



Charlotte Housing Authority FY 2016 Moving Forward Annual Report

The Charlotte Housing Authority's mission is to develop, operate, and provide quality housing in sustainable communities of choice for residents of diverse incomes. The agency's local name for the federal Demonstration Program Moving To Work is "Moving Forward", symbolizing the forward movement in creating community, empowering families and building partnerships that break the cycle of generational poverty and promote affordable housing as a community issue, not just a CHA issue.

Charlotte Housing Authority
400 East Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28203
A. Fulton Meachem, Jr.
CEO/President
Submission: March 31, 2017

Charlotte Housing Authority

Photo: The Landing at Park Road -

This is a development with 92 one-bedroom units for active seniors 55 and older. The development is in the Sedgefield neighborhood. It is on a bus line and is within a mile of the Park Road Shopping Center, the shops on East Boulevard, and just minutes from Uptown Charlotte.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	4
Overview of Charlotte Housing Authority’s short-term and long-term Moving To Work goals and objectives.	4
SHORT TERM PLAN	5
LONG TERM PLAN	7
GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION	11
PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL REQUESTED	25
APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL PREVIOUSLY GRANTED	26
NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES	72
ACTIVITIES ON HOLD	80
CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES	81
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS	82
ADMINISTRATIVE	85

Appendix A	Certification Statement
Appendix B	Listing of Developments with Public Housing and Project-Based Units
Appendix C	Rent Reform Impact Analysis for Public Housing & Housing Choice Voucher Programs
Appendix D	Community Based Rental Assistance Policy
Appendix E	Hardship Policy
Appendix F	Work Requirement Policy
Appendix G	Rent Reform Overview
Appendix H	Sample Bedroom Rent Bands
Appendix I	Community Service Policy
Appendix J	Violence Against Women Act
Appendix K	Other Agency Activity
Appendix L	Ongoing Initiatives Summary
Appendix M	Homeownership Program Hardship Policy
Appendix N	Statement of Family Obligations for Homeownership Program

CHARLOTTE HOUSING AUTHORITY



Board of Commissioners

Commissioner Harold Cogdell, *Chair*

Commissioner Jonathan Lahn, *Vice Chair*

Commissioner Lucy Brown

Commissioner Shirley L. Fulton

Commissioner Sheila Jones

Commissioner William Scurry

Executive Leadership

A. Fulton Meachem, Jr., President /Chief Executive Officer

Troy A. Drawz, Executive Vice President, Real Estate Development

Shaunté Evans, Executive Vice President, Administrative Operations

Heather Franklin, Executive Vice President, Finance

Michael Gosselin, Executive Vice President, Real Estate Management

Harriet Huell, Executive Vice President, Legal

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Charlotte Housing Authority's short-term and long-term Moving To Work goals and objectives.

CEO & President of the Charlotte Housing Authority, Fulton Meachem, is poised to transition the Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) into a new era of affordable housing for the future. Meachem states that the target focus of the CHA is one of transitioning the CHA portfolio by participating in the Federal Demonstration program, Moving To Work (MTW). Through the MTW Program, which permits housing agencies to operate in a less restrictive regulatory environment and combine federal funds allocated for Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher, and Capital Funds into one pool, CHA has implemented programs that:

- 1) Reduce cost and achieve greater cost savings in federal expenditures
- 2) Expand housing choices for low-income families
- 3) Give incentives to families with children pursuing self-sufficiency activities

Additionally, during FY2016, CHA began its portfolio conversion in the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program. RAD allows public housing agencies to leverage public and private debt and equity in order to reinvest in the public housing stock. In RAD, units are no longer under public housing, and take on a voucher identity. A resident's portion of rent continue at no more than 30% of their adjusted income, supportive services are offered and all will have choice mobility after a year's residence under the program.

During 2016, CHA submitted 49 Financing Plans and closed on 28 developments, converting 1,350 public housing units to RAD units. CHA has submitted its final two developments for RAD conversion now and will close on 22 additional developments (1,896 units) in 2017. CHA will complete its portfolio conversion in 2018 with the closing of its final development (136 units).

During FY2016 (January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016), CHA requested approval of several new activities, using MTW flexibility: 1) Modified Terms of Over-subsidy; 2) Imputed Earned Income Implement; and 3) Exception Payment Standard up to 150% for certain demographic areas. CHA also continued ongoing MTW activities (for a full list, see Appendix L Ongoing Initiatives Summary). CHA implemented: 1) Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program; and 2) Biennial Reexamination for Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Participants (now merged with the agency wide Biennial Reexamination activity) in FY2016.

MTW is a necessary platform that allows CHA to implement activities that positively impact:

- The employment rate for able-bodied heads of households and other family members;
- The number of family members in training and/or education programs;
- The increase in average and median income of families (all sources and earned income) (excluding seniors and disabled families);
- The amount of funds leveraged in the community for production of affordable

- housing and the provision of supportive services;
- The number of children who enter post-secondary education;
- The percent increase in the number of CHA students that enter the Charlotte Housing Authority Scholarship Fund (CHASF);
- The number of housing units in mixed-income environments; and
- The distribution of housing units and housing opportunities for (a) Section 9 and (b) Project-Based Section 8.

SHORT TERM PLAN

CHA's short term plan is to continue to be a major contributor in impacting neighborhood stabilization, which will also increase tax revenues in Mecklenburg County. Our plan is to create affordable housing and jobs in the construction, maintenance and repair, and security industries. The purchase of goods and services, utility payments, along with taxes for various aspects of the business are counted towards the financial impact on the local economy. Indirectly, the dollars spent in the community by employees and residents can be factored into the economic impact. Short term examples with goals to revitalize units in our communities, provide innovative property management, enhance the self-sufficiency of residents, and provide housing for the most vulnerable in our population include the following activities:

- 1) In December of 2016 CHA implemented an organizational structure change that will help streamline the process in which we will be able to assist our residents. This change furthers our mission to create as well as sustain economically diverse communities, promoting high quality standards for our residents and owners. The structural change allows CHA the flexibility to be proactive in responding to the needs of the community and agency.
- 2) In December of 2013 CHA submitted its plan to HUD for the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) conversion of 3,279 public housing dwelling units to the Project Based Voucher (PBV) platform in three phases. CHA was offered a Conditional Housing Assistance Payment (CHAP) contract on March 26, 2015. We have been approved for the RAD conversion and began implementation of our portfolio. We have been approved for the RAD conversion and have been implementation of our portfolio conversion. Making the move to RAD means that CHA will be able to achieve two major goals:
 1. preserving our current affordable units for many years to come by moving our funding stream to a more stable platform.
 2. providing more people in our community the opportunity to live in neighborhoods of choice as CHA responds to an increasing demand for more affordable housing in Charlotte by creating new mixed-income communities.
- 1) In conjunction with our ongoing RAD conversion, CHA will expand implementation of the approved work requirement agency wide in 2017. CHA believes it is essential that all applicants and participants who are neither elderly nor disabled should work. To this end, CHA plans to institute a work requirement under which members of the home who are

not elderly or disabled are expected to work at least 20 hours per week. All children under the age of 18 who have not graduated from high school or received their GED, must enroll in school full time. Households that are not compliant will be given up to six months to come into compliance with the program. Failure to comply with the work requirement will result in sanctions that range from a warning to being required pay full contract rent for multiple violations of the work requirement. Exceptions may include: short or long term verified medical issues for immediate family members that include spouse, children parents and grandparents. In an effort to help families comply with this work requirement, CHA has redesigned its Client Services Department and a Case Manager has been assigned to each RAD site. (foot note)

- 2) In April 2016, in an effort to enhance the quality of life for our residents and surrounding communities through crime prevention and deterrent initiatives, CHA's Resident Safety staff participated in North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCCADV) Prevention Institute and Advanced Prevention Institute intensive trainings. The agency was among the top two of 15 prevention teams in:
 - a. Demonstrated knowledge and application of public health, primary prevention, and outer-layer shared risk and protection principles;
 - b. Agency support and capacity for primary prevention activities; and
 - c. Existing planning and implementation of primary prevention at the outer layers of the socio-ecological model.

Through this initiative, CHA was also the recipient of a "mini grant" to address shared risk and protective factors at the community and societal levels. CHA is collaborating with the local domestic violence service provider to address several community-level protective factors. The agency aims to improve coordination of community resources and services by requiring CHA staff to receive training on domestic violence and trauma-informed care, encouraging staff to make appropriate referrals for residents, and holding community forums with various service providers after every incident of community violence that takes place on CHA property. CHA is also working with the domestic violence service provider to increase residents' collective efficacy and community connectedness through bystander intervention trainings for members of the resident leadership council and for all residents, as well as a social marketing campaign focused on bystander intervention and building social norms that reject domestic and other forms of violence. The protective factors addressed through this work are associated with at least five forms of violence, including intimate partner violence, sexual violence, child maltreatment, youth violence, and suicide.

Through implementation of the mini-grant, CHA will be evaluated through pre- and post-tests with trainers to gauge the quality of implementation of domestic violence and trauma-informed care trainings. CHA will also measure the impact of their work through a variety of different methods including surveys for residents after they receive training on bystander intervention, a review of identified case management records to assess referrals made related to domestic violence and trauma-informed care, and focus groups with resident leadership council members to assess changes in community connectedness/collective efficacy.

- 3) In 2016, 914 individuals were served at the Center for Employment Services (CES). 13% of these individuals were identified as CHA residents (121). Even though there was a slight increase of CHA residents from 2015 to 2016 (116 visits in 2015), the overall percentage of total visits versus CHA participation was down. The staff of Grace-Mar will continue to work with CHA's case management services to increase the engagement level of residents seeking work and training opportunities.
- Grace-Mar Services achieved 414 placements in 2016. 44 of the placements were residents of CHA.
 - Average income of CHA residents prior to job placement at CES: \$9.68
 - Average income after placement: \$11.30

This past year, CES fell short of the 50% service goal of CES residents. In 2016, Grace-Mar became the only service provider at CES. However, the agency continues to do great work in providing free, intensive job placement assistance to residents of CHA and the surrounding communities. In light of the Client Services Department's recent expanded case management coordination, CES will increase its marketing to more CHA residents through increased staff coordination. In addition, the department is actively seeking to add a new CES partner(s) that align with the center's goals of increasing employment and training opportunities for CHA residents and program participants.

- 4) Twenty Dillehay Courts residents graduated from the 'Getting Ahead in a Just Getting' By World class in December of 2015. The second class in December of 2016 graduated 6 residents. They all started their 16-session journey and finished the course. Out of the 26 residents, 18 remain as residents of Dillehay, 11 are employed, 3 are enrolled in adult high school or are in GED programs and 4 have unfortunately been labeled as disabled. All 18 that remain at Dillehay are better advocates for their children because of the program. The residents are now on a path to making a positive impact in their lives that Getting Ahead has helped to foster. The next Getting Ahead class is scheduled to start in April of 2017.

LONG TERM PLAN

CHA's long term plan includes developing mixed-income housing and mixed-use developments utilizing vacant parcels currently owned by CHA as well as site acquisitions. There is discussion of (re)developments that will include affordable housing and retail space. CHA works within a framework to create housing for those at the poverty level, workforce housing, and housing for seniors and disabled to maintain their independence. But most importantly, the agency recognizes that these housing developments can exist as part of a vibrant community that provides transportation, retail, grocery, and access to healthcare, in an area where it is essential to the families residing in the housing.

