly or a persons with a disability; they do not own any real estate; the assets only include money in a bank account (savings, money market, etc.); they plan to use the asset for assisted living in the future; and they are currently living on no income or a fixed income. In 2019, 10 households were denied admission for having total assets valuing more than \$50,000. Three qualified for the exception, two did not qualify for the exception and five did not submit an exception request. There were 166 new admissions to the programs (6 to the public housing program and 160 to the Housing Choice Voucher Program).

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) asset income calculation	\$1,677 (64.5 hours x \$26 average per hour)	\$671 (Reduction of 60%)	2019 - \$364.50	Yes, reduction of \$1,312.50 or 79%
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) asset income calculation	64.5 staff hours (86 households x 45 minutes on average)	25.8 hours (Reduction of 60%)	2019 – 13.5 hours (18 households)	Yes, reduction of 51 hours or 79%
CE #3 – Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease)	5% Potential for error	3% reduction in potential for error	2% (18 households have assets over \$50,000) Reduction of 79% potential for errors	Potential for error reduced to 2%

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

There have not been any challenges in achieving the benchmarks that were laid out.

ACTIVITY 2012–5

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2012–5, Elimination of the 40% of Income Cap in the voucher program, was approved and implemented in 2012. This activity has not been amended.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

The goal of this activity is to provide more rental choices to Housing Choice voucher holders by eliminating the 40% of income towards rent cap when they initially lease up. In 2019, 13 families rented a unit where their portion of the rent was more than 40%. The average

rent burden for these 13 families is 60%. One household is paying 100% of their income towards rent (the only source of income is self-employment).

Since implementation of this activity in 2012, we have had a total of 98 households lease up with their rent burden being more than 40% of their income towards rent. When households choose to do this, they sign an agreement that confirms their understanding that they will lose their housing assistance if they are evicted for non-payment of rent. Not one household has lost their assistance since this choice has been offered.

This was not a rent reform activity and no hardship created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
HC #5 – Number of households able to move to a better unit as a result of the activity (increase)	Zero	2% or 17 households per year	2019 – 13 households	No

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

In 2019, the benchmark was not achieved. Because the number of voucher holders who exercise this option is dependent on many factors, including whether voucher holders decide to move to another unit, where they choose to lease up, how much they are willing to pay, etc., we do not always achieve the benchmark.

ACTIVITY 2012–6

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2012–6, Implement a Flat Utility Allowance for the voucher program, was approved and implemented in 2012. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity was designed to increase voucher holders’ ease of understanding of the rent calculation and how utilities affect the maximum contract rent allowed. Implementation of this activity continues to allow for less time spent during the initial briefing to explain the utility allowance. This activity did not involve rent reform and no hardship was created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) explanation of utility allowance in briefings	\$20/briefing (45 minutes x \$26 hour)	\$15 (25% reduction)	\$10/briefing (22 minutes x \$26 hour)	Yes
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Average of 45 minutes per briefing	34 minutes (25% reduction)	Average of 22 minutes per briefing	Yes
CE #3 – Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease)	5% potential for error	0% reduce to zero	0%	Yes
CE #5 – Tenant Rent Share in dollars (increase)	Average utility allowance in 2011 was \$70	Reduction of \$6 for the average utility allowance	Average utility allowance was \$63, reduction of \$7 or 10%	This outcome was achieved in 2012

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The benchmarks have been achieved and will continue to allow less time spent explaining the utility allowance.

ACTIVITY 2013–1

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2013–1, Housing Quality Standards Inspection Schedule, was written to replace Activity 2012–7 and was approved and implemented in 2013. No other amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity aligns the HQS inspection with the recertification schedule. Beginning in 2013, for all households who are elderly or a person with disabilities, the inspection schedule now follows the recertification schedule which is conducted every three years. Beginning in 2014, when Activity 2014–1 was implemented, inspections for the work-able family households were lined up with the biennial recertification schedule. This was not a rent reform activity; no hardship was created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) inspections following the recertification schedule	2012: \$26,425 (755 inspections x \$35 per inspection)	\$8,720 (Reduction of 66%)	2019 – \$9,625 (275 inspections) 64% reduction;	No
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Inspections are conducted by an outside contractor	N/A	N/A	N/A – savings relate to cost of outside contractor, not staff

CE #3 – Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease)	Activity not designed to reduce errors	N/A	N/A	N/A – savings relate to cost of outside contractor, not staff
--	--	-----	-----	---

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The benchmark was not achieved this year, but we were very close. This number fluctuates from year to year based on the number of work-abled families we have on the program, as they are recertified every two years, versus every three years for households who are elderly or a persons with a disability.

