

Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority



Community Pumpkin Carving,
Edgewood Homes



2016 Annual MTW Report

Submitted March 28, 2017
Re-submitted February 22, 2018

A. Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1	Activity 11-2	57
I Introduction	2	Activity 11-3	57
B. Overview of MTW Goals and Objectives	4	Activity 10-2	57
II Operating Information	5	Activity 10-3	57
A. Housing Stock Information	5	Activity 09-2	57
B. Leasing Information	9	Activity 09-3	57
C. Waiting List Information at Fiscal Year End	16	Activity 09-4	58
III Proposed MTW Activities	18	Activity 09-7	58
IV Approved MTW Activities	19	V Sources and Uses of MTW Funds	59
A. Implemented Activities	19	A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds	59
Activity 16-1	19	B. Local Asset Management Plan	61
Activity 16-2	22	C. Commitment of Unspent Funds	62
Activity 14-1	25	VI Administrative	63
Activity 14-2	27	Appendix	64
Activity 14-3	29	I. Certification of Compliance Statement	65
Activity 13-1	32	II. The LDCHA MTW Program	66
Activity 10-1	35		
Activity 09-5	38		
Activity 09-6	40		
Activity 09-6.1	43		
Activity 09-8	45		
Activity 99-1	41		
Activity 99-2	49		
Activity 99-3	52		
B. Not Yet Implemented Activities	56		
C. Activities on Hold	56		
D. Closed Out Activities	57		
Activity 12-1	57		
Activity 11-1	57		

I. Introduction

The Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority (LDCHA) proudly submits this 2016 MTW Report to provide an overview of the activities implemented through its Moving to Work (MTW) program. While the various matrix demonstrates the remarkable success of the MTW Program, it does not capture the full impact the program has on the lives of participants. MTW flexibility allows the LDCHA to target housing assistance to special population like domestic violence survivors, homeless families and youth aging out of foster care; and utilize a robust set of resident services to help participants improve their self-sufficiency and quality of life.

The LDCHA was created in 2001 through the merger of the Lawrence Housing Authority (KS053) and the Douglas County Housing Authority (KS160). The Lawrence Housing Authority was created in 1968 under the Kansas Municipal Housing Act as an independent agency of the City of Lawrence charged with developing, operating and managing low rent housing for the low income population of Lawrence, Kansas. The Douglas County Housing Authority was created in 1983 by the Douglas County Commission for the purposes of administering the Section 8 Certificate Program in Douglas County, Kansas, and was administered by the Lawrence Housing Authority. The dual administration of both entities became impractical, and consequently on January 1, 2001, through a joint resolution of the City of Lawrence and Douglas County and with the approval of HUD, the two housing authorities merged as KS053, and KS160 was dissolved.

The LDCHA is governed by a five-member board of commissioners, two appointed by the Douglas County Commis-

sion and three by the Mayor of the City of Lawrence. One member must be a LDCHA participant and is an appointee of the City of Lawrence. The LDCHA currently employs 40 staff and operates combined budgets in excess of \$8 million.

The LDCHA was selected by HUD as one of the original 23 housing authorities to participate in the Moving to Work Demonstration program in 1998 and signed its first five year MTW Agreement with HUD on March 30, 1999. Congress set out three statutory objectives for the MTW Demonstration:

- Reduce cost and achieve greater costs effectiveness in Federal expenditures;
- Give incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient; and
- Increase housing choices for low-income families.

The LDCHA began implementation of the MTW program on June 1, 1999, by adopting the following program initiatives to meet the Congressional objectives:

1. Abolish the public housing and Section 8 program administrative structure and create a new program of housing assistance called General Housing assistance which

combines the family housing units of the public housing program and Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs.

2. Change or eliminate four basic federal rules under the 1937 Housing Act that contradict customary social and

economic norms and create administrative expense. These changes include:

- The institution of suitability criteria as a part of eligibility criteria.
- Modifying the definition of countable income.
- The establishment of an annual rent and abolishing (with some exceptions) interim re-examinations.
- Instituting comprehensive changes in the rent structure.

3. Establish a rent structure that provides affordability while it:

- Values the unit.
- Creates incentives to work.
- Establishes meaningful minimum and maximum rents by bedroom size.
- Mirrors the private market at an affordable rate.

4. Increase Housing Choice:

- Increase housing choice by permitting Section 8 participants full discretion as to location, size and cost without regard to local Fair Market Rents.
- Create one combined waiting list that allows applicants to elect a housing offer that best suits their needs.

5. Increase usage of existing federal funds:

- Increase rental income by \$150,000 per year.
- Free \$500,000 per year of Section 8 subsidy.
- Using these amounts to serve an additional 100 low income households without additional federal subsidy.

6. Expand by at least 100%, the Family Self Sufficiency program to require participation of non-exempt public housing and Section 8 families.

7. Provide homeownership opportunities including a \$3000 down payment match.

The above objectives created a locally driven housing program and all of these initiatives continue to be the foundation of LDCHA's MTW program.

Established as a five-year demonstration, the LDCHA's MTW Agreement was extended several times. In 2009, LDCHA adopted Activity 09-1 which combined its public housing operation, Capital Funds subsidies, and Section 8 HCV assistance into a single authority source to carry out its approved MTW activities, with full flexibility. In 2016 LDCHA's MTW Agreement was extended until 2028.

B. Overview of the LDCHA's short-term and long-term *MTW* goals and objectives.

LDCHA Short-Term *MTW* Goals

- Maintain or expand core *MTW* initiatives that support employment, maintaining housing and increasing participant self-sufficiency.
- Execute sound management, maintenance, and preservation of the public housing stock according to the highest standards while providing responsible and responsive assistance to those we serve.
- Continue the various community partnerships required to enhance participant opportunities in expanding support services such as social services, education, transportation, mental health, and health care programs.
- The LDCHA is committed to expanding the stock of affordable housing through the acquisition, new construction, reconstruction, moderate or substantial rehabilitation of housing as deemed appropriate by the agency in accordance with its mission. This could include assisted living or other types of housing, possibly in conjunction with commercial facilities or other mixed development consistent with the objectives of the demonstration. LDCHA plans to meet this goal through leveraging its *MTW* funds to create innovative financing and development strategies through joint ventures or other partnerships.

LDCHA Long-Term *MTW* Goals

- Continue to implement business and fiscal policies that result in long term financial viability and solvency.
- The agency will pursue ways to reduce administrative burden.
- Continue to develop and institute policies and programs that create incentives for families to work, to increase household income, and to increase self-sufficiency. In so doing, the agency will continue to promote homeownership and create additional housing opportunities for families.