CHA has begun a tradition of self-development from the initial concept to land acquisition, design, approval, construction and lease-up, as well as self-managing our tax-credit developments with renovations, and the Parktowne/Strawn bond transaction. Our current

project is Park and Marsh. Additional partnerships are being explored and/or established with local city government, developers, banks, private lenders, housing finance agencies and HUD to expand this strategy. The self-development, self-management and mixed-use developments are part of the agency's long-term sustainability plan.

The CHA operates four legally separate, locally incorporated entities to help further its mission of providing safe, decent and affordable housing. Affordable housing property means real property, the principal component of which is comprised of rental housing that is affordable to households that earn less than 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

- **Horizon Acquisition Corporation** - Horizon Acquisition is a for profit subsidiary that was organized in March 2001. Horizon Development Properties has 100% stock ownership. The mission of this organization is to acquire, construct, develop, operate and/ or hold title to affordable housing property, interests in property, and interests in entities that own and operate affordable housing property.
- **Horizon Development Properties, Inc.-** Horizon Development Properties, (HDP) Inc. is a non- profit, tax exempt 501 (c)(3) subsidiary that was organized in March 2001. The mission of the organization is to provide affordable housing to all qualified families. HDP is the development arm of the company.
- **Blue Horizon Property Management, Inc.-** Blue Horizon Property Management, Inc. is a non-profit, tax exempt 501 (c)(3) subsidiary that was organized in July 2016. The mission of the organization is to provide real estate management services to owners of affordable and mixed-income properties.
- **CORE Programs, Inc. -** CORE Programs, Inc. is a non-profit, tax exempt 501 (c)(3) subsidiary. The entity was formerly named Gateway Supportive Services, Inc. and was organized in December 2001. The mission of the organization is to assist affordable (low income) housing residents in achieving economic independence through educational and other support services.

Developments in process include:

- Park and Marsh (The Landing at Park Road) constructed 92 one-bedroom Project-Based Section 8 units in a mid-rise apartment complex for active seniors 55 and older. Tax Credits and local Housing Trust Fund dollars were awarded for this development and construction that began in the fall of 2015. Applications are now being accepted until all units have been leased. The Landing at Park Road received a Certificate of Occupancy in December 2016. Construction is complete and lease up began in the first quarter of 2017.
- The Tall Oaks Demolition Plan was submitted to the Special Applications Center at HUD May 2015. CHA elected to pursue a RAD conversion in lieu of the SAC process. As a result, the demolition/disposition plan was approved under the RAD Program. Tax credit financing was awarded to the project and financing

has closed. The project is under construction and is expected to be complete by December 2017.

- CHA is finalizing a strategy to redevelop the entire 2.2-acre **Hall House** site into a thriving mixed-use development in the center of Charlotte's Central Business District, comprised of residential and commercial space that offers the highest and best opportunity for long-term sustainability. Hall House was incorporated in the RAD Program and the subsidies will be transferred to eligible properties (Woodlawn, Steele Creek & Prosperity Creek). The property will be transferred at fair market value for affordable housing purposes in accordance with the RAD Notice.
- In 2016 Horizon Development Properties, Inc. (HDP), selected The Fallon Company to serve as the Master Developer for the redevelopment of the 16.2 acre **Strawn Cottages site** (122 units).
- CHA has identified the Strawn site located at 1301 South Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28203 as a candidate for demolition and disposition. This 16.2-acre property contained CHA's former administrative offices, an activity center and 122 residential cottages that have been identified as obsolete and is underutilized. The Strawn Master Plan proposes to replace the existing affordable housing units in a mixed-use and mixed-income community on the same site. The City Council has rezoned this site and CHA received authorization from the Special Applications Center at HUD to demolish the 122 residential cottages, activity center and administrative office. The activity center and administrative office were demolished during the fiscal year. The property will be transferred at fair market for affordable housing purposes in accordance with the RAD notice.

The project site, situated immediately adjacent to South End in the Dilworth neighborhood, offers one of the largest fully entitled transit oriented development sites in the region due to its close proximity to Charlotte's Central Business District, numerous transit, trail and highway connections. With this project, HDP is signaling a paradigm shift in how developers can and should approach development opportunities that includes housing for Charlotte's workforce in a mixed use environment. Once completed, the new \$330 million dollar mixed-use mixed-income development will feature:

- 725 new mixed-income apartments (145 of the 725 apartments will be affordable);
 - 20 units of for-sale townhomes;
 - Approximately 57,000 SF of retail space
 - Approximately 330,000 SF of office space
 - Hotel featuring approximately 180 rooms
- **Baxter Street.** The Charlottetown Terrace parcel consists of a 12- story

apartment building currently occupied by Section 9 (Public Housing) handicapped and disabled residents. Situated on 5.54 +/- acres, CHA intends to create two (2) outparcels to redevelop as part of the CHA's 5-Year Strategic Plan. The intended use will be a mixed-income and mixed-use development. Charlottetown Terrace has been converted under the RAD Program and the outparcels have been identified through the non-dwelling unit process. The parcels have been approved for demo/disposition under the RAD Program and the property will be transferred at fair market value for affordable housing purposes in accordance with the RAD Notice. The current plans to redevelop one of those parcels is referred to as "Baxter Street."

- The **Parktowne Outparcel** is 1.6 +/- acres of vacant land adjacent to a six-story senior apartment complex that houses Section 9 residents. The outparcel is zoned for mixed-use development.
- Continue **Bond Issuance** for multifamily housing revenue bonds in the City of Charlotte. The Allen Street project, Stonehaven East Apartments and Oak Park Apartments were closed in 2016.

MTW flexibility is needed in order for CHA to carry out its short and long term strategic plans because the Demonstration program allows considerable flexibility in how Federal funds are able to be utilized and permits exemption from many existing Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher program rules found in the United States Housing Act of 1937.

GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION

Form 50900: Elements for the Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report

Attachment B

(II) General Housing Authority Operating Information

Annual MTW Report

II.4.Report.HousingStock

A. MTW Report: Housing Stock Information

New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year

Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project
Renaissance	15	15	CHA co-developed 224 Income Based, Mixed-Income and Workforce Housing. The community features flats and townhome units. Amenities include a community center, pool, fitness center, technology training rooms.
The Landing at Park Road (Park and Marsh)	92	0	CHA developed a 2.2 acre parcel for construction of a 92 unit, mid rise, senior housing development. CHA will have a Community Services Coordinator at the development, however, supportive services will be offered, but voluntarily. Park Rd/Marsh Rd is a suburban neighborhood with incomes varying between low income and wealthy. There is easy access to retail, grocery and public transportation. The average rental price in the communities surrounding the Park and Marsh development is \$1,242.
n/a	0	0	n/a
n/a	0	0	n/a

		Anticipate d Total Number of Project- Based Vouchers Committe d at the End of the Fiscal Year *	Anticipated Total Number of Project- Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
Anticipate d Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project- Based *	Actual Total Number of New Vouche rs that were Project- Based	644	644
107	15	Actual Total Number of Project- Based Vouchers Committe d at the End of the Fiscal Year	Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
		644	552
* From the Plan			

Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year

CHA converted 1244 Public housing units to RAD PBV

n/a

n/a

Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

The Capital Fund Grant in 2016 will be calculated based on the units that are to be converted to RAD prior to the end of 2016. Planned use of these funds in 2016 will be for RAD HAP contracts for the sites that are anticipated to be converted during 2016. Due to the RAD Conversion, all capital projects to be completed in 2016 will be funded through the replacement reserve accounts established at each property. The Improvements Projects List by site is included as Appendix N. These projects include items identified by the RAD Physical Needs Assessment, as well as additional work needed, and include: painting, kitchen and bath upgrades, ADA compliance items, elevator upgrades, siding replacement, landscaping improvements, sprinkler system upgrades, and other improvements.

AUTUMN PLACE: replace vinyl tile, interior painting, replace all appliances, replace kitchen cabinets, countertops, sinks, bath vanities, smoke detectors; **CEDAR KNOLL:** common area water heater, heat pump; **CHARLOTTETOWN:** paint interior of apartments; **CLAREMONT:** windows, exterior doors and screens; **EDWIN TOWERS:** repair and sealcoat asphalt, window cleaning and swing stage, paint existing stairs; **GLADEDALE:** Hardie siding, site utility work (sewer, water, storm), replace and sealcoat asphalt, regrading landscape & establishment of ground cover; **LEAFCREST:** Range, refrigerator, sealcoat & stripe asphalt, complete sewer line cleaning/repair; **MALLARD RIDGE:** Hardie siding, sealcoat & stripe asphalt (no repairs); **MEADOW OAKS:** storage room doors, window replacement, repair and sealcoat parking lot, regrading landscape & establishment of ground cover; **ROBINSDALE:** sealcoat & stripe asphalt (no repairs); **SAVANNA WOODS:** remove and replace asphalt, recaulk expansion & control joints, replace conference room furnishing, computer lab, office renovation, landscaping, and replace small office/cubicle furnishing; **SOUTHSIDE:** paint interior wall, drywall, Appliance third phase; **WALLACE WOODS:** Overlay asphalt, paint existing wood siding, landscaping, replace small office/cubicle furnishing, windows, and screens.

Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Tax Credit	399	Developments with tax credit and RAD PBV(owned by CHA's subsidiaries Horizon Development Properties Inc. and Horizon Acquisition Corp., managed by CHA and third party management companies)
State Funded	242	Multi-family Project-Based Section 8 property managed by third party (CHA has a General Partnership ownership interest)
Market Rate	321	Affordable rental units with no rental subsidy (owned by CHA's subsidiaries Horizon Development Properties Inc. and Horizon Acquisitions Corporation, managed by CHA and third party management companies)
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	962	

*** Select Housing Program from:** Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.

If Other, please describe:

N/A

II.5.Report.Leasing

B. MTW Report: Leasing Information

Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served*	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	844	566
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	50	49
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	1124	1402
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	894	2017

* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.

** In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.

Housing Program:	Unit Months Occupied/Leased**	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	10128	6792

Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	600	588
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	13488	16824
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	10728	24204

The difference in planned and actual households was less than 10% which can be attributed to the number of port ins and the conversion of some PH units to RAD PBV during FY2016.