ACTIVITY 2013–2

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2013–2, Eliminate Utility Reimbursement Payments, was approved and implemented in 2013. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

The focus of this activity was to ensure that all public housing residents and Housing Choice Voucher participants are contributing towards their rental payment (or at a minimum to ensure that residents and participants are not receiving payments to live on housing assistance). Households who were receiving a utility reimbursement payment (URP) in April 2013 continued to receive one through March 2014, unless there was a change in their circumstances that resulted in no URP. No new instances of URP were allowed after April 1, 2013. Households met with their Voucher Specialist within the first three months of implementation. Reminders with information on utility use and grants were sent in October 2013 and January 2014. There were 12 households who were still receiving URP as of March 31, 2014, and it was eliminated as of as of April 1, 2014, when the hardship ended.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) elimination of utility reimbursement payments	\$12,396 (cost of 42 URP as of 4/1/2013) \$247 (cost to mail 42 URPs each month)	Zero	Zero	Yes, outcome achieved in 2014
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	84 staff hours (42 checks x 10 minutes per check to print, stuff and mail)	Zero	Zero as of 4/1/14	Yes, outcome achieved in 2014
CE #3 – Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease)	This activity was not designed to eliminate errors	N/A	N/A	N/A
CE #5 – Tenant Rent Share in dollars (increase)	Participants receiving a utility reimbursement had a tenant rent share of zero	No change anticipated	Tenant rent share remains at zero; however, they no longer receive the utility reimbursement payment to pay for their utilities	Yes, outcome achieved in 2014

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The benchmarks for this activity were achieved in 2014 when elimination of all utility reimbursement payments occurred.

ACTIVITY 2013–3

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2013–2, Local Voucher Program in Partnership with Safehouse Progressive Alliance for Nonviolence (SPAN), was approved and implemented in 2013. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity focuses on continuing BHP’s partnership with SPAN, which provides eight families who are victims of domestic violence with housing assistance through BHP and case management services through SPAN. This activity allows BHP to use vouchers for transitional housing.

On January 1, 2019, we had eight families participating in this program. We had four families successfully leave the program in 2019 and transition to the Housing Choice Voucher Program. We added four new participants and on December 31, 2013 had eight families participating in the program: one who entered the program in 2016 and was eligible for graduation in 2019 (but has not yet graduated), three who entered the program in 2018 and will be eligible for graduation in 2020, and the four who entered this year and will eligible for graduation in 2020.

This was not a rent reform activity and no hardship created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #4 – Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)	Zero, prior to this activity, no households were receiving services	\$16,000 (\$2,000 per household x 8 households)	2019 - \$18,000	Yes

SS #5 – Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase)	Zero	8	8	Yes
SS #8 – Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). Self-sufficiency defined as exiting program and moving into market rental or home ownership	Zero	4 in 2019	4	Yes
HC #3 – Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease)	12 months	6 months (Reduce by 50% based on this being a two-year transitional program)	2019 – decrease of 33% (8 months)	No
HC #5 – Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	Zero	8	8	Yes, these families are victims of domestic violence, therefore all have moved to better situations and units

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metric or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The benchmark for reduction in time on the waiting list was not met in 2019. This can be a moving target based on the availability of vouchers and units to accept vouchers and finding applicants who are ready for this program and able to move in when a voucher is available.

ACTIVITY 2013–4

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2013–4, Use of Replacement Housing Factor Funds for Other Housing, was approved and implemented in 2013. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity allows BHP to use Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Funds to build other affordable housing units. In 2013, BHP used RHF Funds at 1175 Lee Hill, a 31–unit community for chronically homeless using the Housing First model. Construction began in 2013, with full completion and full occupancy in November 2014.

With the disposition of 148 public housing units in 2015, BHP anticipates receiving Demolition or Disposition Transitional Funding in 2016 and will use those funds for other local affordable housing opportunities. BHP no longer receives RHF Funds, therefore no fund were used in 2019.

This was not a rent reform activity and no hardship was created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #4 – Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)	Zero	For all other years, benchmark is zero, activity is opportunity driven and no benchmark can accurately be set beyond the initial year. 2013 – \$7,433,805	2019 – 0; 2018 - \$524,713; 2017 – \$0; 2016 – \$0; 2015 – \$0; 2014 – \$0; 2013 – \$7,433,805 for 1175 Lee Hill	Yes

HC #1 – Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase)	Zero	2013 – 31	2019 – 0; 2018 – 0; 2017 – 0; 2016 – 0; 2015 – 0; 2014 – 31 new units for chronically homeless at 1175 Lee Hill	Yes
HC #2 – Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase)	Zero	Zero	2019 – 0; 2018 – 1.6 units; 2017 – 0; 2016 – 0; 2015 – 0; 2014 – 0	Yes
HC #5 – Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	2014 – 31 households	2014 – 31	2019 – 0; 2018 – 0; 2017 – 0; 2016 – 0; 2015 – 0; 2014 – 31 formerly homeless households housed at 1175 Lee Hill	Yes

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metric or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

Due to the timing of receipt of the funds and the nature of this being a market-driven opportunity, units will be added as the opportunity arises.