II. 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
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A

Anticipated Total
Number of New
Vouchers to be Pro-
ject-Based *

0

Actual Total Number
of New Vouchers
that were Project-
Based

0

Anticipated Total Number of
Project-Based Vouchers Com-
mitted at the End of the Fiscal
Year *

0

Actual Total Number of Pro-
ject-Based Vouchers Commit-
ted at the End of the Fiscal
Year

0

Anticipated Total Number of Pro-
ject-Based Vouchers Leased Up
or Issued to a Potential Tenant at
the End of the Fiscal Year *

0

Actual Total Number of Project-
Based Vouchers Leased Up or Is-
sued to a Potential Tenant at the
End of the Fiscal Year

0

* From the Plan

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

N/A

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 agency used its 2016 Capital Fund exclusively for improvements to its public housing developments for upgrades and remodeling at turnover. Additionally the agency replaced HVAC units at several developments. The agency also used its single fund authority to use MTW funds to replace the roof at Babcock Place, a 120 unit senior development. The roof replacement was started in 2015 and completed in 2016.

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

Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Clinton Parkway Apts.	58	Clinton Parkway Apts. (Clinton Place) is a 58-unit Section 8 project based multi-family development designated for the elderly purchased by the LDCHA in 2006 and renovated with MTW reserve funds.
Building Independence III, Inc.	4	Building Independence III is a Section 811 PRAC 4-unit property owned by Bert Nash Community Mental Health Center and administered by the LDCHA through a management agreement.

Peterson Acres II	8	Peterson Acres II is a 8-unit senior development that is fully handicapped accessible and owned by LDCHA. This development is unsubsidized and operates with a sliding scale below market rate rent structure.
HOPE Building	6	LDCHA operates 6 units of supportive permanent housing in a facility it leases from a private owner under the Continuum of Care Permanent Supportive Housing Program. This program serves chronically homeless individuals who are dual diagnosed with mental health and/or substance abuse problems. The LDCHA funds the required match with MTW funds.
1725 New Hampshire	6	Purchase of this property by LDCHA was completed on December 29, 2015 with MTW reserve funds. This development is an unsubsidized property using a below market sliding rate rent structure.
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	82	

*** 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 **	76	74
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	1
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	76	75

* 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 ***	912	892
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	12
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	912	904

Local MTW funded TBRA vouchers are leased through Activity 09-8: Prisoner Re-Entry Program, 16-1: Safe Housing, and 16-2: Next Step Program, which are counted under the LDCHA HCV voucher count.

*** 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	0	0

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	67	67	68	70	65	87	N/A	N/A
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	63	63	63	61	56	79	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	94%	94%	93%	87%	86%	91%	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	201	251	0	452	47%
2 Person	69	116	0	185	19%
3 Person	53	115	0	168	17%
4 Person	25	59	0	84	9%
5 Person	20	28	0	48	5%
6+ Person	5	20	0	25	3%
Totals	373	589	0	962	100%

Explanation for Baseline Adjust-
ments 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 House- hold Sizes to be Maintained **	47%	19%	17%	9%	5%	3%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	708	206	150	103	55	42	1,264
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	56.0%	16.3%	11.9%	8.1%	4.4%	3.3%	100%
Percentage Change	19%	-14%	-30%	-10%	-12%	10%	0

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

The variation in the one-person household size is a result of the addition of 30 vouchers designated for non-elderly disabled participants in 2000, the addition of the 140 Pinetree conversion vouchers in 2011 of which 78% are one person households, and the addition of 45 HUD/VASH vouchers since 2013 of which 65% are a one person household.

In the last two years the LDCHA experienced a demographic change involving an increase in serving extremely low income households that are large family size of 5 and 6 members.

No decisions were made by the LDCHA to affect changes to the mix of families served.

* “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	<p>The Public Housing family development occupancy rate averages 97% to 98%. LDCHA's strict enforcement of rent payment and anti-crime lease enforcement, creates this turnover rate at the family developments.</p> <p>Additionally the LDCHA has experienced difficulty filling 3 bedroom units due to lack of sufficient applicants.</p>

	Kansas Residential Landlord Tenant Act requires all lease holders to give 30 days' notice of termination of the lease. This state law notice provision creates a 30 day delay from when a tenant accepts a public housing unit to when they can take occupancy. Vacancy days created by state law are beyond the ability of the agency to control.
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
09-5: Homeownership Matching Grant	2	Families who voluntarily end participation in the voucher or public housing programs.
Graduated to Market Rent	16	Families who voluntarily end participation in the voucher or public housing programs.
N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Annual Total Number of Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency	18
--	----

* 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 **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
General Housing Federal MTW Public Housing - Section 8 HCV	Community- Wide Combined / Merged	398	Open	N/A
Babcock Place / Peterson Acres I Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site Based	127	Open	N/A
Clinton Place Project Based Local Non-traditional MTW	Site Based	90	Open	N/A
Peterson Acres II Project Based Local Non-Traditional MTW	Site Based	4	Open	N/A

New Hampshire Project Based Local Non-Traditional MTW	Site Based	0	Open	N/A
--	------------	---	------	-----

More can be added if needed.

* *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:

Clinton Parkway Apartments - HUD Multifamily - Site based elderly and near elderly - open
Peterson Acres II - Site based elderly and near elderly non-subsidized LDCHA-owned affordable housing, all handicapped accessible units - open
New Hampshire – Site based non-subsidized LDCHA-owned affordable housing with preference for young adults aging out of foster care - open

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A

N/A

N/A

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.

N/A

III. Proposed MTW Activities

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

IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted

A. IMPEMENTED ACTIVITIES

1. Activity 16-1	Safe Housing Program Approved for 2016 Plan, implemented 2016.
2. Description and information on its impact.	
<p>This Activity uses MTW flexibility to provide ten transitional housing vouchers to survivors of domestic violence. This Activity has been extremely successful in reducing the wait time for this vulnerable population. Additionally the partnership with case managers from other agencies has increased housing choice for these families and reduced homelessness.</p>	
3. Were benchmarks achieved?	
Yes.	
4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?	
No.	
5. Has data collection methodology changed?	
No.	

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0	Began tracking in FY 2016 to establish benchmark: Average of 50 hours per TBRA voucher at \$22 per hour. 5 vouchers x 50 x \$22 = \$5,500	In 2016: 9 vouchers x 50 x \$22 = \$9,900	Yes.

Housing Choice

When citing the statutory objective to “increase housing choices for low-income families,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months). Transitional Housing waitlist wait time = 18 months	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity = 6 months	In 2016: Average waitlist wait time = 3 months	Yes.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 5	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity in 2016 = 9	Yes.

1. Activity 16-2**Next Step Vouchers**

Approved for 2016 Plan, implemented 2016.