*** In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.

**** Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.

	Average Number of Households Served Per Month	Total Number of Households Served During the Year
Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only	51	614

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory objective of “assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families” is being achieved by examining public housing and Housing Choice Voucher family characteristics as submitted into the PIC or its successor system utilizing current resident data at the end of the agency's fiscal year. The PHA will provide information on local, non-traditional families provided with housing assistance at the end of the PHA fiscal year, not reported in PIC or its successor system, in the following format:

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	N/A	N/A	N/A	276	284	390	N/A	N/A
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	258	284	390	N/A	N/A

Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	93%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	-----	-----

-

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

In order to demonstrate that the statutory objective of “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” is being achieved, the PHA will provide information in the following formats:

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	1209	1029	0	2238	34
2 Person	405	939	0	1344	20
3 Person	311	1006	0	1317	20
4 Person	241	764	0	1005	15

5 Person	107	371	0	478	7
6+ Person	62	232	0	294	4
Totals	2335	4341	0	6676	100

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized

N/A

Mix of Family Sizes Served

	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	34	20	20	15	7	4	100
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	2443	1122	991	702	321	223	5802

Percentage of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	42	19	17	12	6	4	100
Percentage Change	24%	-5%	-15%	11	5	3	99

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages

There has been a decrease in overall unit count since baseline due to the removal of Boulevard Homes, Hall House and units for Modernization from inventory during that time. Edwin Towers was brought back online this fiscal year increasing 1 bedroom units from last year. Also, CHA neglected to include PBV units in the count last year (first time using the new Attachment B) because MTW activities were not used on the PBV vouchers, however, those vouchers are part of our base voucher count.

* “Non-MTW adjustments to the distribution of family sizes” are defined as factors that are outside the control of the PHA. Acceptable “non-MTW adjustments” include, but are not limited to, demographic changes in the community’s population. If the PHA includes non-MTW adjustments, HUD expects the explanations of the factors to be thorough and to include information substantiating the numbers used.

** The numbers in this row will be the same numbers in the chart above listed under the column “Baseline percentages of family sizes to be maintained.”

*** The methodology used to obtain these figures will be the same methodology used to determine the “Occupied number of Public Housing units by family size when PHA entered MTW” and “Utilized number of Section 8 Vouchers by family size when PHA entered MTW” in the table immediately above.

**** The “Percentages of families served by family size this fiscal year” will reflect adjustments to the mix of families served that are directly due to decisions the PHA has made. HUD expects that in the course of the demonstration, PHAs will make decisions that may alter the number of families served.

Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
Public Housing	No leasing challenges (units are being held for renovation/relocation)
n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a

Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End

Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Moving Forward Supportive Services	11	Moved to homeownership or private rental not requiring a housing subsidy
n/a	0	n/a
n/a	0	n/a
n/a	0	n/a

Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	0
--	----------

ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	11
---	-----------

* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.

II.6.Report.Leasing

C. MTW Report: Wait List Information

Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Numbe r of House holds on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW and non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program (CHA does not maintain separate list)	Community- Wide	13,832	Closed	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site Based	3,517	Open	Yes

Project Based Voucher	Site Based	2,074	Open	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units at Third Party Managed Sites	Site Based	3,530	Open	Yes

* *Select Housing Program:* Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program; Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units; Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.

** *Select Wait List Types:* Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described in the Rules for Program Participation), None (If the Program is a New Wait List, Not an Existing Wait List), or Other (Please Provide a Brief Description of this Wait List Type).

*** For Partially Open Wait Lists, provide a description of the populations for which the waiting list is open.

n/a
n/a
n/a

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

n/a
n/a
n/a

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

n/a
n/a
n/a
<p>If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative detailing these changes.</p>
n/a

PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL REQUESTED

All proposed activities that are granted approval by HUD are reported in Section IV as “Approved Activities”.

APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL PREVIOUSLY GRANTED

The following Activities are using flexibilities granted through the agency MTW agreement, have been approved by HUD, implemented by CHA and are Ongoing from the previous plan year. This data represents April 1, 2015 to December 31, 2016. The evaluation of the CHA Moving Forward Program is being conducted by the Center for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS) at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Their update is reported on in the Administrative section of this report.

All activities are preceded with a year and the activity number for that year, Ex 2015 – 1 translates to the 1st activity of 2015. This process helps CHA track approvals and number of activities within a year.

2016-1 Homeownership Activity

- 1) CHA received approval to implement a Homeownership Program in the FY 2016 Annual Plan for qualifying Housing Choice Voucher participants and residents in Public Housing. Households may be eligible to participate if they meet HUD's definition of first-time homebuyers and have either earned income, Social Security (SS), or Supplemental Security Income (SSI).
- 2) General requirements for program participation include, but are not limited to the following:
 - Must be a Housing Choice Voucher program participant
 - Participating households must demonstrate a minimum 24 months of stable employment history or stable receipt of acceptable fixed income for elderly/disabled
 - Must possess a minimum annual income of \$14,500 for families reporting earned income
 - A minimum annual income of \$8,796 for elderly or disabled designated households (changes according to the SSI amount)
 - All households must attend a mandatory Open House and participate and successfully complete a CHA approved HUD-certified Homeownership Education and Counseling program. The program will provide workshops and individualized tailored counseling plans on budgeting, credit, the home buying process, roles and responsibilities of the lender and realtor. The Homebuyer Education Provider will assess participants for mortgage readiness through review of their tri-merge credit scores, debt ratio, employment history, reserves, and other financial concerns that directly impact the participant's ability to become mortgage ready. There is an 8-hour workshop provided to each participant once they become mortgage ready. This workshop is recognized by down payment assistance programs. However, the number of hours of counseling needed for each individual is directly correlated to their mortgage readiness status.

- Upon closing, a household will continue to be counseled and monitored through the Client Services Department for a period not to exceed three years. Monitoring by Client Services shall serve as an additional foreclosure prevention measure through financial literacy training and yearly refresher training. The families will also receive Post Homeownership Education and Counseling follow-up services up to 12 months. Each family will construct a new budget reflective of their current status. Additionally, they will participate in workshops about repair and prevention, warranties, roles and responsibilities of the homeowner, community involvement and being a good neighbor.

Under CHA's Homeownership Program, a participant's income is supplemented by a monthly subsidy provided by CHA that is equal to a participant's calculated Housing Assistance Payment (HAP). A re-calculation will be done when the participant is determined mortgage ready by the Homebuyer Education Provider to determine the new HAP. This subsidy combined with a participant's income shall serve as the base for mortgage lender approval. HAP subsidies will be set and may not be adjusted by a household's loss of income. Accordingly, households which may experience an increase in income will not incur an adjustment in their HAP subsidy; therefore, incentivizing families to increase their household incomes during the fifteen-year HAP assistance period.

CHA chooses to use the set HAP because our banking partners qualify participants based on the participant's income along with the CHA HAP amount. Therefore, since the family qualified based on that income, CHA will keep the HAP the same. HAP payments will be paid directly to approved lenders for a period of fifteen years (or 30 years for elderly and disabled) at which point a participant would assume the entire mortgage obligation.

Households are responsible for attaining their own financing from a CHA approved lender and will be assisted in identifying both lenders and best financing alternatives through Homeownership Counseling. All mortgages must escrow property taxes and insurance. Participants must also be able to provide a 3% down payment. However, down payment assistance programs, such as the City of Charlotte's House Charlotte Program can be used to meet this requirement. It should also be noted that CHA does not contribute any financial assistance for the homebuyer process other than the monthly Housing Assistance Payment.

The acquired home must serve as a household's sole residence and they are not allowed to rent their property during the HAP subsidy period. Subleasing of the property is a program violation which is cause for termination of HAP subsidy.

Homeowner participant households will not be required to participate in annual or interim reexaminations during the program's duration; however, a criminal background check will be conducted biennially on all household members 16 years of age and older and reporting changes as mandated by HUD for the Housing Choice Voucher Program are still in effect. CHA will conduct an initial HQS or UPCS inspection on the home during the contract due diligence period. In addition, the homebuyer will be responsible for contracting with a

certified home inspector during the due diligence period.

Homebuyers are still bound to certain HUD mandated program rules and are subject to termination from the program and HAP subsidy for any program violations listed within the Statement of Family Obligations Appendix N form that will be part of the formal and binding agreement made between participant and the CHA at closing. In the event of termination from the program/HAP subsidy, a household will be immediately responsible for assuming the entire mortgage commitment.

Homeowner participant households can qualify for a hardship expense and HAP adjustment based on extraordinary maintenance expenses, not covered by any insurance or warranties. Please reference Appendix M for hardship request requirements and limitations.

This program is being carried out using MTW flexibilities, which are conditioned upon an agreement with HUD. If the CHA's MTW status expires, CHA's homeownership program would revert to HUD's traditional HCV Homeownership Program and operate within the statute of the HUD HCV Program.

As of December 2016, CHA had 16 families receiving homeownership counseling services. Fifteen of these were pre counseling services and one is post homeownership counseling. The agency held two information sessions during the year for recruitment purposes. After processing over 200 applications, there were a significant number of individuals who either did not meet the screening criteria or did not have the credit score required to obtain a mortgage. The agency's third party contractor chose to work with the households that had a reserve amount of income for homeownership incidentals such as appraisals, inspections, and earnest money, as well as credit score between 620-640. The agency works with lenders who offer or have access to down payment and closing costs, and realtors are encouraged to solicit closing costs for participants.

Outcomes and benchmarks are compared in the chart below. The activity is on schedule.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
SS #1: Increase Household Income				
Increase average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars	\$21,827	\$22,372	\$27,436.33	Yes
SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Employed Full-Time	12	15	12	No
Unemployed	0	0	0	Yes
Other ¹	0	4	6	Yes

¹ SSI and SS Households

SS#4 Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Decrease the number of households receiving TANF assistance	0	0	0	Yes
SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in the number of households transitioned to self sufficiency ²	0	10	0	No
HC#6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities				
Increase in number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity	0	5	3	No
HC#7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice	0	30	18	No

- 3) The benchmark was not met for the number of employed full time and the number receiving services. This was attributed to credit scores and households not meeting the screening criteria for income, employment history and criminal background checks. CHA will have a smaller pool of households near the required credit score and provide guidance on improving the credit score. The agency is also doing more marketing of the homeownership program to voucher holders to increase interest.

The benchmark for those transitioning to self-sufficiency (housing without subsidy) and those purchasing a home was due to both a late start in recruitment during the year (program was being redeveloped) and the pricing demands of the housing market in Charlotte. CHA will increase the income guidelines for SS/SSI households and earned income households to reflect the pricing demands of the housing market in Charlotte. Additionally, the agency now has a process to follow to keep the pipeline of participants in counseling and search throughout the year.

- 4) CHA modified the number of families that would purchase a home to 5 during 2016 due to the restructuring of the program and actual engagement of families during the year.
- 5) CHA did not change the data collection methodology.

² Positive Move Outs With No Subsidy

2016-3 Rent Reform and Work Requirement Revision of 2010-1

- 1) CHA received approval to implement Rent Reform and a work requirement in the FY2010 annual plan. The activity was implemented in FY2011. While elderly and disabled are not required to participate in the work requirement, they are mandated to participate in rent reform. Rent simplification applies to both CHA Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher and RAD PBV. Per approval of the revision in the FY 2016 Annual Plan, the work requirement for families that port into Mecklenburg County applies when the work requirement is implemented for the HCV program.
- 2) The rent calculation is an income-based, stepped rent. The income bands are a \$2,500 range with the stepped rent being 30% of the range low end. Annual adjusted income will be used to establish the income band. A ceiling rent was established at CHA Fair Market Rents (PH, PBV, RAD PBV) by bedroom size and is reviewed/updated every fall. Incentive accounts may be available for those who are participating in social services.