ACTIVITY 2014-4

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2014-4 Removed the Flat Rent Option for all Public Housing Households. This activity was approved and implemented in 2014. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity was implemented for families in 2014 and removed the option for families to choose to pay the flat rent when the rent portion based on income was higher than the flat rent. When implemented, families were given six-months’ notice of the rent amount they would pay under this activity. No further hardships have been granted.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #5 – PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase)	\$5,544	\$8,292	0	No

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

In 2015, 288 of the total 337 public housing units were converted to project-based vouchers. Benchmarks for this activity were reset in 2016 for the remaining 49 public housing units.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

In 2015, 288 of the total 337 public housing units were converted to project-based vouchers. Benchmarks for this activity were reset in 2016 for the remaining 49 public housing units. The FY2014 Appropriations Act required PHAs to establish flat rents at no less than 80% of the applicable Fair Market Rent. This increased the flat rents that had been set by BHP and in 2019 there were no families whose income set their rent at higher than the flat rent. We believe this trend will continue; however, we wish to continue to have the activity in place for situations where income does establish a rent higher than the flat rent. Once disposition of the remaining 49 units of public housing is granted, this activity will no longer be applicable.

ACTIVITY 2014–5

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2014-5 Changes the Mobility Options for Families who live at Woodlands, a project-based voucher community, and participate in the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program. This activity was approved and implemented in 2014. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

To request the next available voucher and move out of Woodlands, families must stay a minimum of three years (except in extenuating circumstances). Upon successful graduation from FSS, they must leave Woodlands, and may go with a voucher if the family continues to need housing assistance. In 2019, we had 11 households move out of Woodlands, nine of which were successful graduations (one household was terminated from the program and one transferred out of the program without graduating due to VAWA issues). Of the nine successful graduations, eight of them earned escrow while participating, with payouts totaling \$104,005.54. Seven of the nine did not need the voucher upon graduation (one purchased a home), and two left with a voucher. Households may request an exemption from the three-year rule for extenuating circumstances. In 2019, there were no requests.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) applicant processing	\$780 (30 hours x \$26 per hour average)	\$390 (15 hours x \$26 per hour average)	\$1,430 (55 hours x \$26 per hours on average)	No

CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	30 total hours (5 hours on average x 6 families)	15 total hours (5 hours on average x 3 successful graduations)	55 total hours (5 hours on average x 11 move ins)	No
HC #3 – Average time on FSS wait list in months (decrease)	10.3 months	Decrease of one month	2019 – decrease of 0.4 months (9.9 months)	No

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The benchmarks are dependent on the number of graduations that occur each year, which is outside our control.

ACTIVITY 2015–1

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2015-1 allows BHP to create an Affordable Housing Acquisition and Development Fund. This activity was approved and implemented in 2015. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity allows BHP to use MTW funds to pursue opportunities in the city of Boulder to build new rental units as well as acquire existing land and/or units to increase the number of affordable housing units.

This activity is very dependent on available market opportunities. In 2018, BHP acquired an apartment complex using a variety of sources, including a Line of Credit. In 2019, BHP spent \$1,446,825 of MTW funds to finance the repayment of the Line of Credit which

equates to 5 units (Twenty37). This property is part of BHP's Affordable Housing Program and targets households earning less than 60% AMI.

This was is not a rent reform activity and no hardship was created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
HC #1 – Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase).	Zero	Zero	2019 – 5 units; 2018 – 10.6 units; 2017 – 4.4 units; 2016 – 6 apartments, and 5.25 acres of land; 2015 – 0	Yes
HC #2 – Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase).	Zero	Zero	2019 – 0; 2018 – 0; 2017 – 0; 2016 – 0; 2015 – 0	Yes
HC #5 – Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	Zero	Zero	2019 – 0; 2018 – 0; 2017 – 0; 2016 – 0; 2015 – 0	Yes
CE #4 – Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)	Zero	Zero	2019 – 0 2018 - \$5,030,545; 2017 – \$4,565,559; 2016 – \$781,469; 2015 – 0	Yes

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The success of this activity is dependent on timing and availability of funds and market-driven opportunities. Benchmarks are all set at zero, as it is impossible to predict in any given year the number of units we may be able to acquire or develop.

ACTIVITY 2016–1

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2016-1 replaced and amended Activity 2014–1: Rent Reform for Housing Choice Work-able Families. The activity was approved and implemented in 2016. No other amendments have been made to this activity since 2016.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity is aimed specifically at Work-able Families in the Housing Choice Voucher Program. The elements included in this rent reform are:

- *Flat tiered rent system*: total tenant payment is calculated using a two–step system. The family size and gross income place the family into an income tier. The income tier and the size of the unit determine the total tenant payment for the family. From this amount, if applicable, the utility allowance is subtracted, a flat fee per ineligible family member is added, and any amount the gross rent exceeds the payment standard is added.
- *Minimum rent*: the minimum rent is based on bedroom size and ranges from \$120 for a zero bedroom to \$180 for a four bedroom.
- *Biennial recertification*: households are recertified every two years.

- *No interim recertification*: all interim recertifications were eliminated except for family composition or status changes, or if the family moves. If the household is claiming income that places them in the lowest income tier, all increases in income must be reported until the family's income places them into income tier two.
- *Flat fee per ineligible family member*: for those household members who are not legally eligible to receive housing assistance, a flat fee of \$125 per member per month is added to their total tenant payment.
- *Annual income*: The manner in which income is calculated was also changed under this activity and is now considered as either (1) current, stable income or (2) past two-year history of income. If a family reports zero income at the time of recertification, and there is a history of income, an average of the past two years is calculated.