2. Description and information on its impact.

This Activity uses MTW flexibility to provide transitional housing vouchers for youth who have aged out of foster care. This Activity has been successful in reducing waiting times for this vulnerable population. Additionally it has provided a targeted effort to house young adults and provides, through agency partnerships, the necessary support services for these individuals to be stably housed and to avoid homelessness.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

No. It was anticipated that 3 of the 5 available vouchers would be issued or leased up by the end of 2016. Only 2 vouchers were leased at the end of 2016, although an additional 2 vouchers were issued.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

<i>CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Began tracking in FY 2016 to establish benchmark: Average of 22 hours per TBRA voucher at \$22 per hour. 3 x 22 x \$22 = \$1,452	In 2016: 2 vouchers x 22 hours x \$22 = \$968	No.

Housing Choice

When citing the statutory objective to “increase housing choices for low-income families,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

<i>HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity = 18 months	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity = 6 months	In 2016: Average waitlist wait time = 2 months	Yes.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = 0 .	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 3 .	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 2 .	No.

1. Activity 14-1	Create a Biennial Housing Quality Standards (HQS) Inspection process for existing Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) properties. Approved for 2014 Plan, implemented 2014.
2. Description and information on its impact. <p>This Activity uses MTW flexibility to revise the HQS certification to permit biennial HQS inspections for units that have a record of good property maintenance, a history of making repairs in a timely manner, and have passed HQS on the first inspection for two consecutive annual inspections. If the unit does not pass on the biennial first inspection, it returns to the annual inspection schedule. The unit must also have the same resident for 36 months. Special inspections will continue, including at the request of a resident.</p> <p>In 2016, of the 765 total unit inspections, 675 were inspected and an estimated 90 could have skipped, while 90 were actually skipped, saving \$52 per inspection for a total of \$4,680 in reduced staff cost. Staff hours were reduced by 180.</p>	
3. Were benchmarks achieved? <p>No. Tracking of eligible units to be skipped is done manually due to software tracking issues. This issue could result in not capturing all units eligible as part of the biennial inspection process.</p>	
4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised? <p>No.</p>	
5. Has data collection methodology changed? <p>No.</p>	

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduce the total cost of inspections by 25%. Total cost of inspections in dollars (decrease) = \$9,226.	Cost of annual inspections prior to implementation of the activity = \$36,906.	Expected cost of inspections after implementation of the activity = \$27,680.	Inspections of 675 out of 765 eligible units reduced agency cost by 12 % for a total decrease of \$4,680.	No.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Units inspected biennially will result in 173 fewer units inspected annually x 2 hours per unit. Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) = 346.	Staff spent 1,388 hours on annual inspections x 2 hours per inspection.	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 1,042 annually.	Reduced staff hours by (90 inspections x 2) = 180.	No.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
A special inspection of no more than 2 units per year have to be conducted as a result of the biennial inspection process.	A special inspection of 1% or less required re-inspection as a result of the biennial inspection process.	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). 1% of 173 unit inspections eligible to skip = 2.	In 2016: Special inspection of units skipped = 0.	No.

1. Activity 14-2**Create a Landlord Self-Certification that minor repairs are complete.**

Approved for 2014 Plan, implemented 2014.

2. Description and information on its impact.

This Activity uses MTW flexibility to revise the HQS certification to allow Landlord Self-Certification of Correction at LDCHA's discretion and in cases where all deficiencies are minor non-life-threatening, non-safety-hazard deficiencies as determined by an approved list maintained by LDCHA.

In 2016, there were 363 re-inspections conducted, 75 were eligible for self-certification; 46 were certified by staff and 29 were self-certified by landlords, saving \$39 per inspection for a total of **\$1,131** in reduced staff cost. Staff hours were reduced by **43.5**.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

No. There were a large number of units that were eligible but for which the landlord self-certification form was not returned, and the units had to be re-inspected by staff.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduce the total cost of re-inspections by 25%. Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) = \$3,638.	Cost of re-inspections prior to implementation of the activity = \$14,550.	Expected cost of re-inspections after implementation of the activity = \$10,913.	Self-certification of 29 units reduced agency cost by 8% for a total decrease of \$1,131.	No.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Reduced re-inspections will result in 97 fewer units re-inspected x 1.5 hours per unit. Total time to complete task in staff hours (decrease) = 146.	Staff re-inspected 388 units x 1.5 hours per unit = 582 hours.	Expected hours for re-inspections after implementation of this activity = 437 hours.	Reduced staff hours by (29 re-inspections x 1.5) = 43.5 hours.	No.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
A special inspection of no more than 2 units per year have to be conducted as a result of the On-Site Verification.	A special inspection of 1% or less required re-inspection as a result of the On-Site Verification.	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). 1% of 374 unit inspections eligible to skip = 4.	In 2016: Special inspection of units self-certified = 0.	No.

1. Activity 14-3**Change the effective dates of variables affecting rent calculations to January 1.**

Approved for 2014 Plan, implemented 2014.

2. Description and information on its impact.

This Activity uses MTW flexibility to change the effective dates for program changes that affect rent calculations such as Fair Market Rent, Voucher Payment Standard and Utility Allowance, etc., to correspond with the beginning of LDCHA's January 1 fiscal year. This will reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness by eliminating unnecessary reprinting of key agency documents.

In 2016, hours were reduced to 15, saving 30 hours of staff time, which saved \$994. Paper was reduced to 874 pages, saving 2,126 pages, which saved \$125. Total savings was \$1,119.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

Yes.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Cost of reprinting fact sheets, applications, information sheets, briefing materials: 2 x 1,000 pages x \$.059 per page = \$118. Cost of staff time: \$33.13 per hour x 15 hours x 2 = \$994. Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) = \$1,112.	Cost of staff time = \$1,491 Cost of reprinting = \$177 Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$1,668.	Expected cost of staff time = \$497. Expected cost of printing = \$59. Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$556.	Total saved: \$1,119. Savings of staff time: \$994. Savings of printing materials: \$125. Total actual cost: \$549. Actual cost of staff time: \$33.13 per hour x 15 hours = \$497 Actual cost of printing materials: 874 pages x \$.059 per page = \$52.	Yes.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) = 30.	Clerk time: 2 hours x 3 = 6 General Housing Director time: 10 hours x 3 = 30 Data Analyst Time: 3 hours x 3 = 9 Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 45 hours.	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 15.	Time saved = 30 hours Actual time to complete task = 15 hours.	Yes.

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

This Activity is meant to be revenue neutral; increase in agency rental revenue is not applicable so there is no baseline or benchmark data. This metric does not apply.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0 .	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0 .	N/A	N/A

1. Activity 13-1

Create an Affordable Housing Acquisition and Development Fund.

Approved for 2013 Plan, implemented 2013.

2. Description and information on its impact.

The LDCHA Board of Commissioners authorized the use of up to \$1 million of LDCHA MTW reserves for the development or acquisition of new low income affordable housing. The LDCHA may use its MTW flexibility to purchase land and/or improvements, acquire existing units, or participate in project ownership and/or development by providing financing for direct construction or rehabilitation costs. LDCHA may leverage, where possible, additional funds from private and public sources (including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Private Activity Bonds, or other available financing methods). This Activity is designed to increase housing choice for low income households utilizing MTW reserves.