In FY11, the Rent Reform and Work Requirement initiatives were split. Rent Reform began for all conventional public housing and Housing Choice Voucher participants on December 1, 2010. Participants are still granted interim rent reexaminations between annual reexaminations provided they have met the established criteria. If there is a decrease in the family's income or an increase in medical expense or childcare expense which is expected to last longer than thirty days (and will change their flat deduction eligibility), the participant may request that an interim reexamination be performed. Participants must still report changes in family size.

Income earned by seasonal employment is annualized if the employee has maintained employment for more than 60 days. Employees of temporary agencies will be annualized after an initial 30 days of assignments.

Income from assets with a combined value of less than \$5,000 are excluded. The biennial/triennial recertification includes self-certification for households with combined assets at or below \$5,000, or third party verification for assets over \$5,000. Traditional medical and childcare deductions are eliminated. Participants need only verify enough non-reimbursable expenses to meet the requested deduction level listed below.

Medical Expenses	Medical Deduction	Childcare Expense	Childcare Deduction
\$0 - \$2,499	\$0	\$0 - \$2,499	\$0
\$2,500 - \$4,999	\$2,500	\$2,500 - \$4,999	\$2,500
\$5,000 - \$7,499	\$5,000	\$5000 - \$7,499	\$5,000
\$7,500+	\$7,500	\$7,500+	\$7,500

Work Requirement

CHA introduced a work requirement where the Head of Household is expected to work full-time in the final phase (however, the requirement can be fulfilled by any adult in the household or a combination of the adults in the household). Full-time work is defined as employment for 30 hours or more per week.

The work requirement launched at our Moving Forward sites with supportive services during FY2015, where all non-working residents (except the elderly and persons with disabilities) underwent an assessment to determine the extent of any barriers to work. Participants who were prepared for work were urged to look for work. As we expand the program to additional properties and to the housing choice voucher program, participants who are not prepared will be connected to other work participation activities to help them prepare for work, including life skills education, volunteering, and short-term vocational training.

During the first introductory phase of the program, no participants were sanctioned for failure to comply with the policy. This gave participants time to address barriers to work and better understand the policy.

After the introductory phase, Households were expected to exhibit a good-faith effort to find work for a minimum of 20 hours a week and/or participate in other work participation activities.

At the beginning of the final phase of the work requirement, CHA will begin requiring the Household to work full-time (at least 30 hours /week). Participants who fail to comply with the terms of the Work requirement policy may be sanctioned. The sanctions will increase in magnitude the longer a participant is in non-compliance, and shall be applied in phases as follows:

Improvement Period: Participants will have a three (3) month warning period to cure non-compliance, if not cured within three (3) months, probationary sanctions will be applied. Participants may be granted extensions to the implemented period if in compliance with their established improvement plan.

Probationary Period: Participant will lose 50% of their rental assistance for up to three (3) months. If they fail to correct the non-compliance within three (3) months, non-compliance sanctions will be applied.

Non-Compliance Period: Participant will lose 100% of their rental assistance for six (6) months and will be required to pay the established contract rent. Participant still has the option to cure the non-compliance during the 6-month period while they are paying

market rent. If the Participant fails to cure the non-compliance by the end of the 6-month period, they will continue to pay contract rent and move to Termination.

Termination: Termination will begin and the Participant's incentive account, if any, is forfeited due to non-compliance. For Housing Choice Voucher participants this means they will lose their voucher eligibility permanently, but may be able to remain unassisted in their current unit.

CHA conventional units managed by the agency completed 908 re-certifications, while the Housing Choice Voucher program completed 2,615. These combined with the 3rd party managed Public Housing units totaled 4,498. However, the third party managed properties do not participate in the rent reform activity. Therefore, the total re-certifications reflected in the data below is 3,523.

Outcomes and benchmarks are compared in the chart below. The activity is on schedule.

2i. CHA received 89 hardship request, of which, 69 were approved.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of rent reform in dollars	The cost of task prior to implementation of activity is \$67,960 (3,398 staff hours multiplied by \$20 per hour for FTE of specialist/prop mgr)	The expected cost of task \$38,160.	The outcome was $.38 \times 3523 = 1338.74$. $1338.74 \times \$20 = \$26,774.80$	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease total time to complete the task in staff hours	Total amount of staff time prior to implementation of the activity is 3,398 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated 1,908 hours.	Total time was 1,338 staff hours	Yes
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in rent calculation task as a percentage.	The average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity will be set in FY2015.	The expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity will be determined after the baseline is set.	The average error rate is 20% - This will be considered the baseline for CHA.	Yes
CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenues				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had agency wide PH rental revenue of \$4,780,995.99	CHA projects rental revenue of \$2,798,379	CHA PH rental revenue is \$3,407,800	Yes

SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households participating in the Rent Reform activity	Average earned income prior to implementation \$13,326	Expected average earned income (2.5% increase) \$13,659	Average earned income is \$13,105	No
SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Average amount of savings/escrow of households participating in the Rent Reform activity	The average amount of savings/escrow of households participating prior to implementation was \$0	The average amount of savings/escrow of households participating \$982 per household	Average amount of savings/escrow of households participating is \$1,332	Yes
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Increase in the number of head(s) of households employed full-time	Head(s) of households employed full time prior to implementation of rent reform activity was 64	Expected head(s) of households employed full time 92	Head of households employed full time is 79	No
SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is not available, but as of FY2014 it is 231.	Expected number of households receiving TANF 205.	Households receiving TANF is 168	Yes
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 291	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services 295	293	No

SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in average amount of Section 8 and Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$547 for HCV HAP and \$359 for PH	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy is \$605 for HCV HAP and \$262 for PH	Average subsidy per household is \$608 for HCV and \$313 for PH	No
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency ³	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (positive move out with no subsidy assistance) prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (positive move out with no subsidy assistance) is 6.	Households that transitioned to self-sufficiency (positive move out with no subsidy assistance) is 4 in the PH Moving Forward Self-Sufficiency Program and 5 in the HCV Program for a total of 9	Yes

* the average escrow balance includes households in the traditional FSS program and the Rent Reform Incentive accounts. The baseline for Section 9 subsidy includes properties that are now owned by Horizon

CHA has obtained a waiver and does not offer a flat rent under its MTW Rent Reform Initiative; instead a ceiling rent is used. For a full description of the Rent Reform Initiative see The Hardship Policy, Work Requirement, Rent Reform Overview and examples of alternative rent schedules included in the Appendices.

- 3) CHA did not achieve the benchmarks for average earned income, number employed full-time, average subsidy provided and number of families receiving self-sufficiency services. All of these are interconnected. Improvement is needed in the employment status to make an impact in the other areas. During 2016, CHA was unable to roll out the supportive services to more developments. This prevented participants from gaining better skill sets for more sustainable jobs. CHA has developed a supportive services plan for all sites moving forward. Additionally, they are working on the plan for Housing Choice Voucher Program in 2017.
- 4) The benchmarks and metrics remain the same.
- 5) The data collection methodology did not change.

³CHA defines self-sufficiency as no subsidy assistance

2016-4 Implement a Single Platform for Inspections

- 1) CHA received approval to standardize the inspection protocol for all programs during the FY 2016 plan year. CHA has not implemented the UPCS inspection model on the tenant based voucher units.
- 2) CHA may use the Uniform Physical Condition Standard (UPCS) as the model for inspection in lieu of Housing Quality Standards (HQS) and exclude the UPCS inspection criteria that impacts the building systems, site common areas, such as playgrounds, pools, laundry mats, and other amenities. In addition, CHA received approval to allow the agency's certified/trained UPCS inspectors or HCV certified designees as described in the HCV Administrative Plan to conduct inspection of the units that the agency and/or their subsidiaries has an ownership interest in.

This activity is not on schedule. Utilization of UPCS inspection criteria for CHA's tenant based voucher program has not been implemented. Implementation is expected to begin in FY 2017.

Standard HUD Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease total cost of re-inspections in dollars	\$73,208 cost for re-inspections in FY2015	\$24,403 cost for re-inspections in FY2016	Not implemented	No
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease total time to complete re-inspections in staff hours	3,748.50 hours spent on re-inspections	1249.50 hours on re-inspections in FY2016	Not implemented	No
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average percent of re-inspections of initial inspections	55%	40%	Not implemented	No

- 3) The benchmarks were not met because the agency has not yet acquired the software capability to implement the UPCS format. Software changes are being assessed during FY 2017.
- 4) CHA did not revise the benchmarks or metrics.
- 5) The data collection methodology has not changed.

2016-5 Controlled Program Moves

- 1) CHA received approval to control program moves in the Housing Choice Voucher tenant-based program during the FY 2016 plan year. The initiative was implemented during the first quarter of 2016.
- 2) CHA will approve elective move transfers only if the participant has lived in the current unit for a minimum of eighteen (18) consecutive months unless the situation involves a mandatory or permissible move.

Mandatory:

- Abatement
- Breach of contract by owner
- Transfer of ownership where new owner is not participating in the HCV program
- Notice of Pending Foreclosure
- Under Housed
- Natural disasters that make the unit uninhabitable
- Decrease in the payment standard

Permissible:

- Domestic Violence
- Reasonable Accommodations
- Health or safety of a family member (e.g. lead-based paint hazards, domestic violence, and witness protection programs), or to address an emergency situation over which a family has no control.
- Educational opportunities
- Employment opportunities

The CHA will also deny a participant permission to make an elective move if the family is currently in a repayment agreement until they are paid in full and will be denied if pending termination. This policy applies to moves within the PHA's jurisdiction or outside it under portability.

Third party documentation will be required for all requests inside of the 18- month period. Documentation examples include a job offer, school letter, police report, bank notices, or any documentation that verifies the legitimacy of the reason for the request to move inside of the 18-month period. Owner agreement to terminate may be applicable in some situations. This activity will apply to all tenant based voucher holders and port-ins.

CHA implemented the 18-month elective move/transfer in March 2016. Outcomes and benchmarks are compared in the chart below. The activity is on schedule. For the period of April 1, 2015 – December 31, 2016, there were 964 transfers, however, for a full one-year period of January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016, there were only 462. CHA estimates 90 minutes per transfer.

Standard HUD Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of processing move requests	\$26,230 per year	\$13,115 per year	\$7,806	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease in total staff time (in hours) transfers	1,398 hours per year (12.51*1.5*1398)	699 hours per year (12.51*1.5*699)	416 hours per year (12.51*1.5*416)	Yes

- 3) The benchmarks were met.
- 4) CHA did not revise the benchmarks or metrics.
- 5) The data collection methodology has not changed.

2016-6 Modified Definition of Elderly

- 1) CHA received approval to modify the definition of elderly from 62 or older to 55 or older during the FY 2016 plan year. The initiative was implemented with RAD.
- 2) The definition of elderly families for eligibility in both the Public Housing and Project Based Voucher Programs has been modified from head or co-head or spouse age 62 or older to head or co-head or spouse age 55 or older. This activity enables CHA to expand housing choice for near elderly households. Outcomes and benchmarks are compared in the chart below. The activity is on schedule.