For the work-able families that were recertified in 2019 (and are the project-based voucher group), there was an average increase in income of 55.1% for this group (from \$20,494 to \$31,788), which resulted in an 89.5% increase in average tenant rent. Average rent burden for these families is 35%. In 2019, we had nine households whose income put their rent above the contract rent and three voluntarily gave up the voucher.

There were two different hardship cases for this activity.

- *Maximum rent increases*: In 2017, all hardships for this group of work-able families were discontinued due to experiencing a change in family composition, income, contract rent increases, moving from one unit to another, or leaving the program. No further hardships were granted for this group.
- *No interim recertification*: In 2019, we received 32 requests for an interim recertification due to loss of income. Of these 32 requests, 8 were approved for an interim to be processed and their rent portion was adjusted accordingly. Of the 24 that were denied, two families were referred to the Safety Net Program and one did contact our partner agency and received multi-month assistance in the amount of \$1,000 total.

There are two sets of metrics for this activity, each set relates to a different group. When the activity was originally implemented in 2014, it included the tenant-based voucher work-able families along with our Broadway East (project-based voucher) family site. The baselines for this group were set in 2014 and outcomes will be reported every even year, in which the recertification takes place. The second set of metrics applies to the converted public housing work-able families. This group was originally transitioned to the flat tier rent system in October 2015. Baselines reflect the data as of 12/31/2015 for this group.

Metrics for tenant-based voucher work-able families who were recertified effective June 1, 2018. Baseline reflect the data as of 12/31/2014. There are no updates to these metrics in this 2019 report.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task (decrease)	\$21,684 (834 staff hours x \$26 per hour)	\$13,010 (40% reduction over the two-year recertification period)	2018 result - \$15,912	No
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	834 total staff hours (3 staff hours per recertification X 278 recertifications)	500 hours (40% reduction over the two-year recertification period)	2018 result – 612	No
CE #5 – Tenant Rent Share in dollars (increase)	\$341 (this number is prior to any rent reform being implemented)	\$365 (Increase of no more than 7%)	2018 result – \$674, increase of 90%	No
SS #1 – Increase in household income	\$16,073 (as of 12/31/2015)	\$16,395 (Increase of 2% for total of \$20,904)	2018 result – \$23,670, increase of 47%	Yes, increased by \$7,597
SS #3 – Increase in positive outcomes in employment status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full Time - Part Time - Educational Program - Job Training - Unemployed - Other 	Employed full time – 102; Employed part time – 106; Unemployed – 44; Other – 26	Full time: 104 (increase of 2%) Part time: 108 (increase of 2%) Educational Program: no change Job Trainee: no change Unemployed: 43 (decrease of 2%)	Employed full time – 102 (0% increase); Employed part time – 42 (152% decrease); Educational program – 0; Job training – 0; Unemployed – 12 (267% decrease); Other – 6 (333% decrease)	Yes
SS #4 – Number of households receiving TANF (decrease)	15 household	No decrease	11 households	Changes in circumstances and households entering the program make this metric difficult to control

SS #5 – Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency	Zero	No increase	Zero	No, activity not aimed at increasing services
SS #8 – Number of families moved to self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency defined as exiting program and moving into market rental or home ownership	Zero	1 (one)	34	34 (10 families voluntarily gave up voucher, 24 families' income increased to the point where they no longer qualify to receive HAP)

Metrics for project-based voucher work-able families who were transitioned to the flat tier rent structure effective October 1, 2015 and were recertified in 2019. This group recertifies every odd year.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task (decrease)	\$12,717 (471 staff hours x \$26 per hour)	\$7,358 (40% reduction over the two-year recertification period)	\$10,935	No, as 2019 was the year in which this group was recertified
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	471 total staff hours (3 staff hours per recertification X 157 recertifications)	283 hours (40% reduction over the two-year recertification period)	405	No, as 2019 was the year in which this group was recertified
CE #5 – Tenant Rent Share in dollars (increase)	\$484 (this number is prior to any rent reform being implemented)	\$518 (Increase of no more than 7%)	2019 result – \$917, increase of 89.5%	No, rent is based on many factors, including income increases, increase in tier rents, contract rents, etc.
SS #1 – Increase in household income	\$20,494 (as of 12/31/2015)	\$410 (Increase of 2%) for total of \$20,904	2019 result – \$31,788 increase of 35%	Yes, increased by \$11,294

<p>SS #3 – Increase in positive outcomes in employment status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full Time - Part Time - Educational Program - Job Training - Unemployed - Other 	<p>Employed full time – 94; Employed part time – 24; Unemployed – 4; Other – 7</p>	<p>Full time: 96 (increase of 2%) Part time: 24 (increase of 2%) Educational Program: no change Job Trainee: no change Unemployed: 3 (decrease of 2%)</p>	<p>Employed full time – 108 (13% increase); Employed part time – 13 (85% decrease); Educational program – 0; Job training – 0; Unemployed – 8 (50% increase); Other – 0 (100% decrease)</p>	<p>Full time employment increased by 13% whereas part time decreased by 85%; the number of unemployed families increased to 8</p>
<p>SS #4 – Number of households receiving TANF (decrease)</p>	<p>1 household</p>	<p>No decrease</p>	<p>3 households</p>	<p>Changes in circumstances and households entering the program make this metric difficult to control</p>
<p>SS #5 – Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency</p>	<p>Zero</p>	<p>No increase</p>	<p>Zero</p>	<p>No, activity not aimed at increasing services</p>
<p>SS #8 – Number of families moved to self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency defined as exiting program and moving into market rental or home ownership</p>	<p>Zero</p>	<p>1 (one)</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Yes</p>