On December 29, 2015, the LDCHA finalized purchase of a 6-unit property for \$479,637. In 2016 MTW funds were used for improvements to the property in 2016 and no new acquisitions occurred in 2016.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

Partially. Six units were acquired on December 29, 2015. The LDCHA honored the existing leases and at the end of the lease terms, in July and August, each unit had electrical upgrades and bathroom and kitchen improvements made. By the end of 2016 only 2 units were leased up.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Housing Choice

When citing the statutory objective to “increase housing choices for low-income families,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<p>Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.</p> <p>There is a preference on the property for youth exiting foster care.</p>	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity = 0 .	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity for 2016 = 6 .	<p>Housing units of this type 2016 = 6.</p> <p>All 6 units had improvements completed.</p>	Yes.

HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<p>Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.</p>	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity (number) = 0 .	Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity for 2016 = 6 .	Housing units preserved for 2016 = 6 .	Yes.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) = 0 .	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity in 2016 = 0	No.

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0 .	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0 .	Amount leveraged in 2016 = 0 This project did not receive any fund leveraging.	N/A

13-1

1. Activity 10-1	Conduct Biennial Recertification for Elderly and Disabled Public Housing and Section 8 Households. Approved for 2010 Plan, implemented 2010.
2. Description and information on its impact.	
<p>Adopt alternative recertification schedule to conduct biennial recertification for all elderly and disabled public housing and Section 8 households on fixed incomes, to reduce the total number of annual recertifications processed to reduce cost and achieve greater administrative efficiencies. Each annual recertification takes an average of 4 hours staff time to process. This change also constitutes a rent reform initiative. Activity 12-1 was combined with this Activity in 2015 to combine the report of Public Housing and Section 8 biennial recertifications into one Activity.</p> <p>Hardship Policy: Participants may request a hardship and be recertified in the year identified to skip if their annual medical expenses have increased by 10% in the previous 12 months.</p> <p>In 2016, of the 705 eligible households, 359 were recertified and 346 were skipped, saving \$107 per recertification for a total of \$37,022 in reduced staff cost. Staff hours were reduced by 1,384 hours.</p>	
i: Rent Reform Activity:	
<p>This Activity provides a hardship policy which specifies that a household may request to be recertified annually if their medical expenses increased by 10% in the previous 12 months. These households undergo a full annual recertification which includes not only counting all medical expenses but increases in annual income and assets as well. In 2016 there were 4 requests for hardship, all were granted and the households were recertified.</p>	
3. Were benchmarks achieved?	
Yes.	
4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?	
No.	
5. Has data collection methodology changed?	
No.	

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total staff cost eliminated for biennial recertification of 48% of eligible households in dollars (decrease) = \$31,362.	Staffing cost in 2009 for annual recertification of 208 public housing and 405 Section 8, in 2011 for eligible elderly / disabled households for a total of 613 x \$107 per recertification = \$65,512 .	Expected staff cost for recertification of 52% of eligible households after implementation of biennial recertification = \$34,150.	Recertification of 359 of 705 eligible households reduced agency cost by 49% for a total decrease of \$37,022.	Yes.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time eliminated to complete the biennial recertification of 48% of eligible households in staff hours (decrease) = 1,177.	Staffing hours in 2009 for annual recertification of 208 public housing, and 405 Section 8, in 2011 for eligible elderly / disabled households for a total of 613 x 4 hours per recertification (in hours) = 2,452.	Expected staff time for recertification of 52% of eligible households after implementation of biennial recertification (in hours) = 1,275.	Reduced staff hours by (346 recertifications x 4) = 1,384.	Yes.

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

This Activity is meant to be revenue neutral; increase in agency rental revenue is not applicable so there is no baseline or benchmark data. This metric does not apply.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0 .	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0 .	Not a revenue generating activity.	N/A

10-1

1. Activity 09-5	Homeownership Matching Grant. Approved for 2009 Plan, implemented 2009.
2. Description and information on its impact. This Activity provides a matching grant of up to \$3,000 for down payment assistance to MTW households who purchase a home and serves as an incentive for households to achieve economic self-sufficiency. Secondly, when a participant purchases a home it increases housing choice, and it opens up public housing or Section 8 assistance for other income eligible households thus perpetuating the objectives of the MTW program.	
3. Were benchmarks achieved? No. In 2016, 2 households purchased a home, 2 were Section 8 participants and 0 were public housing households. Both received the full \$3,000 matching grant. The benchmark is set at 3 households purchasing a home each year, but in 2016 only 2 households purchased, not achieving the benchmark. The LDCHA believes this is a result of the large number of households (10) who purchased a home in 2015. This benchmark has been achieved in all but 3 years of the 15 years this activity has been utilized, so no change to the benchmark is anticipated.	
4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised? No.	
5. Has data collection methodology changed? No.	

Self Sufficiency

When citing the statutory objective to “give incentives to families...whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training educational or other programs to assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). For this metric, LDCHA is defining self-sufficiency as families who voluntarily end participation in the voucher or public housing programs.	2000 - Households purchasing a home = 0 .	Expected households purchasing a home = 3 .	2016 = 2 homes purchased; 2 were Section 8 participants and 0 were public housing households.	No.

Housing Choice

When citing the statutory objective to “increase housing choices for low-income families,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

HC #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	2000 - Households purchasing a home = 0 .	2016 - Expected households purchasing a home = 3 .	2016 - Households purchasing a home = 2	No.

1. Activity 09-6**Revise Definition of Countable Income: Exclude Earned Income of Adult Children Between the Ages of 18 and 21.**

Approved for 2009 Plan, implemented 2009.

2. Description and information on its impact.

Historically the earned income of adult children between the ages of 18 and 24 who are enrolled full-time in school is excluded under the agency's MTW plan, however, for those not in school, the income was counted and the work requirement applied. This Activity provides an exclusion of income for this group while retaining the work requirement. Prior to this Activity, this 18-21 year old population who were not in school frequently placed their family at risk for being terminated when the adult child failed to go to work, or to retain employment after their income was factored into their household's rent. It also resulted in an MTW work requirement violation, with the entire household's housing being placed at risk under the violation. This Activity reduces this risk while continuing to create an incentive and motivation for adult children in the household to work.

This Activity reduces the amount of time staff spends on program enforcement activities, rent recalculations, and reduces the number of housing and program terminations that result through program enforcement.