CHA received a Certificate of Occupancy in December 2016 for 92 units at The Landing at Park Road, which houses seniors. CHA does not keep a separate wait list for the 55 or older, therefore, the number reported may be under reporting because CHA can only assume that a cross reference of move ins during the April 1, 2015 – December 31, 2016 for move ins at the senior apartment complexes is the simplest way to compile the data. There were no move ins during this period for The Landing at Park Road due to the date of the occupancy certificate. Using the \$400 deduction for move ins may include disabled and cause an over reporting. There were 30 such move ins during the time period.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity for near elderly.	95	95	122	Yes
HC#3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease)	11 years	11 years	11 years	Yes
HC#4: Displacement Prevention				
Number of near elderly households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	338	0	0	Yes
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	77	77	122	No

- 3) The actual outcome for number of households able to move to a better unit and or neighborhood is not able to calculate accurately due to CHA's RAD conversion. Each tenant had to be moved out of the property code into a RAD property code. Therefore, CHA will not know for this year whether it met the benchmark or not.
- 4) The benchmarks and metrics are the same.
- 5) The data collection methodology remains the same.

2015-1 Streamline Project-Based Vouchers (PBV) and Public Housing Regulations (ONLY APPLICABLE TO DEVELOPMENTS WITH PBV AND PH AT THE SAME DEVELOPMENT)

- 1) CHA modified its Project-Based voucher (PBV) and Public Housing policies to blend the programs and simplify administration when units reside in the same development/building. Approved and Implemented FY2015.
- 2) Property managers and residents have found the programs complex to administer. The management continues to keep separate waiting lists, however they are permitted to use the same tenant selection plan, grievance policy, Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS- which is typically associated with public housing program) or Housing Quality Standards (HQS – which is typically associated with Housing Choice Voucher program) inspections, and termination procedures for both programs. UPCS does not require initial inspections as HQS inspections do. However, based on CHA's MTW Agreement, the PBV units will maintain initial inspections (which can utilize on-site maintenance supervisor completion of the move-in inspection per UPCS protocol). A standard move-in form will be used.

The management of each development has created policies for eligibility, grievance, inspection and terminations which were approved by CHA's Administrative staff. CHA will charge a fee if the third party management uses CHA's grievance panel. Third party management firms may also be responsible for costs associated with annual and/or initial property inspections.

A standardized system of inspections such as UPCS ensures decent, safe and sanitary housing and minimizes the risk of substandard housing. Additionally, simplifying inspections to single inspections decreases risk, as well as errors in inspections which have to comply with multiple inspection standards. The PBV and PH units will both be monitored for quality control by CHA Asset Managers' quarterly visits, annual third party UPCS inspections and REAC annual inspections if the property elects UPCS inspections.

CHA continued to contract with a third party for a portion of the fiscal year. There were 20 initial PBV inspections conducted by a 3rd party inspector at a rate of \$75.00 and 101 annual PBV inspections using UPCS at a rate of \$9.35. Outcomes and benchmarks are compared in the chart below. The activity is on schedule.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1 Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of Initial Third Party HQS Inspection in dollars	FY2013 The current cost of HQS third party inspections is \$55	Expected to decrease cost of initial third party HQS inspections after implementation to \$0/Self-certification of Initial inspections conducted by property management	Actual cost was \$75.00 per inspection for a total of	No
Decrease in total cost of Annual Third Party HQS Inspection in dollars	FY2013 The current cost of Annual HQS inspection is \$55 per unit	Expected to decrease the cost of Annual Third Party HQS to \$10 per unit using UPCS Inspections	Actual cost was \$9.35 per inspection	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease total time to complete the Inspections in staff hours.	Total amount of staff time dedicated to Inspections prior to implementation of the activity is 272 hours	Expected total staff time dedicated to Inspections after implementation is not expected to decrease due to potential of increased units and all units will continue to receive an annual inspection.	Actual staff time for inspections was 272 hours	Yes

CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in the average percent error rate in completing HQS inspections at mixed	The average percent failed HQS inspections prior to implementation is 4%	The expected average percent failed HQS inspections after implementation is 0%.	Actual failed HQS inspections were 16%	No
Decrease in the average percent error rate in completing annual UPCS inspections at mixed developments	There is a 14.99% error rate prior to implementation of this activity	CHA anticipates no change in the error rate in the first year of implementation.	Actual late or failed UPCS Inspections at mixed income 44%	No

- 3) The benchmark for initial inspections was not met because CHA was still using the 3rd party vendor due to a delay in software changes.
- 4) No benchmarks or metrics have been revised.
- 5) There is no new data collection method.

2015-2 Biennial Inspection of Housing Choice Voucher Units

- 1) CHA received approval to conduct biennial inspections of the Housing Choice Voucher Units in FY 2015. The activity was implemented in FY 2015.
- 2) CHA streamlined the Housing Quality Standards (HQS) Inspection process for tenant based voucher units. HUD requires that HQS inspections be conducted yearly on all HCV units. CHA modified the frequency of HQS inspections by inspecting qualifying housing stock biennially. CHA initially thought to create a high performing unit list to identify properties that qualified for the biennial inspection process, however, the final program design resulted in all properties being inspected based on their physical location using interstate 77 as the dividing line. Properties in the Eastern Region are inspected in even years and properties in the Western region are inspected in the odd years. CHA will continue to review public tax records to ensure that there are no tax liens on the properties. CHA conducted 2,672 Biennial Inspections and 1,370 of these failed the first inspection. Outcomes and benchmarks are compared in the chart below. The activity is on schedule.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in the total cost of HQS tenant based inspections	The activity costs \$514,675 in FY2014 (\$35x14,705) prior to implementation	The activity is expected to cost \$411,740 (\$35x11,764)	The actual cost was \$93,520	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease in total staff time to complete HQS tenant based inspections	There were 7,677 hours of staff time dedicated to the task in FY2014 prior to implementation of activity	The activity is expected to take 5,822 hours	The activity took 1,336 hours	Yes
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average percent error rate in completing the HQS tenant based inspections on time	Average error rate of HQS tenant based inspections is 2% not completed on time prior to implementation of the biennial inspection activity	Average error rate of HQS tenant based inspections is 29% fail rate	51%	No

- 3) The benchmark for initial inspections was not met because CHA did not limit enrollment of units into biennial inspections to high performers. All units in the program are inspected biennially.
- 4) No benchmarks or metrics have been revised.
- 5) There is no new data collection method.

2015-3 Public Housing No Assistance Termination Policy

(MIXED-INCOME COMMUNITIES ONLY)

- 1) In FY 2015, CHA requested a waiver to terminate the housing of participants that reach the ceiling/market rent of the community and has income that qualifies them to pay that rent for 6 months. CHA implemented the activity in FY 2015.
- 2) The household will be considered “graduated”, however, they will remain in the unit

and the next market rate unit which becomes available will become a public housing unit. This policy is similar to the Housing Choice Voucher program which terminates participants after 6 months of no Housing Assistance Payment (\$0 assistance). The activity outcomes are compared to the baselines and benchmarks in the chart below. The activity is on schedule.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in the number of new public housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI at mixed income communities as a result of the activity.	There were 2 housing units occupied by persons over 80% of AMI that can be leased to households at or below 80% AMI at mixed income communities prior to the start of the activity.	2 housing units can be leased to households at or below 80% AMI at mixed income communities	0	No
HC#3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Decrease in the average applicant time on wait list in months	The average wait time prior to implementation is 72 months	The average wait time prior to implementation is 36 months graduation mark.	The average wait time at mixed income properties with FSS is 121 months	No

- 3) The benchmark for number of Public Housing transitioned to market rate at mixed income developments was lower than targeted because CHA is looking at possible households (those that were originally considered) more carefully before making the determination.
- 4) The benchmarks and metrics remain the same.
- 5) There is no new data collection method.

2009-2 Agency Wide Biennial Reexaminations – Approved in 2009 for elderly/disabled and implemented FY2011. Expanded Agency Wide approved and implemented FY2014.

- 1) CHA was approved in FY 2009 to conduct biennial reexaminations for elderly/disabled (implemented FY 2011 and approved to expand the activity in FY 2013 to the entire portfolio, and was implemented in FY 2014.
- 2) CHA implemented a biennial schedule in all CHA managed communities and all Housing Choice Voucher (HCV), including Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH), households regardless of sources of income or type of family. Changes in income, expenses, family composition, etc. must still be reported in the administrative policy timeframes. CHA has no limits on the number of interim reexaminations processed annually at the family's request. Any changes that result in an increase in rent will be documented, but not processed until the biennial. Minimum renters are not required to complete 90-day minimum rent reviews; however, a property manager may provide resource guidance for the household.

Criminal background checks continue to be conducted annually for all household members ages 16 and older. Additionally, Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) is still used during reexamination.

Households with an anniversary in odd months are recertified in odd years (i.e. January - 2015) and households with an even month anniversary are recertified in even years (February - 2016).

The activity is on schedule and considered effective for the overall intent to reduce time spent on reexaminations to allow staff to conduct quality assurance and improved customer service.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in the cost of task in dollars (postage for biennial reexaminations)	Cost of postage for reexaminations prior to implementation of biennial reexaminations was \$1,973	Projected cost of postage for reexaminations after implementation of biennial reexaminations is \$1,513	The actual cost of postage for reexaminations was \$1,255	Yes

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease the time to complete the task in staff hours	PH and HCV spent 3,398 hours prior to implementation of the activity	PH and HCV anticipates spending 1,996 hours	PH and HCV spent 1,338 hours	Yes
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in the percentage of average error rate in on time Biennial reexaminations	Average on time reexaminations error rate was 0% for PH and .06% for HCV	CHA anticipates a 0 % error rate for both programs	CHA had a 0% error rate for both programs	Yes
CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars ¹	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$2,798,379	3,407,800	Yes
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households participating in the activity	Average earned income prior to implementation \$13,326	Expected average after implementation (2.5% increase) \$13,659	The actual average earned income was \$13,105	No
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency ²	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity is 6	The total families that transitioned to self-sufficiency was 9	Yes

- 3) The average earned income benchmark was not achieved and CHA attributes it to the significant number of households pulled from the wait list that were at or below 30% of the AMI.
- 4) There were no changes to the benchmarks or metrics for this activity.
- 5) There is no new data collection method.

¹ Rental revenue in this report is for Public Housing only

² CHA's definition of self-sufficiency is positive move out to housing with no subsidy

2008-1 Participant and Landlord Tracking Program

- 1) The agency was approved and began implementation to begin tracking the locations of Housing Choice Vouchers in order to address de-concentration of poverty and increase access to affordable housing opportunities in non-concentrated areas in FY 2008.
- 2) Using the Geographic Information Science (GIS) mapping services of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC), CHA identified each voucher holder within Mecklenburg County (Charlotte, Pineville, Huntersville, Mint Hill, Matthews, Davidson, Cornelius). The results of the mapping indicated that 75% (3,206 of 4,268) of Housing Choice Voucher holders reside in 8 concentrated zip codes within the City of Charlotte (28208, 28215, 28216, 28205, 28217, 28212, 28269, and 28213). CHA identified where both poverty and Housing Choice Voucher participation is low in order to design a program which would encourage participants to move into those areas.

CHA began including information on the benefits of residing in low poverty areas in the voucher briefings, including a list of amenities in non-concentrated zip codes. No additional services are provided to the household. CHA has also worked on reducing this percentage by actively visiting apartment complex management companies, and speaking with landlords who own or manage properties outside of the concentrated areas. Additionally, CHA has formed a Landlord Advisory Group to assist in recruiting properties for Housing Choice Voucher leases and a Neighborhood Advisory Group to solicit suggestions and feedback on how to improve the perception of the Housing Choice Voucher program.