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

Revisions were made to the original activity (2014-1) which were included in this activity (2016-1). No other changes have been made to this activity.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

With the 2015 conversion of 288 public housing units to the project-based voucher program, the work-able families have been divided into two groups. The original Housing Choice work-able families will recertify every even year, with recertification effective on June 1.

The converted public housing work-able families will recertify every odd year, with recertification effective October 1. Beginning in 2019, we no longer recertify all the work-abled families effective the same date, but rather on their lease renewal date.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

Significant changes were made to the original activity (2014-1) and was re-proposed and approved in 2016 as Activity 2016-1.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

There are a few challenges that relate to the benchmarks for this activity. Households are entering and leaving the program every year which affects the original benchmark. Increases in income are determined by several different variables (economy, job market, households participating, etc.), which in turn effect the amount of rent that households pay. Households also have the ability to choose to pay a higher amount of rent if they wish to rent a unit larger than their voucher size, or a unit that is more expensive than what the voucher covers.

ACTIVITY 2016–2

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2012–2, Rent Simplifications for Households who are Elderly and/or Persons with Disabilities, was approved and implemented in 2012. This activity was amended under Activity 2014–3. Both these activities were replaced with Activity 2016–2, which was approved and implemented in 2016. No further amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This activity is a simplified rent structure for households who are elderly and/or persons with disabilities: 1) rent based on 26.5% of gross income; 2) triennial recertification; 3) income disregard; 4) a limit on interim decreases; and 5) flat fee of \$125 per ineligible family member per month.

The hardship capped their rent increase at 7% provided all other variables (such as income, contract rent, utility allowance, etc.) remained the same. Below are the dates and number of households who continue to receive a hardship:

- December 31, 2013 – 57 households
- December 31, 2014 – 41 households
- December 31, 2015 – 25 households
- December 31, 2016 – 19 households
- December 31, 2017 – 16 households

- December 31, 2018 – 9 households
- December 31, 2019 – 6 households

In 2019, for 3 households the hardship was discontinued:

- 1 (33%) left the program
- 1 (33%) experienced a subsequent increase in their portion of the rent that was less than 7%
- 1 (33%) added a household member with income

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) triennial recertification schedule	2012: cost of \$46,332 (1,782 staff hours x \$26 per hour with an average of 3 hours per recertification)	\$15,290 (Reduce total number of recertifications to 198 or less than 606 hours)	2019 – \$17,004 (654 hours) 37% reduction	No
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) triennial recertification schedule	2012 total staff time of 1,782 (3 hours average per recertification x 594 annuals processed)	588 hours (Reduction of hours in staff time of less than 66%)	2019 – 654 hours (218 annuals) 37% reduction	No

CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) elimination of medical deductions	In 2011, 232 households had medical deductions, average was 1 hour per recertification to calculate these deductions	Zero hours	2012: Reduction in staff time of 232 hours, equals staff savings of \$6,032 = 232 x \$26 per hour)	This outcome was achieved in 2012, and BHP continues to realize savings due to elimination of medical deductions from the calculation
CE #3 – Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease)	50% potential for errors calculating medical deductions	Decrease to zero potential	Zero (all deductions have been eliminated)	Yes
CE #5 – Tenant Rent Share in dollars (increase)	Average Public Housing: \$235 Average Housing Choice: \$274	Zero increase	2019 results Public Housing: increase of \$58 (total \$293) Housing Choice: increase of \$50 (total \$324)	No
SS #1 – Increase in household income	\$11,616 Average household income at 12/31/13	\$11,848 (Increase of 2%)	2018 - \$14,233 (increase of 23%)	Yes

<p>SS #3 – Report the following separately for each category:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other 	<p>65 total households employed (when this metric was written in 2012, it was not separated by category)</p>	<p>66 (Increase of 1% increase (when this metric was written in 2012, it was not separated by category))</p>	<p>2019 results: Employed full time – 18; Employed part time – 29; Educational program – 0; Job training program – 0; Unemployed – 10; Others – 180 (main source of income is SS or SSDI based on population type)</p>	<p>No, there was a 28% decrease in number of households that were employed, which makes sense based on the population being elderly and/or disabled households</p>
<p>SS #8 – Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). Self-sufficiency defined as exiting program, moving into market rental or home ownership</p>	<p>Zero</p>	<p>Zero</p>	<p>Zero</p>	<p>This activity applies to households who are elderly and/or disabled and are not expected to obtain self-sufficiency</p>

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have not been any non-significant changes to this activity.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

Significant changes were made to the original activity 2012-2 under activities 2014-3 and 2016-2, which incorporated all the elements of activities 2012-2 and 2014-3 into this current Activity 2016-2.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

There are several variables that go into the benchmarks. The benchmark for income was set in 2012 and does not account for inflation. With the triennial recertification cycle, we are not capturing any Cost of Living Adjustment that is given to those receiving Social Security benefits on an annual basis. This delayed increase in the rent may cause a higher than normal increase in the rent portion paid by the families. The number of households who are elderly and/or persons with disabilities can fluctuate from year to year based on who enters the program through the lottery system. This activity was not designed to increase employment outcomes as the focus is on households with elderly and/or persons with disabilities and any employment income that can be earned is arbitrary.