In 2016 there were **53** households with adult children 18-21 years old in this category whose income was previously subject to rent calculation action. By not recalculating rent for these households to include income, **\$689** was saved and **26.5** hours of staff time were saved.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

Yes.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of eliminating staff time required for rent recalculation for adult children 18-21 income in dollars (decrease)	2009 - Cost of rent recalculation prior to implementation: 63 x .50 x \$26 per hour (in dollars) = \$819.	Expected cost after implementation of Activity 09-6 (in dollars) = \$0	Cost eliminated by not recalculating rent for 53 households with adult children 18-21: \$689.	Yes.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours = (decrease)	Eliminate staff time required for rent recalculation for adult children 18-21 income (in hours) 63 x .50 = 31.5.	Expected staff hours after implementation of Activity 09-6 (in hours) = 0	Time eliminated by not calculating rent for 53 adult children 18-21: 26.5 hours.	Yes.

Self Sufficiency

When citing the statutory objective to “give incentives to families...whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training educational or other programs to assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving work requirement action services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).	2009 - Work requirement actions for failure to meet work requirement = 5 , and 0 resulted in termination or eviction.	Expected households meeting the work requirement: 100%, resulting in no terminations or evictions for failure to meet the work requirements = 0 .	2016 - Work requirement actions for failure to meet work requirement = 2 , and 0 resulted in termination or eviction.	Yes.

09-6

1. Activity 09-6.1**Revise Definition of Countable Income: Count Income under Previously Disallowed 12:12:48 Regulation.**

Approved for 2009 Plan, implemented 2009.

2. Description and information on its impact.

In 2009, the LDCHA began to count as income wages from employment for disabled residents, eliminating the income exclusion for disabled public housing and Section 8 tenants under the 12:12:48 month earned income disallowances rule as outlined in 24 CFR §960.255 for public housing and 24 CFR § 5617 for a HCV program. This exclusion has a direct result of increasing the federal housing assistance by disallowing earned income that can be counted toward the household's contribution toward rent. The tracking for this disallowance was extremely burdensome and eliminating this exclusion saves additional processing time per month per household with disallowed income under this regulation.

The estimated count of households with previously disallowed income using the 12:12:48 regulation is 19, which is the number of households voluntarily participating in the MTW rent structure. Cost of tracking task eliminated was **\$8,892**. Total staff hours saved was **342**.

2.i. Number and results of any hardship request

All of the 19 households are voluntarily participating in the MTW rent structure because the rent calculation is advantageous to them due to the additional deductions. If a household elects to voluntarily participate in the MTW rent structure the MTW hardship policy as outlined in Activity 99-2 is available to the household. Additionally, households voluntarily participating in the MTW rent structure have the opportunity to elect to return to the income based rent structure one time between annual re-examinations. In 2016 **41** MTW hardships were granted and **2** were denied; neither of the denied hardships involved one of these MTW voluntary households.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

Yes.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	2009 - 19 households x 1.5 hours x 12 months = 342 hrs x \$26. Cost of task prior to implementation of the Activity (in dollars) = \$8,892.	Elimination of 100% of staff cost to calculate the earned income disallowance. Expected cost (in dollars) = \$0.	In 2016, 19 households previously would likely have been eligible resulting in staff cost savings = \$8,892	Yes.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total staff time to complete the task in hours (decrease).	2009 - 19 households x 1.5 hours x 12 months. Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the Activity (in hours) = 342.	Eliminated 100% of staff hours to calculate the earned income disallowance. Expected staff time (in hours) = 0	In 2016, 19 households previously would likely have been eligible resulting in total staff time eliminated = 342 hours.	Yes.

09-6.1

1. Activity 09-8**Create a Prisoner Re-Entry Housing Program.**

Approved for 2009 Plan, implemented 2009.

2. Description and information on its impact.

In January 2009 the LDCHA set aside funding for five units of TBRA to be used, in collaboration with the Douglas County Sheriff's Corrections Division, to provide housing assistance for five inmates being released from Douglas County jail under their Jail Re-entry Program. This program provided housing to individuals who otherwise would not be eligible for housing assistance. It permits the individual to have affordable, decent and sanitary housing so that they can focus on attaining their re-entry goals which includes obtaining employment or other income.

There have never been a sufficient number of referrals by Corrections to fill all five TBRA vouchers.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

Yes. In 2016, **3** participants were housed; **2** have SSI income and **1** has wage and Indian Trust income.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Self Sufficiency

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency Activity.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number achieving mainstream income or employment.	Head(s) of households prior to implementation of the Activity = 0 .	50% of participants achieving mainstream income / employment.	In 2016, 100% of participants achieved mainstream income or employment. 2 have SSI. 1 has wage and Indian Trust income.	Yes.

Housing Choice

When citing the statutory objective to “increase housing choices for low-income families,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase).	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity = 0 .	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity: number of Re-entry Vouchers = 2	In 2016 there were 3 participants utilizing these special purpose vouchers.	Yes.

1. Activity 99-1**Combine Public and Section 8 TBRA Programs and Operations.**

Approved for 1999 Plan, implemented 1999.

2. Description and information on its impact.

This Activity uses MTW flexibility to establish a locally designed waiting list and tenant selection criteria by combining the public housing family housing units and Section 8 HCV into one program called General Housing with one waiting list and single organizational program structure. The objective of this Activity was to decrease the vacancy rate by using the same suitability criteria for both programs and offering the next available unit to the applicant at the top of the waiting list. Additionally it decreases administrative burden by reducing voluntary unit turnover cost.

This Activity has had the effect of standardizing eligibility criteria, maintaining high occupancy rates in family public housing units, decreasing the waiting time for an affordable housing unit, and streamlining administrative program functions.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

Yes.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Cost Effectiveness

When citing the statutory objective to “reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Public Housing rental revenue per year in dollars (increase) = \$150,000.	1998 - Rental revenue prior to implementation of the Activity (in dollars) = \$758,485.	Expected Public Housing rental revenue increase of \$150,000 per year (in dollars) = \$908,485.	2016 Public Housing rental revenue was \$1,302,395 , an increase of \$543,910.	Yes.

99-1

1. Activity 99-2

Alternative Rent Structure.

Approved for 1999 Plan, implemented 1999.

2. Description and information on its impact.

Developed alternative MTW rent structure with minimum and maximum annual rents that are adjusted periodically and applied to all non-disabled/non-elderly households in the General Housing program. The rent structure requires all non-elderly, non-disabled adults to pay a significant minimum rent regardless of their income. To reward work, the agency set a maximum rent for each size unit.

Bedroom Size	Minimum	Maximum
1 Bedroom	\$ 185	\$ 435
2 Bedroom	\$ 215	\$ 500
3 Bedroom	\$ 255	\$ 575
4 Bedroom	\$ 275	\$ 665
5 Bedroom	\$ 315	\$ 690

To encourage employment advancement the agency established a system of income deductions that increase as hours of work increase.

Special income deductions for MTW households include:

- 10% earned income deduction for those working at least 35 hours/week
- \$2,000 medical deduction for those working at least 35 hours/week
- full out-of-pocket dependent care deduction necessary to allow work or school attendance
- utility allowance as an annual income deduction, not as a monthly deduction from rent
- increase in the child dependent deduction to \$840 per child capped at \$1,680 per household

Flat rents are not applied in the MTW rent structure, and MTW participants are not eligible for the flat rent option.