It is noted that the % change can be impacted by the utilization rate and number of vouchers available; therefore, the actual number of vouchers in the concentrated area is critical to realizing movement for de-concentration purposes. The activity is on schedule and effective. Project Based vouchers and port outs are excluded from the count.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 25% or 1,062 of 4,268	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhoods of opportunity after implementation to 1,280	Actual number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhoods of opportunity was 1,425	Yes

HC#7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Increase in the number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Anticipated number of households to receive services is 190	Actual households that receive services is 293	Yes

- 3) Benchmarks were achieved.
- 4) There was no change in the benchmark or metric.
- 5) The data collection method did not change.

2008-2 Adopt Investment Policies Consistent with State Law

- 1) CHA proposed to adopt an investment policy consistent with state law in FY 2009 and was approved. The agency implemented the new activity in FY 2009.
- 2) CHA invests only in securities authorized under NC state law that allow the flexibility to invest productively and efficiently to achieve a portfolio which is safer, more liquid, and obtains competitive yield. CHA's investments are performed in accordance with HUD regulations and North Carolina Statutes. This activity has allowed CHA to achieve higher earnings on idle funds in a safer, more liquid environment. The activity is on schedule and effective.

CHA's investment policy restricts amounts deposited or invested for different types of investments as a percentage of the overall portfolio. The agency has less ability to invest in commercial paper than in previous years and investments are not yielding as well as in previous years, however, the agency continues to compare the NC investments portfolio to HUD's portfolio and maintains it is gaining more interest on dollars leveraged in the NC portfolio.

This activity has allowed CHA to achieve higher earnings on idle funds in a safer, more liquid environment. The interest rates during the baseline period averaged 4.41% per month. The current average interest rate is .12% due to the economy. In past years, CHA experienced a higher interest rate under the new portfolio strategy since implementation began in 2009, resulting in a higher net portfolio return which achieves greater cost

effectiveness in Federal expenditures. The activity is on schedule. The chart below illustrates the outcome compared to baseline and benchmark.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase amount of funds leveraged in dollars	The increase in amount of funds leveraged prior to the start of this activity was \$0	The expected amount of funds leveraged after this activity is \$30,000	\$82,579	Yes

- 3) Benchmarks were achieved.
- 4) There was no change in the benchmark or metric.
- 5) The data collection method did not change.

2009–3 Modify Section 8 Inspection Procedures

- 1) In 2009, CHA was approved and implemented the use of a local building standards inspection and subsequent issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) instead of the required initial Housing Quality Standard (HQS) inspection for the initial or move-in inspection on newly constructed project-based or tenant-based voucher units.
- 2) At the start of the activity, the HQS inspection was \$50. It is now \$75. CHA was able to save \$3,750 by using the Mecklenburg County Building Standards Certificate of Occupancy for 15 Project Based Voucher units at Residences at The Renaissance and 35 at Moore Place II. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task in dollars	The cost of HQS inspections was \$50 prior to implementation of the activity (114 units at \$5,700).	The expected cost of the task is \$0 after implementation of the activity.	The actual dollars spent was \$0	Yes

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease in the total time to complete the task in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity was 57 hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 0.	The actual staff time spent was 0	Yes
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in the average percent error rate in completing inspections	The average percent failed inspections prior to implementation is 0%	The expected average percent failed inspections after implementation	The actual percent failed was 0%	Yes

- 3) Benchmarks were achieved.
- 4) There were no changes to the metrics or benchmarks.
- 5) The data collection method did not change.

2008–4 Community Based Rental Assistance

Local Rental Subsidy

- 1) The activity was approved in FY2011 as a second amendment to the Plan. The activity was implemented in FY2011. CHA awards partner agencies with an allocation of tenant-based vouchers to house homeless families participating in intensive supportive services.

The CHA may grant special admissions to referrals from partner agencies participating in the local Rental Subsidy Program and admit families that are not on the HCV waiting list or without considering the family's position on the HCV waiting list. However, referrals that are on the HCV waiting list will have preference. Families referred to CHA by partner agencies must meet HCV eligibility criteria and adhere to the partner's supportive services requirements for continued eligibility.

Partner agencies participating in the Local Rental Subsidy program may impose voucher time limits based on their CHA-approved service delivery model.

- 2) CHA is collaborating with four partners to implement the Local Rental Subsidy Program:
 - a. Charlotte Family Housing (CFH) receives 50 rental subsidies. The families referred

through CFH are either working or participating in a self-sufficiency or educational program and earning less than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). CHA may subsidize up to 15 families that need employment at the time of admission. The CFH program targets families who are situationally or transitionally homeless and ready for transition from local shelters. The CFH program is a collaborative effort that joins local agencies that are already providing services to this population with funds from the faith community, the corporate community and the public sector. The goal is to help families achieve self-sufficiency within three to five years by providing comprehensive family development via social work, intensive case management and access to services while the family is permanently housed in a stable apartment community.

CFH has established operating procedures, landlord relationships and administrative staff to deliver wrap-around services and assist families in locating suitable housing. The CFH partnership enables delivery of supportive services at no cost to CHA. CHA and CFH may modify the \$500 subsidy cap for working households due to the impact on larger families' ability to locate units below the CHA payment standard.

- b. A Stable Home (ASH) is a collaboration with A Child's Place, Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System, Mecklenburg County, and CHA to provide stability for homeless school children and their families.

ASH case managers identify and refer homeless families at participating schools for participation in the local Rental Subsidy Program. CHA provides case management to referrals that meet HCV eligibility and FSS program requirements. CHA has reduced the ASH voucher allocation from 50 to 35 due to their average utilization rate.

- c. Supportive Housing Communities (SHC) formerly known as Weyland II receives 15 rental subsidies for chronically homeless families and/or individuals with disabilities. SHC transitioned from a site-based rental subsidy program at Weyland Apartments to a scattered-site program in 2016. Referrals for the SHC local Rental Subsidy Program are received by SHC through Mecklenburg County's Coordinated Assessment. Coordinated Assessment aims to connect individuals and families who are homeless, or at imminent risk of becoming homeless to available shelter and housing resources in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg community. SHC provides supportive services to families participating in the SHC local Rental Subsidy Program. Families must comply with HCV requirements and SHC supportive services to maintain continued eligibility.
- d. Urban Ministry Center (UMC) has received an allocation of vouchers to serve chronically homeless families and/or individuals with disabilities. The first phase of the local Rental Subsidy Program will be implemented in 2017 with 15 initial vouchers.

Referrals for the UMC local Rental Subsidy Program are received by UMC through

Mecklenburg County's Coordinated Assessment. Coordinated Assessment aims to connect individuals and families who are homeless, or at imminent risk of becoming homeless to available shelter and housing resources in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg community.

UMC provides supportive services to families participating in the UMC local Rental Subsidy Program. Families must comply with HCV requirements and UMC supportive services to maintain continued eligibility.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Supportive Housing Project-Based Activity				
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount of leverage prior to implementation of the activity is \$0.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$2,300 per family for supportive services	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$5,650 per family for supportive services	Yes
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of new housing units made available for special needs, homeless or disabled households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase)	114	Anticipate 35 PBV units will be made available at Moore Place II	Actual supportive housing units made available were 35	Yes
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of average HAP in dollars	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity \$547	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity \$489	The cost of the average HAP for work requirement programs is CFH \$521 and ASH \$839.	No

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease in total time to complete the task (process HAP) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time (process HAP) dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected amount of total staff time (process HAP) dedicated to the task is 3 hours per month.	HAP payments for the Local Rental Subsidy Program have been automated through Yardi and require no staff hours	Yes
CE#3: Decrease in error rate of tax execution				
Decrease average error in completing a task (HAP calculation) as a percentage	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is to TBD during FY2015	N/A	HAP payments for the Local Rental Subsidy Program have been automated through Yardi	Yes
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$0	Expected amount leveraged for supportive services is \$5,000 per family	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$5,000 per family.	Yes
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation was not available to CHA. The baseline is set at \$12,322	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of this activity is \$12,630 (2.5%)	The actual average earned income for CFH is \$12,243 and ASH is \$7,339	No
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Employed Full Time	TBD	Expected head of households employed full time after implementation is 50.	The actual number of full time households is CFH 20 and ASH 5	No

SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 0.	There was no change. Households with TANF remain at 0.	Yes
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 50.	Household receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 40 CFH, 14 SHC, and 24 ASH.	No
SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in total cost of task (cost of HAP) in dollars	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity \$0	Expected cost of task (average HAP) after implementation of the activity \$489.	The cost of the average HAP for work requirement programs is CFH \$521 and ASH \$839.	No
S#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	Households in this program lease from private landlords. There is no impact on rental revenue for CHA	N/A	N/A	N/A

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (no subsidy) prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity is 1.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation is 7.	Yes
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation is 100.	There were 71 households able to move to a better unit or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity.	No

- 3) Most of the ASH program participants are in the initial year of the FSS contract so increases in wages have not been obtained which is indicated by a higher HAP average.
- 4) The benchmark for number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity was changed to reflect the addition of the families in A Stable Home program. The metric was not revised. The agency removed metrics for Traditional since no MTW flexibility was need for traditional project-based vouchers at CHA owned units.
- 5) The data collection method did not change.

2009-5 Moving Forward Supportive Services (formerly Currents of Change)

- 1) CHA was approved to implement a Supportive Services activity in FY 2009.
- 2) CHA is coordinating this activity in conjunction with supportive services from a Hope VI project.

The activity is on schedule and effective. In previous contracts for supportive services funding was provided for the entire family. The scope of services limits the

focus and investment to the head of household, though services can still be provided to other family members in the household. The revised contract reduced the cost per household for supportive services to \$1,300 per year.

Moving Forward Supportive Services are provided to two pilot groups. In the Annual Report we break the sites out into three pilots: Victoria Square and Claremont Pilot 1, Boulevard as Pilot 2 and Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills as Pilot 3. However, under CHA's Moving Forward programming we divide the sites up by program or group. The HOPE VI group, Moving Forward Group 1 (Claremont, Victoria Square and HCV) and Moving Forward Group 2 (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills). The Client Services Department previously tracked a comparison site; Dillehay Courts. Dillehay is a large conventional public housing community that does not currently receive supportive services. With the approved changes for Biennial Reexaminations the Dillehay Courts comparison group will no longer be used in the FY 14-15 year and going forward, as the numbers no longer reflect current incomes and wages.

Moving Forward Supportive Services – FSS Program:

CHA administers the Moving Forward Supportive Services (MFSS) Program, which operates in our conventional sites located at Claremont, Victoria Square as well as in the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program (Group 1). This program is the combination of the traditional family self-sufficiency (FSS) program and the newer MTW Moving Forward Self-Sufficiency program. In 2010, FSS contracts were no longer offered and those who were under a traditional FSS 5-year contract had the option to remain under their FSS contract or roll under the new Moving Forward Supportive Services program. Under this program, applicants must be willing to finish a high school diploma or earn a GED during participation in the program. During the first twelve (12) months they are encouraged to become employed a minimum of 15 hours per week and willing to enroll in school and/or job training. After the introductory period, the work requirement applies and they are required to be working and/or in an approved job training program. Applicants must demonstrate motivation towards self-sufficiency. Although the contract of participation is still a part of the Moving Forward Supportive Services program, a time frame is not set. Continual progress towards self-sufficiency is expected with an average program time being seven (7) years.