ACTIVITY 2016–3

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2016-3 – Landing Landlords, was approved in 2016, one element (Moving Compliance) was implemented in 2016 and the other three elements were implemented in 2018. No amendments have been made to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

The goal of this activity was to increase participation by private landlords in the Housing Choice Voucher program. There are four elements to this activity:

- Landlord Incentive Payment/Signing Bonus
- Damage Claim Fund
- Security Deposit Revolving Loan Fund
- Moving with Continued Assistance

The Housing Choice Voucher Program was over leased beginning in January 2016 and no new vouchers had been issued since early 2016. The first three elements of this activity were implemented in August 2018 when vouchers were issued.

For the Landlord Incentive Payment, seven new landlords agreed to participate in the program in 2019, for a total of \$1,400 paid in incentives. The Damage Claim Fund was also implemented in August. Due to how this fund works, the first possibility of receiving any claims will be August 2019. As of December 31, 2019, we have not had any claims. In 2018, the Damage Claim Fund was expanded with our regional partners to include all voucher holders within Boulder County. There are four agencies within Boulder County that administer vouchers (Boulder Housing Partners, Boulder County Housing Authority, Longmont Housing Authority and Mental Health

Partners – contract administrator for the Colorado Division of Housing vouchers). The fund has been renamed the Landlord Assurance Fund and is funded by Boulder County, the City of Boulder and the City of Longmont, along with the Housing Authorities.

In 2018, we had three requests for the Security Deposit Loan fund and all three loans were paid off in the 10 months allotted. In 2019, we had eight requests for the Security Deposit Loan fund. Five requests were approved, three were denied due to lack of income. Of the five approved, four requested the full amount of \$1,000 and one requested \$250). Of the five approved, one has been paid off and the other four are currently under a payment agreement and monthly payments are being made.

The fourth element, Moving with Continued Assistance, was implemented in 2016. During 2019, we had 108 requests to move and eight households were asked to come into compliance with their current landlord, prior to being able to move with continued assistance. Two of the eight households did come into compliance and were able to move, two moved without voucher assistance and four remained in place.

This is not a rent reform activity and no hardship was created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
HC #5 – Number of households able to move to better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	Zero	Zero	Zero	Yes

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The standard metric for this type of activity does not apply to Boulder, as all of Boulder’s neighborhoods are neighborhoods of opportunity.

ACTIVITY 2016–4

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2016-4, Bringing School Home Referral Process, was approved and implemented in 2016. There have been no amendments to this activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This Activity 2016-4, Bringing School Home Referral Process, is the first step in our bigger program, Bringing School Home, which is designed to positively disrupt factors working against the success of children. This activity allows us to bring families with children age 0 to 5 into five of our sites where services are offered through the Bringing Home School Program. In 2019, 26 families entered the program. The families agree to accept services through this program where the goal is for children to be kindergarten ready and succeed in school and eventually be self-sufficient.

The average time an applicant is on the waitlist has decreased from 2 years to 79 days (2.65 months).

This is not a rent reform activity and no hardship was created.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
SS #5 – Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase)	Zero	100% of all new admissions based on vacant units	2019 – 26 families (100% of new admissions)	Yes

SS# 8 – Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase)	Zero	Zero	Zero	Yes
HC #3 – Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease)	24 months	2 months	2.65 months (79 days average)	No
HC #4 – Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). This activity targets families with children	Zero	Zero	Zero	Yes
HC #5 – Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	Zero	Zero	Zero	Yes
HC #7 – Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase)	Zero	Zero	Zero	Yes

CE #4 – Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)	Zero	\$9,408	\$17,472	Yes
---	------	---------	----------	-----

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There have been no changes to the metrics or data collection methodology.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have been no changes made to the activity since it was approved and implemented.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

The benchmark of 2 months wait time is an estimate that was created without historical data on our new process. In 2017 the average number of days on the wait list was 122. The 2018 average number of days on the waitlist is 134 days. In 2019, we are closer to the benchmark that was set and will continue to monitor progress towards meeting the benchmark.