The LDCHA's Rent Hardship Policy permits a degree of rent relief if the household experiences a loss of earned income equal to or greater than 50% of total reported earned income, then the MTW Hardship Rent shall be reset to \$50 a month for the household for a three consecutive month period, *OR*, if loss of earned income is at least 25% but is less than 50% of total reported earned income, the MTW Hardship Rent shall be reset \$100 a month for the household for a three consecutive month period. A household may have a hardship rent reduction only once every 12 months from the end of an approved hardship. If the household's income loss is due to a condition that qualifies the individual for a disability under ADA, the household's designation is changed from MTW to income-based and they are then recertified.

Section 8 portability is restricted. MTW households may not move outside the LDCHA's jurisdiction unless the household applies for and receives an exception from this rule as a reasonable accommodation for a disability, VAWA, or other good cause, such as taking a job in a different city, education, or other household need. Households porting into the LDCHA's jurisdiction must participate in the MTW program.

An important component of the LDCHA's MTW rent structure is an Annual Rent. MTW rent is fixed for one year and does not change, regardless of changes in household income or composition except in instances where a household permanently loses income through death, divorce, or when an income producing adult child whose income was included in the rent calculation moves out of the household.

During 2016, 11 MTW households were terminated for failure to pay rent in public housing. There was 1 termination for failure to pay rent in the Section 8 program.

i. Number and results of any hardship requests.

Hardships are granted for loss of income of the household.

During 2016, **41** hardships were granted, **17** from public housing and **24** from Section 8; **34** of the hardships were granted for loss of employment and **7** for medical reasons. A household may remain at the hardship rent amount for up to 90 days after which they are returned to their previous rent amount. There were 2 hardship requests denied because the household was in the annual recertification process and their new rent amount was already being recalculated based on new income information.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

Yes.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Self Sufficiency

When citing the statutory objective to “give incentives to families...whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training educational or other programs to assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

<i>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue per year in dollars (increase) = \$150,000.	1998 - PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the Activity (in dollars) = \$758,485.	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the Activity (in dollars) = \$908,485.	2016 Public Housing rental revenue was \$1,302,395 an increase of \$543,910.	Yes.

99-2

1. Activity 99-3

Work Requirement.

Approved for 1999 Plan, implemented 1999.

2. Description and information on its impact.

This Activity establishes an MTW work requirement which applies to all households in the General Housing program with a non-elderly non-disabled adult in the household. The work requirement mandates that all able-bodied adults age 18 and older work a minimum of 15 hours a week. For a two-adult household with minor children, the work requirement can be met if one adult works 35 hours per week. Enrollment in a post-secondary education program or Work Training Program satisfies the work requirement. An adult child in the household is also subject to the work requirement. Residents who fail to meet the work requirement must participate in the LDCHA's Family Self-Sufficiency Program 15 hours per week. Failure to meet the work requirement is a major program breach.

Following are the exemptions to the work requirement and MTW rent structure.

- A person over age 62 or person who has a permanent disability that prevents them from getting and/or keeping employment.
- Discretionary exemption for households with only one adult who does not have disability status or who, due to limitations of employment experience, education or training, or other significant barriers unlikely to be overcome, is unable to earn sufficient income to meet the rent requirement.
- Households with one or two adults, neither of whom have disability status, who are over age 50, and who do not have children residing in the household.
- Households receiving TANF Cash Assistance with one adult member who has been determined "not mandatory for work" by DCF. The household will receive assistance under the MTW rent structure, but the person will not be subject to the work requirement.

Exempt households may elect annually to participate in the MTW rent structure if they meet the work requirement through employment income.

Failure to meet the work requirement results in a lease violation. If not corrected, tenant rent goes to full market rate for the unit.

The work requirement mandate has been demonstrated to move households to work and increase self-sufficiency. Of the households that participated in the MTW program during the Plan Year there were **53** work requirement enforcement actions: **33** were in Section 8 and **20** in public housing. All households came into compliance.

3. Were benchmarks achieved?

No. While the average income of MTW participants who received LDCHA employment related services increased by 17% during 2016 (see Activity 10-2), the overall average income of all MTW participants decreased by 1.7%, from \$21,010 in 2015 to \$20,657 in 2016.

4. Were benchmarks or metrics revised?

No.

5. Has data collection methodology changed?

No.

Self Sufficiency

When citing the statutory objective to “give incentives to families...whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training educational or other programs to assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient,” include all of the following metrics that apply:

SS #1: Increase in Household Income

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households participating in MTW rent structure affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	2013 - Average earned income of current MTW rent structure participants is \$18,596 . <ul style="list-style-type: none">Data on income did not separate out earned income until 2013. Historical data reflects an average annual change of 2% in gross household income from \$16,434 in 2000 to \$21,060 in 2013.	Expected increase in total average earned income of MTW Rent Structure participant = \$18,782 . 1% per year increase in average earned income.	Outcome = \$20,657 (average earned income of all 2016 MTW rent structure participants.) Income decrease for 2016 = (-1.7%)	No.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline - Public Housing	Benchmark - Public Housing		Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in MTW rent structure prior to implementation of the Activity in 1998:	Expected head(s) of households in MTW rent structure after implementation of the Activity:		2016: 162 Public Housing MTW participants.	
		<u>2000</u>	<u>Estimated for 2013</u>	<u>2016</u>	
(1) Employed Full-Time	N/A *	N/A	100	(1) Employed Full-Time - 84	
(2) Employed Part-Time	N/A *	N/A	24	(2) Employed Part-Time - 65	
(1 & 2 Combined) Employed MTW rent structure participants	119	133		149	
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	15	33	28	(3) Enrolled in Educational Program - 24	
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	N/A		22	(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program - 68	
(5) Unemployed	49	1	6	(5) Unemployed - 13	
(6) Other - Discretionary Exemptions	N/A	0	6	(6) Other - Discretionary Exemptions - 14	
	* Data not available for 1 & 2 separately until 2013	Total exceeds 100%, some participants are captured in multiple categories.			
	Percentage of total work-able households in the MTW rent structure per category prior to implementation of Activity (percent).	Expected percentage of total work-able households in the MTW rent structure per category after implementation of the Activity (percent).		Actual percentage of total work-able households in the MTW rent structure per category.	Yes.
		<u>2000</u>	<u>Estimated for 2013</u>	<u>2016</u>	
(1) Employed Full-Time	(1) Data not available	(1) 25%	(1) 25%	(1) 52%	