Moving Forward Supportive Services Program:

Beginning April 1, 2013, CHA provides self-sufficiency programming to three conventional public housing sites: (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest, and Tarlton Hills- Group 2) that were previously being served by an outside case management agency. As of April 2014, Grace- Mar, Inc. provides the self-sufficiency programming to our relocated Boulevard Homes families *who have not* relocated back to the revitalized community of Renaissance (Group 2). Renaissance West Community Initiative (RWCI) was contracted to oversee the supportive services at the Renaissance and The Retreat at Renaissance which includes serving those Boulevard original families who chose to return to the revitalized community. As of this report there are a total of 15

original Boulevard Homes' families that returned to the revitalized community.

Like the Moving Forward Group 1 program, applicants must be willing to finish high school diploma or earn a GED during participation in the program. During the first (12) months they are encouraged to become employed a minimum of 15 hours per week and willing to enroll in school and/or job training. After the introductory period, the work requirement applies and they are required to be working and/or in an approved job training program. Applicants must demonstrate motivation towards self-sufficiency. Although the contract of participation is still a part of the Moving Forward program, a time frame is not set. Continual progress towards self-sufficiency is expected with an average program time being seven (7) years. Many of the active participants in this program have a lot of barriers to self-sufficiency.

Metrics are determined on an annual basis due to program attrition.

CHA (Claremont, Victoria Square)				
Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	Expected cost after implementation of the activity is \$2,300 per household	Actual cost of task is \$1,300 per household	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 100.	Expected amount of total staff time after implementation of the activity is 120 hours monthly	Actual hours of staff time was 136 hours monthly	Yes

CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage.	Average error rate of task (inactive head of household) prior to implementation of the activity is 0%	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity is 0%	Actual error rate of task (unemployed, inactive head of household) is 0%	Yes
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$10,000	Actual amount leveraged is 7,240	No
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (1% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Averaged earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$13,779	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of this activity is \$14,585	Actual average earned income is \$14,793	Yes
SS#2: Increase in household savings				
Increase average amount of escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$1,517	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$1,532 (1%)	Average escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$1,492	No

SS#3 Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	23	≥23	26	Yes
# Employed PT (1-31)	54	≥54	46	No
Enrolled in an Educational Program	2	2	1	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	2	2	1	No
Unemployed	≤23	≤23	3	Yes
Other (workshop)	≥23	≥23	32	Yes
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 0	Number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 0	Yes
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 78	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation is ≤78	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency is 78	Yes
SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of this activity is \$391	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$282	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the	No
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$2,798,379	CHA public housing rental revenue was	Yes

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	2	2	1	No
CHS (Boulevard Homes Originals)				
Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,300 per household	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity is \$1,300 per household	Actual cost of supportive services per household is \$1,300	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 100.	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 179 hours monthly	Actual hours of staff time dedicated is 298 hours per month	No
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is $\leq 11\%$	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity is $\leq 11\%$	Actual error rate is 2%	Yes
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$10,000	\$13,550	Yes

SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (0% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$13,078	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$15,588	Actual average earned income is \$16,155	Yes
SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Increase average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$1,118	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$1,123	Actual savings of households is \$1,192	Yes
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	22	≥35	32	No
# Employed PT (1-31)	37	≥47	44	No
Enrolled in an Educational Program	3	5	0	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	3	5	0	No
Unemployed	53	≤96	26	Yes
Other (workshop)	11	31	12	No
SS#4: Households removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 4.	The actual number of households receiving TANF is 11	No

SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 111	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 101	101	Yes
SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	The participating households in this group are a combination of voucher and public housing residents (HOPE VI relocation) and are not coded in one group in the software system to pull this data.			
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$2,798,379	CHA public housing rental revenue was \$3,407,800	Yes
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (no subsidy) is 0	Expected to transition to self-sufficiency is 1	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency is 0	No

CHA (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest, Tarlton Hills)				
Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity is \$1,300 per household	Actual cost is \$1,300 per households	Yes

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 120.	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 170 hours monthly	Actual staff time per month is 160 hours	No
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is 47%	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity is 42%	Average error rate is 42%	Yes
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$10,000.	Actual amount leveraged is \$31,000	Yes
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (0% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$19,249	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$16,397	Actual average earned income is \$15,630	No

SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Increase average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$548	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$551	Actual average savings/escrow amount is \$1,520	Yes
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	22	>22	21	No
# Employed PT (1-31)	37	>23	39	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	11	5	5	Yes
Enrolled in Job Training Program	11	5	5	Yes
Unemployed	56	<83	18	Yes
Other (workshop)	2	>31	17	Yes
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 7	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 7	Actual households receiving TANF 2	No
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 106.	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is <=110	118	No
SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$397	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$304	Actual average subsidy per household is \$401	No

SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$2,798,379	CHA public housing rental revenue was \$3,407,800	Exceeded
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (no subsidy) prior to implementation of the activity is 3	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (no subsidy) is 3	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency is 3	Yes

NOTE:

1. All metrics are taken from the FY2016 program metrics.
 - 3) The Project Expense Level (PEL) is an estimate of the cost to operate each project, exclusive of taxes, utilities and certain add-ons. CHA's subsidy assistance at a property has multiple variables outside of tenant rent that will influence the PEL. Escrow amounts did not increase as predicted since some households moved out, taking their escrow payments with them. New households would not have escrows to counter the removals.
- CHA began serving the Head of Household rather than the entire family which reduced the cost of supportive services per household.
- For the Boulevard Homes households expected to receive self-sufficiency services is <=101 NOTE: New baseline number on caseload as a result of exits. This caseload will not grow which means the benchmarks may not be able to be met as set.
- 4) The baselines and benchmarks are reset each year to reflect the population being served.
 - 5) The data collection methods have not changed.

2009–7 Increase Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Existing Multi-Family Properties

- 1) In FY 2009, CHA was approved for the activity to Increase Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Existing Multi-Family Properties. The activity was implemented in FY 2009 and expanded in FY 2012.
- 2) CHA received approval to expand this initiative to acquire and rehabilitate existing multi-family properties in mixed-income communities. CHA has found acquisition more cost effective and, at times, it has allowed the agency to add more units to the inventory

in a shorter period of time than new construction.

Current new construction is at \$120,000 or more per unit. Individuals who resided at the acquired properties were relocated as necessary in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act. The remaining occupied units are filled through attrition with ACC or Project-Based units as they become vacant. Using MTW flexibility, CHA has acquired 918 units, each costing less than \$81,000 per unit.

CHA purchased expiring tax credits on the public housing, LIHTC and market rate units in HOPE VI developments (Park at Oaklawn and Arbor Glen) in FY2016. There were 50 public housing units in Arbor Glen that were not included because Horizon Properties, LLC owns these units and CHA provides the subsidy. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (acquire units)	Cost of task (acquire units) prior to implementation of the activity was \$120,000 per unit	\$685.00	\$0	Yes
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity	There were 719 units planned	0	Yes
HC#4: Displacement Prevention				
Decrease in number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity was 0	Expected displacement is 0	0	Yes

HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity was 0.	Increase in resident mobility is 0	0	Yes

- 3) Were benchmarks achieved? If not, why not? There were no new acquisitions during the year due to the emphasis on the RAD conversion, completion of The Landing at Park Road, and the start of Tall Oaks redevelopment.
- 4) There are no revised benchmarks or metrics.
- 5) The data collection method has not changed.

2009 – 8 Land Acquisition for Future Use

- 1) CHA was approved and implemented the activity Land Acquisition for Future Use in FY 2009.
- 2) The purpose of the activity is to secure as many good locations, if possible, along the new transit corridors and light rail as well as in rapidly developing areas of Charlotte to expand housing choices. MTW flexibility allows CHA to acquire sites without prior HUD approval, providing that the agency certifies that HUD site selection requirements have been met. This allows CHA to be proactive and competitive in the market when land becomes available. CHA has a surplus of land in inventory, but is experiencing challenges in securing development financing; therefore, acquiring additional land is not a priority at this time.

Steele Creek Seniors has been developed. A tax credit application was approved on the 2.2-acre parcel at Park and Marsh, which was developed for construction of a 92-unit Project-Based Section 8, midrise, senior housing development. CHA will have a Community Services Coordinator at the development, and supportive services will be offered, but voluntary. The average rental price in the communities surrounding the Park and Marsh development is \$1,242. The Park and Marsh development is called The Landing at Park Road. The Certificate of Occupancy was received in December 2016 and lease ups began in January 2017.

Krefeld Drive is a property that has been land banked and development scenarios are being assessed for the future. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	There were 0 housing units targeted.	There were 92 housing units made available as a result of this activity.	Yes

- 3) Benchmark was met.
- 4) There were no revised metrics or benchmarks.
- 5) There is no change to the data collection process.

Local Non-Traditional Initiatives

2011–2 Convert Units to Public Housing

- 1) In FY 2011, CHA was approved and implemented an activity to convert units to public housing. CHA's non-profit subsidiary, Horizon Development Properties, Inc. acquired Hampton Creste Apartments to add 60 public housing units to serve homeless families at Hampton Creste Apartments.
- 2) The apartments have been refinanced and rehabilitated into a mixed- income community. The remaining 153 units are comprised of 40 at 40% AMI and 113 at 80% AMI. The activity was branded the Supportive Housing Innovative Partnership (SHIP).

The Salvation Army (TSA) is responsible for providing the supportive services. The SHIP program provides services to homeless families with children, such as intensive home-based case management and evidence-based programs and services that address severe emotional, social, developmental, educational, and employment challenges that homeless families may face entering permanent housing are provided.

The activity is on schedule and considered effective.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to is \$0	Expected amount leveraged is \$160,000 annually	Actual amount leveraged is \$160,000	Yes
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation is \$5,331 (28 families)	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy is \$3,629 (57 families)	Actual average earned income for 49 households is \$12,312	Yes
SS#4: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Employed Full-Time	Head of households employed full-time prior to implementation of the activity is 15	Expected head of households employed full-time is 19	Actual number of employed full-time was 11	Yes
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 12	Expected number of households receiving TANF is 24	Actual number of families receiving TANF is 15	Yes
SS#5: Households assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in the number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation.	CHA expects 60 households to be receiving self-sufficiency services	Actual units available are 60, actual leased and receiving self-sufficiency is 49	No
SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participant Households				
Decrease in average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this is \$224	370	Yes

SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had rental revenue of \$0	CHA anticipates rental revenue for this property to be \$161,558	Rent due for PH was \$52,952	No
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in the number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency ⁴	There were 0 households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to this activity.	CHA anticipates 2 households to transition to housing with no subsidy.	Actual households transition to non-subsidized housing is 1	No
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity is 60	Actual number of households moving to better unit/and or neighborhood was 49	No

3) Participants are encouraged to obtain needed stabilization assistance which includes TANF. The Project Expense Level (PEL) is an estimate of the cost to operate each project, exclusive of taxes, utilities and certain add-ons. CHA's subsidy assistance at a property has multiple variables outside of tenant rent that will influence the PEL. The households are transitional families through the Salvation Army therefore participation fluctuates.