ACTIVITY 2018-1

a. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Activity 2018-1 Project Based Waivers was a consolidation of all the previous project-base voucher waivers from activities 2012-1, 2014-6 and 2015-2 into one, and introduced three new elements. This activity was approved and implemented in 2018. No amendments have been made since adding all the waivers into one activity.

b. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

Since becoming a participating Moving to Work agency, Boulder Housing Partners has implemented several activities related to the Project-Based Voucher rules. This activity includes the following elements:

- *Waive the 20% cap on project-based vouchers* – allows BHP to project base more than 20% of our voucher authority.
- *Definition of excepted units* – allows BHP to project base vouchers at 100% of the units in advance of offering services.
- *Waive the competitive bidding process* – this requirement is waived when BHP is placing vouchers in a project owned by BHP.

- *Rent limits and rent reasonableness* – allows BHP to establish appropriate rent limits and conduct our own rent reasonableness tests for our project-based voucher contracts, using data gathered from market studies, Fair Market Rents, current market comparisons and average rents.
- *Allow owner/service partner to hold wait list* – allows the owner or the service partner at all project-based voucher sites to hold the wait list and refer participants to BHP’s Housing Choice Voucher Department.
- *Allow BHP staff to conduct Housing Quality Standards inspections at our PBV units* – allows in-house staff that has been certified in Housing Quality Standards to conduct inspections at BHP-owned properties.
- *Allow participants who are no longer receiving housing assistance payments to remain on the voucher* – allows families to stay on the voucher program even when their portion of rent is higher than the contract rent, which also allows them to be eligible for the next available voucher if assistance would be received living in the private market.
- *Allow participant families to continue to pay rent according to their income* – allows families to stay in place at a project-based voucher community and pay rent according to their income when it exceeds the contract rent that has been set under the contract.

This is not a rent reform activity and no hardship was created.

In 2019, BHP did not project base any vouchers and therefore most of these waivers were not used. During recertification of the workable families at the project-based vouchers sites, nine households would have been graduated from the program and asked to move without rental assistance due to increases in income that allowed them to pay the entire contact rent. However, using this waiver, these nine households have been allowed to stay in place, continue to be eligible for the next available voucher and are paying rent according to their income.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
CE #1 – Total cost of task (decrease) elimination of competitive process	\$1,680	Reduce to \$0	Zero	Yes
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) elimination of competitive process	40 hours	Zero	Zero	Yes
CE #1 – Total cost of task (decrease) average cost of an independent consultant to determine reasonable rent	\$6,000	Reduce to \$130	Zero	Yes
CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) independent consultant to determine reasonable rent	5 hours	Zero	Zero	Yes
CE #1 – Total cost of task (decrease) time to maintain wait list	\$2,340 (90 hours x \$26 per hour)	Zero	Zero	Yes

CE #2 – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) to maintain wait list	90 hours	15 hours	41 (41 move ins x 1 hour to process application)	No
HC #1 – Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI (increase)	Zero	Zero	2019 – 0; 2018 – 0; 2017 - 0; 2016 – 0; 2015 – 0; 2014 – 31 (Lee Hill)	Yes
HC #2 – Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase)	34 in 2019	34 in 2019	2019 – 0; 2018 – 0; 2017 - 0; 2016 – 0; 2015 – 148 (Kalmia and Walnut Place); 2014 – 0	No
HC #3 – Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease)	31.5 months	2 months	6.75 months	No
HC #4 – Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).	Zero	Zero	Zero	Yes

c. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

There have not been any non-significant changes to this activity.

d. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

The number of project-based vouchers has increased from 2012 when BHP entered the demonstration program and first implemented a waiver. In 2012, BHP had 89 project-based voucher units. We added 31 units in 2014 and 279 units in 2015 with the conversion of the public housing units under RAD/Section 18. We now have a total of 399 project-based voucher units. Metrics regarding wait time and applicant processing will continue to be watched in the coming years.

e. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGE

This activity consolidated three previously approved activities into one, while adding three new elements to the activity in 2018.

f. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

Due to the timing of the disposition of our final 49 units of public housing, the benchmark was not met for number of units to be preserved this year. The goal is to dispose of 34 units of public housing and convert to project-based vouchers. The application was approved for disposition on May 13, 2019, but actual conversion will not take place until late 2020. BHP did not project-based any new vouchers this year so some of the waivers were not utilized.

ACTIVITIES NOT YET IMPLEMENTED

BHP does not have any activities that have not been implemented.

ACTIVITIES ON HOLD

BHP does not have any activities that have been placed on hold.

CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY 2012–1

MTW Activity 2012 – 1, Allow BHP to Commit Project-Based Vouchers to cover 100% of the units at converted public housing developments was incorporated into MTW Activity 2018 – 1. The metrics have been included with MTW Activity 2018 – 1. This activity was approved in 2012 and implemented in 2015 with the conversion of public housing units to Housing Choice Vouchers. Metrics were reported in the Annual Reports for 2012 through 2017. This activity was closed out in 2018. Metrics for 2018 and future years are reported under Activity 2018 – 1.

ACTIVITY 2012–2

MTW Activity 2012 – 2, Rent Simplification for Elderly and Disabled Households was approved and implemented in 2012. It was amended under Activity 2014–3. Further changes were made to the rent reform in 2016 and all aspects of this activity were incorporated into Activity 2016–2, closing it out in 2016. Metrics were reported in the Annual Reports for 2012 and 2013. Metrics for 2014 and 2015 were reported under Activity 2014 – 3. Metrics from 2016 forward are included in Activity 2016-2.