(2) Employed Part-Time (1 & 2 Combined) Employed MTW rent structure participants (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other - Discretionary Exemptions	(2) Data not available (1 & 2) 65% (3) 9% (4) Data not available until 2013 (5) 27% (6) 0%	(2) 25% (3) 20% (4) 10% (5) 10% (6) 10%	(2) 25% (3) 20% (4) 10% (5) 10% (6) 10%	(2) 40% (3) 15% (4) 42% (5) 8% (6) 9%	
Unit of Measurement	Baseline - Section 8 HCV	Benchmark - Section 8 HCV		Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in MTW rent structure prior to implementation of the Activity in 1998:	Expected head(s) of households in MTW rent structure after implementation of the Activity:		2016 - 317 Section 8 HCV participants	
(1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (1 & 2) Employed MTW rent structure participants (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other - Discretionary Exemptions	N/A N/A [Data not available for 1 & 2 separately until 2013] 172 60 0 63 0	<u>2000</u> N/A N/A 119 19 N/A 4 5	<u>Estimated for 2013</u> 147 79 55 25 22 8	<u>2016</u> (1) Employed Full-Time - 178 (2) Employed Part-Time - 118 296 (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program - 44 (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program - 79 (5) Unemployed - 21 (6) Other - Discretionary Exemptions - 33	

* Total exceeds 100%, some participants are captured in multiple categories.

	Percentage of total work-able households in the MTW rent structure prior to implementation of Activity (percent).	Expected percentage of total work-able households in the MTW rent structure after implementation of the Activity (percent).		Actual percentage of total work-able households in the MTW rent structure per category.	
		<u>2000</u>	<u>Estimated for 2013</u>	<u>2016</u>	
(1) Employed Full-Time	(1) N/A	(1) 25%	(1) 25%	(1) 56%	Yes.
(2) Employed Part-Time	(2) N/A	(2) 25%	(2) 25%	(2) 37%	
(1 & 2) Employed MTW rent structure participants	(1 & 2) 58%				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	(3) 20%	(3) 20%	(3) 20%	(3) 14%	
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	(4) N/A	(4) 10%	(4) 10%	(4) 25%	
(5) Unemployed	(5) 21%	(5) 10%	(5) 10%	(5) 7%	
(6) Other - Discretionary Exemptions	(6) 0%	(6) 10%	(6) 10%	(6) 10%	

99-3

B. NOT YET IMPEMENTED ACTIVITIES

In 2016 there were no “not yet implemented” Activities.

C. ACTIVITIES ON HOLD

In 2016 there were no Activities on hold.

D. CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES

Name of Activity	Year Approved	Year Implemented	Year Closed Out	Reason for Close Out
Activity 12-1: Conduct Biennial Recertification for all Elderly and Disabled Section 8 Households.	2012	2012	2015	Combined with Activity 10-1 so all biennial recertifications are administered consistently and tracked as one activity.
Activity 11-1: Provide Financial Assistance for Vehicle Repair.	2011	2011	2014	Moved to Single Fund Flexibility. Activity is still operating and results are being tracked.
Activity 11-2: Partner with DCHI to Create Year Round Social, Educational, Health and Recreational Opportunities for Youth.	2011	2011	2014	Moved to Single Fund Flexibility. Activity is still operating and results are being tracked.
Activity 11-3: Combine the Administrative Plan and the Public Housing ACOP into one policy statement.	2011	2011	2013	The Activity was completed. The Board adopted the final Combined Admin-ACOP on August 26, 2013 by Resolution 2013-14.
Activity 10-2: Expand Employment Related Services to MTW Households	2011	2011	2014	Moved to Single Fund Flexibility. Activity is still operating and results are being tracked.
Activity 10-3: Energy Conservation Improvements	2010	2010	2012	Closed out after contract work was completed. Energy cost savings are reported annually to regional HUD office.
Activity 09-2: Mandatory Orientation for All New Incoming Residents.	2009	2009	2014	Moved to Single Fund Flexibility. Activity is still operating and results are being tracked.
Activity 09-3: Expand Case Management Services to MTW Households with Incomes Below 40% AML.	2009	2009	2013	Closed out as a separate Activity, absorbed into Activity 10-02.

Activity 09-4: Biennial Recertifications for MTW households.	2009	2009	2015	This Activity never had the anticipated impact and it resulted in increasing complexity rather than reducing staff time and achieving greater cost efficiency. This initiative was a voluntary election and was subject to fluctuating tenant income, resulting in too many mid-year recertifications. This Initiative was difficult to track and created additional administrative complexity to our program without resulting in a significant benefit to participants.
Activity 09-7: Create Housing Stabilization Initiative called "Homeless to Housed".	2009	2009	2014	Moved to Single Fund Flexibility. Activity is still operating and results are being tracked.

V. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

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

In 2014 the following activities were closed and moved to MTW Single Fund Flexibility.

Activity 11-1: Vehicle Repair Funding. This Activity provides a maximum of \$500 to assist MTW households to repair vehicles used for transportation for employment and education purposes.

In 2016, 23 HCV households and 20 public housing households received car repairs. A total of \$19,043 was spent with the average repair costing \$450. 41 households maintained employment and 2 student remained enrolled in school.

Activity 11-2 Partner with DCHI to Create Year Round Social, Educational, Health and Recreational Opportunities for Youth. This initiative partnered with Douglas County Housing, Inc. to allow the agency to reduce cost and rely less on tax dollars by focusing on funding through grants to serve households with children. The Full Circle Program serves as a year round program that provides a free, safe and positive place for youth ages 7-18, from households receiving housing assistance to spend time in a constructive manner and avoid educational regression. Services focus on out-of-school learning, self-development and mentoring through programming tailored for each unique individual.

In 2016 DCHI and LDCHA applied for and received \$23,925 in donations and grants. This money is used to support programming and staff to maintain the year-round out-of-school, health, and wellness programming targeting youth and their families. In 2016, 121

youth receiving housing assistance participated in the youth program. This program in part allowed 13 parents to maintain their employment during times when their children were not in school.

Activity 10-2 Expand Employment Related Services to MTW Households. This Activity uses funds to provide education and training opportunities in order to reduce the barriers to employment and underemployment to households participating in the MTW rent structure, to maximize a household's potential for securing worthwhile, long term employment. Some financial assistance is available for training opportunities including certified nursing and medical assistance certification, computer skills and mechanics, technical drafting, welding, commercial driver licensing, etc. There are also a number of training opportunities offered that focused on soft skills development that include workplace behavior skills such as punctuality, attendance, appropriate attire, customer service, and phone skills.

In 2016, 212 tenants participating in LDCHA employment related services experienced an average income increase of 17% or \$3,446 for a final average wage of \$24,103. In addition, the number of households receiving TANF decreased by 7.

Activity 09-2 Mandatory Orientation for All New Incoming Residents. The LDCHA requires all new MTW admissions to attend an orientation program that outlines all the services and programs offered by the Resident Services Office. Mandatory orientations educate residents about available services to access in times of crisis that could lead to termination of their housing assistance, and as a facilitation vehicle for families motivated toward upward mobility, economic self-sufficiency and homeownership. It also provides a connection to support services staff.