4) No metrics or benchmarks were revised.

5) There was no change to data collection method.

2011 – 3 New Construction of Affordable Units

1) Approved FY2010 and Implemented FY2011 (expanded FY2012).

2) CHA proposes to develop properties into mixed-income communities. The projects will include units intended for a wide range of income levels, from market rate to units that are affordable to those earning less than 30% area median income (AMI). Adding these units will increase housing choices for those needing affordable housing.

⁴ Positive Move Outs with No Subsidy

The selected environment will be an ideal situation for residents to excel in CHA's Moving Forward program. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools is in the planning phase for the prek-8 grade school that will be built on-site. The school is projected to open in time for the 2017 – 2018 school term. The on-site Community Center is completed and is open. It houses the leasing office and the offices for the non-profit Renaissance West Community Initiative.

There are currently three projects that were completed in FY 2016 for this activity:

- a. The Vistas @ 707 (formerly named Lofts at Seigle Point) is the final on-site component of the Seigle Point HOPE VI redevelopment of the former Piedmont Courts. However, HOPE VI funding is not included in this project. CHA broke ground on the development in December 2012. The project includes 190 units of which 80% will be for lease to families at 80% AMI and below and 20% will be affordable to those at 50% AMI.

The overall Seigle Point community has a 10,000 square foot community building, 204 tax credit apartments, 31 market rate townhomes, and an amenity area with a playground, tennis & basketball courts, greenway, and shelter area.

- b. The second phase of The Residences at Renaissance is completed. An additional 74 units of rental housing for families was leased in FY2015. The third phase was completed in FY 2016 and provided an additional 150 units at completion. The residential buildings include three story apartment buildings, two story direct access apartment buildings and two story townhomes, configured in one- to three-bedroom units. The activity is on schedule and effective.
- c. The Landing at Park Road received a Certificate of Occupancy for 92 one-bedroom units for active seniors 55 and older.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Achieved Benchmark?
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	Expected housing units of this type is 340	There were 432 new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI	Yes

HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity is 0.	There were 340 new units leased.	Yes

- 3) Benchmarks met.
- 4) The benchmarks nor metrics were revised.
- 5) There was no change to the data collection method.

NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES

CHA does not have any activities that have not yet been implemented.

ACTIVITIES ON HOLD

2009 – 6 Youth Initiatives

1. In FY2009, CHA was approved to establish a Cooperative Agreement to Form Partnerships with Communities In School (CIS), Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS), Partners in Out of School Time (POST), and the Charlotte Housing Authority Scholarship Fund (CHASF) in order to connect CHA participants to programs and services that address truancy, post-secondary education preparation, and academic performance improvement. The Agreement has expired; however, CHA's focus continues to be on providing services for youth that are assisted by CHA housing programs as a means to help break the cycle of generational poverty. The authority will be seeking other partners and initiatives which can provide outcomes for the desired metrics for CHA's student portfolio. CIS's data was reporting aggregate data and did not allow CHA to see the progress of its student population.
2. CHA will use FY2016 as a planning year to identify new collaborations for serving the youth residing within our portfolio.

2009-1 Acquisition of General Partnership Interest

1. *Acquire the General Partnership interest in the Little Rock Apartments* - This activity was approved in March 2010, but was made as a first amendment to the FY2011 plan. In June, 2011, CHA, acting through its subsidiary Horizon Acquisition Corp. (Horizon), acquired the general partnership interest in Little Rock Apartments, a 240-unit Section 8 multi-family project adjacent to the Boulevard Homes site (now known as The Renaissance).
2. Due to budget restraints, CHA's endeavor to provide services and opportunities to Little Rock's residents such as self-sufficiency and employment services is delayed. Once a plan for services has been approved, appropriate baselines, benchmarks, and measures

will be developed and implemented.

CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES

Good Neighbor Training

1. CHA proposed the Good Neighbor Training (GNT) activity in FY2008. The activity implementation began in FY2008 for HCV households and 2011 for Public Housing households. The training is designed to assist families' acclimation to a neighborhood. Participants learn more about being "Good Neighbors" by focusing on topics such as building codes and standards, property maintenance, basic zoning regulations, home maintenance, neighborhood involvement, school and amenities locations, and conflict resolution.
2. CHA continues to provide mandated GNT, which is conducted by CHA staff, to all new Housing Choice Voucher and public housing applicants entering the program. Good Neighbor Training for public housing and Housing Choice Voucher existing program participants has been completed. Port-Ins are also required to complete Good Neighbor Training.
3. This activity was closed out effective December 2014. CHA no longer requires the waiver to hold GNT since it has been incorporated into the briefing and all existing participants have been trained.

Biennial Review Process for Elderly and Disabled

1. A biennial review process for elderly and disabled heads of households was approved by HUD for FY2009. Implementation of the Biennial Review Process began December 2010.
2. The activity is being closed out because the agency has implemented an agency wide Biennial Process. The elderly and disabled will be reported on as part of the entire agency report on skipped/conducted.
3. The activity was closed out FYE 2013.

Site-Based Waiting Lists for Public Housing and Project-Based Housing Choice Voucher

1. CHA was approved to implement the site-based waiting lists for public housing and Project-Based Housing Choice Voucher units in FY2009. The activity began in the same year.
2. CHA continues to manage the waiting lists for public housing and project-based voucher units at the site level. CHA considers this activity a success due to no 3rd offers in FY2013.
3. This activity was closed out effective FYE 2013.

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

V.2. Plan.Local Asset Management Plan

B. MTW Plan: Local Asset Management Plan

Is the PHA allocating costs within statute?

Y	O
	r
	O
	r
	N

Is the PHA implementing a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. The narrative shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

	O
	r

PHAs should provide a brief summary of any changes in the Local Asset Management Plan in the body of the Plan.

CHA is not utilizing a Local Asset Management Plan

Annual MTW Report

V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system

Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

See the introduction of report for the Getting Ahead in a Just Getting' By World, Resident Safety and the Center for Employment Services activity descriptions and updates.

V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan

B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?

Y
e
s

Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

N
o

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

N
o

n/a

a

V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds

C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds

In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.

Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
Real Estate	Strawn Master Plan	0	1,267,166
Real Estate	Renaissance Child Development Community Center	0	4,000,000

Real Estate	J.T. Crawford Renaissance Community Center	0	1,718,136
Real Estate	Renaissance Revitalization	0	2,451,991
Real Estate	Tall Oaks	0	994237
Real Estate	Vistas @707	0	599557
Real Estate	The Landings (Park & Marsh)	0	2008219
Real Estate	Woodlawn	0	602662
AMP	Southside -Aurora	0	500000
Total Obligated or Committed Funds:		0	14,141,968

In the body of the Report, PHAs shall provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds, including what funds have been obligated or committed to specific projects.

Note: Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of obligations and commitments, MTW agencies are not required to complete this section.

ADMINISTRATIVE

- A. There are no HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue.
- B. Most current evaluation results of the demonstration program:

UNC CHAPEL HILL REPORT FOR MTW REPORT

The Center for Urban and Regional Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (CURS) has evaluated the Charlotte Housing Authority's (CHA) Moving Forward program over the past seven years. The evaluation objectives are to monitor program implementation, assessing program outputs and impacts, and provide feedback. Key research questions include:

- What are the major obstacles to implementing Moving Forward initiatives, and how are they overcome?
- To what extent has the Moving Forward program helped the CHA meet Moving to Work's three statutory goals (achieve cost efficiencies, expand housing options, in addition to improving residents' quality of life)?
- What are the impacts of the Moving Forward program on CHA operations?

These research questions are being addressed through: (i) analysis of data from CHA's Yardi database; (ii) surveys of CHA residents; (iii) interviews with CHA and partner organization staff and board members, residents of the five work requirement sites, and those who have left CHA housing; and (iv) investigation of secondary data such as the Charlotte Quality of Life database.

In 2016, CURS has prepared three reports for the CHA. In May, we delivered a report entitled *The Financial Impacts of Biennial Re-certifications of Work-Able Residents*. Requested by CHA staff, this report analyzed the financial impacts of implementing biennial re-certifications for work-able residents. Through analysis of administrative data, it found that biennial re-certifications resulted in approximately \$1.9 million in foregone revenue over the first two years of implementation.

Building on our prior analysis of the CHA's work requirement, in June we delivered a report entitled *Moving Forward Work Requirements: Update on Impacts*. This report found that, among work-able residents subject to the policy, the percent paying minimum rent continued to decline in 2015. This decrease was greatest at the three developments that were not formerly limited to FSS clients, where the percent of clients paying minimum rent fell by one-third. Employment among affected residents also continued to increase in 2015.

In preparation for the expansion of the CHA's work requirement to its additional family public housing developments, we delivered a report entitled *Minimum Renters in the Charlotte Housing Authority*, which analyzed the prevalence of minimum renters across the agency's portfolio. This report identified a substantial number of clients who paid minimum rent for four or more months in the past year, a cohort we term "chronic minimum renters." We recommend that CHA target these clients for intensive case management services following work requirement expansion. A summary of this report was presented to the CHA's Board of Commissioners in November, 2016.

In late 2016, we conducted a survey of clients across the CHA's family public housing developments. This survey queried satisfaction with CHA services and policies, in addition to households' composition, health, and economic well-being. Additionally, for the five work requirement sites, the survey included questions pertaining to their satisfaction with case management services, and their ability to meet the work requirement policy. Survey results will be included in our forthcoming biennial report, to be delivered to the CHA in early 2017.

Beyond the survey, we have continued to collect and compile primary and secondary data, including semi-annual, in-person interviews with residents of the five work requirement developments and ongoing phone interviews with those who have left CHA housing. We also continue to analyze monthly reports submitted by case managers at the work requirement sites.

In the coming year, CURS will build on previous research and initiate several new activities, including:

- Releasing our third interim Moving Forward report, which draws on review program implementation and offer recommendations to improve performance.
- Analyzing impacts of the CHA's Incentive Account policy.
- Publishing a report that offers best practices for work requirement implementation based on our research of other MTW agencies with such policies.
- Producing a report that compiles findings from surveys of those who have left CHA housing.

Appendices Listing

Appendix A	Certification Statement
Appendix B	Listing of Developments with Public Housing and Project-Based Units
Appendix C	Rent Reform Impact Analysis for Public Housing & Housing Choice Voucher Programs
Appendix D	Community Based Rental Assistance Policy
Appendix E	Hardship Policy
Appendix F	Work Requirement Policy
Appendix G	Rent Reform Overview
Appendix H	Sample Bedroom Rent Band
Appendix I	Community Service Policy
Appendix J	Women Against Violence Act
Appendix K	Other Agency Activity
Appendix L	Ongoing Initiatives Summary
Appendix M	Homeownership Program Hardship Policy
Appendix N	Statement of Family Obligations for Homeownership Program