ACTIVITY 2012–3

Activity 2012–3, Rent Simplification for Family Households, was approved and implemented in 2012, closed out in 2016. All elements of this activity were incorporated into Activity 2016–1. Metrics for this activity were reported in the Annual Reports for 2012 through 2015. Metrics from 2016 forward are included in Activity 2016 – 1.

ACTIVITY 2012–7

MTW Activity 2012 – 7, Implement a Landlord Self–Certification System for HQS Inspections in the Voucher Program, was approved in 2012 but never implemented. The original activity would have placed a greater, undue burden on landlords. Therefore, the activity was re–written and approved in the 2013 MTW Annual Plan under Activity 2013 – 1 and allows the inspection cycle to follow the recertification schedule.

ACTIVITY 2014-1

MTW Activity 2014 – 1, Rent Reform for Housing Choice Work-able Families was implemented in 2014, and amended under Activity 2016-1. All aspects of the original activity were included in the 2016 Activity. This activity was approved and implemented in 2014 and closed out in 2016. Metrics were reported in the Annual Reports for 2014 and 2015. Metrics from 2016 forward are included under Activity 2016 – 1.

ACTIVITY 2014-2

MTW Activity 2014-2: Rent Reform for Public Housing Work-able Families was never implemented. With the conversion of six of the eight public housing sites (85% of the units) under Section 18 disposition and RAD in 2015, the households were transitioned to the voucher program. This activity was approved in 2014 and never implemented due the decrease in the number of work-able families in the public housing units, and the goal BHP has of converting the final 49 public housing units to the Housing Choice Voucher program.

ACTIVITY 2014-3

MTW Activity 2012 – 2, Rent Reform for Elderly and Disabled Households was added to under Activity 2014-3 Limit of One Interim Decrease Recertification per year for elderly households and persons with disabilities. Further changes were made to the rent reform in 2016 and all aspects of this activity were incorporated into Activity 2016-2. This activity was approved and implemented in 2014 and closed out in 2016. Metrics have been reported in Annual Reports for 2014 and 2015. Since 2016, metrics have been included in Activity 2016 – 2.

ACTIVITY 2014-6

MTW Activity 2014 – 6, Rent Limits and Rent Reasonableness for Project-Based Vouchers was incorporated into MTW Activity 2018 – 1. This activity was approved and implemented in 2014 and closed out in 2018. Metrics were provided for this activity in Annual Reports for 2014 – 2017. Current metrics have been included with MTW Activity 2018 – 1.

ACTIVITY 2015-2

MTW Activity 2015 – 2, Project-Based Voucher Applicant Process was incorporated into MTW Activity 2018 – 1. This activity was approved in 2015, implemented in 2015 and closed out in 2018. Metrics were provided for this activity in the Annual Reports for 2015, 2016 and 2017. Current year metrics are included with Activity 2018 – 1.

V. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

A. ACTUAL SOURCES AND USES OF MTW FUNDS

i. Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

Boulder Housing Partners will submit unaudited and audited information in the prescribed Financial Data Schedule (FDS) format through the Financial Assessment System – PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system.

ii. Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

Boulder Housing Partners will submit unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the FASPHA, or its successor system.

iii. Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

ACTUAL USE OF MTW SINGLE FUND FLEXIBILITY
Activity 2013-4 allows for the use of Replacement Housing Factor Funds for other affordable housing. Activity 2015-1 allows for MTW funds to be used on other local, non-traditional affordable housing.

B. LOCAL ASSET MANGEMENT PLAN

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

Yes

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

No

iii. Did the MTW PHA provide a LAMP in the appendix?

No

iv. If the MTW PHA has provided a LAMP in the appendix, please provide a brief update on implementation of the LAMP. Please provide any actual changes (which must be detailed in an approved Annual MTW Plan/Plan amendment) or state that the MTW PHA did not make any changes in the Plan Year.

N/A

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. REVIEWS, AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS

The HUD MTW office conducted their site visit in June 2019. No other reviews, audits or inspections were done during 2019.

B. EVALUATION RESULTS

BHP worked in partnership with the University of Colorado (CU) to develop the rent-controlled study to evaluate the effects of the flat tier rent reform structure that was implemented in 2014. Due to the size of our work-abled family group, it was not feasible to compare a control group to a treatment group. Instead households were compared against themselves over time to ascertain if changes occurred over time and if so, if they could be attributed to the interventions put in place through the MTW Program. The baseline surveys were conducted in 2014 and the final survey was conducted in 2018. Information about the evaluation can be found in the 2014 – 2018 Annual Reports. Currently, there are no active evaluations outside of annual monitoring of all MTW Activities and their outcomes and impact.

C. MTW STATUTORY REQUIREMENT CERTIFICATION

Boulder Housing Partners hereby certifies that the three statutory requirements below have been met:

- assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low income families;
- continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and
- maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration

D. MTW ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACT (EPC) FLEXIBILITY DATA

Boulder Housing Partners does not possess flexibility with regard to Energy Performance Contracts.