Of the 50 new move-ins targeted to receive a Mandatory Orientation, 27 households, 54% of new move-ins, received the orientation. Of the 27 households that received orientation, 19 went on to receive case management services from RSO.

Activity 09-7 Create Housing Stabilization Initiative called "Homeless to Housed". This Activity provides individual case management for hard-to-house applicants who are being offered housing assistance, funded through the City of Lawrence HOME Transitional Housing (TH), and households participating in the MTW Jail Re-Entry (JRE) initiative. Housing stabilization case management services reduce the number of lease and program violation incidents as well as reduces evictions, thereby breaking a cycle of homelessness and/or housing instability.

In 2016, 19 transitional households, 5 without other case management and 4 JRE participants received case management.

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?

Yes

N/A

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

N/A

or

No

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/A

or

No

The LDCHA has 369 public housing units and opted out of the asset management requirement for 2008 to 2015 as provided by various HUD appropriations acts and continuing resolutions. LDCHA elected to opt out of asset management for again for 2016 pursuant to the Omnibus Appropriations Act. The agency uses a cost allocation system to prorate expenses among the different programs it administers. This election does not use any MTW flexibility.

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
MTW Activity	Expanded Resident Services & Homeownership	\$ 59,300	\$ 63,949
MTW Activity	Homeless to Housed	4,860	4,863
MTW Activity	Douglas County Prisoner Re-Entry Voucher Program	18,190	15,089
MTW Activity	Douglas County Housing Inc. Youth Programming	29,250	35,024
MTW Activity	Acquisition/Development Proposal (balance from FY 2015)	509,820	15,279
MTW Activity	Safe Housing Voucher Program	39,640	32,186
MTW Activity	Next Step Voucher Program	3,850	6,353
MTW Activity	Babcock Place Roof Replacement (balance from FY 2015)	68,478	68,478
Section 8 HCV	PUC program costs (2 months)	840,321	840,321
Public Housing	25% Routine Operating Budget for FY 2016	480,436	480,436
Public Housing	Tenant Security Deposits at 12/31/16 FYE	158,003	158,003
Public Housing	Accrued PILOT at 12/31/16 FYE	101,162	101,162
Public Housing	Energy Performance Loan Repayment #4 due 1/1/16	104,023	104,023
Section 8 HCV	Continuum of Care Year 12 HOPE House Match	13,845	13,845
Section 8 HCV	Babcock Bus	49,650	49,650
Total Obligated or Committed Funds:		2,480,828	1,988,661

N/A

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.

VI. Administrative

Annual MTW Report

A. General description of any HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue;

The Agency had no corrective actions to perform in 2016.

B. Results of latest PHA-directed evaluations of the demonstration, as applicable; and

The LDCHA does not currently have any agency directed evaluations of the MTW Demonstration.

C. Certification that the PHA has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; 2) continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and 3) 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.

The Certification of Compliance with the statutory requirements is attached as Appendix I.

Appendix

Appendix I

Certification of Compliance Statement 2016 MTW Annual Report

The Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority certifies that it has met the three statutory requirements of:

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

SEAL

Shannon Oury, Executive Director

Date

Appendix II: The LDCHA MTW Program

The LDCHA submits Appendix II to provide additional data on its MTW Program and rent structure, which it has maintained since the agency entered the MTW Demonstration and desires to continue to collect and report.

The agency developed a rent structure that requires all non-elderly, non-disabled adults to pay a significant minimum rent regardless of their income. The LDCHA's rent structure goal was intended to move participants to work by making them responsible for paying a meaningful rent, high enough to require work but low enough to be affordable. To reward work, the agency set a maximum rent for each unit by bedroom size. To encourage employment advancement the agency established a system of income deductions that increase as hours of work increase. The LDCHA's MTW rent structure requires a significant minimum payment regardless of income and caps rent as income rises to encourage upward economic mobility.

In 2016 the minimum and maximum rents for households in the MTW rent structure were:

Bedroom Size	Minimum	Maximum
1 Bedroom	\$185	\$435
2 Bedroom	\$215	\$500
3 Bedroom	\$255	\$575
4 Bedroom	\$275	\$665
5 Bedroom	\$315	\$690

Besides household income, the other factor that determines a household's rent payment is a system of income deductions awarded to working households. These include:

- 10% earned income deduction for those working at least 35 hours/week
- \$2,000 medical deduction for those working at least 35 hours/week
- full out-of-pocket dependent care deduction necessary to allow work or school attendance
- utility allowance as an annual income deduction, not as a monthly deduction from rent
- increase in the child dependent deduction to \$840 per child capped at \$1680 per family

Actual monthly rent is determined by:

- annualizing total household income
- subtracting allowable deductions
- multiplying the sum by 30%
- dividing the amount by 12

If the final amount is less than the minimum rent for the bedroom size occupied by the household, the annual rent is increased to the minimum. If it is higher than the maximum rent, it is lowered to the maximum. If it falls between the minimum and maximum, it is set where it falls. Families that receive tenant-based assistance may pay a rent higher than the maximum if they select a unit with a contract rent that exceeds the payment standard.

Application of MTW Rent Structure

The alternative MTW rent policy and work requirement apply to all households in the General Housing program with a non-disabled adult age 50 or younger in the household. Exempt households may elect to participate in the alternate rent policy if they meet the work requirement and have employment income.

MTW exemptions are as follows:

- A person over age 62 or who has a permanent disability that prevents them from getting and/or keeping employment.
- Discretionary exemption for households with only one adult who does not have disability status who, due to limitations of employment experience, education or training, or other significant barriers unlikely to be overcome, is unable to earn sufficient income to meet the rent requirement.
- Households with one or two adults, neither of whom have disability status, who are over age 50, and who do not have children residing in the household.
- Households receiving TANF Cash Assistance with one adult member who has been determined "not mandatory for work" by DCF. The household will receive assistance under the MTW rent structure, but the person will not be subject to the work requirement. This includes persons receiving TANF Cash with a child under 6 months of age and households with more than one adult when one of the adults is needed in the home to care for a person with disabilities.

Annual Rent

An important component of the LDCHA's MTW rent structure is the feature of Annual Rent or Fixed Rent. Rent is fixed for one year and does not change, regardless of changes in household income except in instances where a household permanently loses income through death, divorce, or when an income producing adult child moves out of the household.

Other Approved Rent Reform Elements of the Rent Structure

Section 8 portability is restricted. MTW families may not move outside the LDCHA's jurisdiction unless the family applies for and receives an exception from this rule as a reasonable accommodation for a disability or other good cause, such as taking a job in a different city. In 2016 LDCHA approved portability for:

5	Reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities
4	Economic
0	Relocation for education
5	Household needs
<hr/>	
14	Total LDCHA voucher holders

Households porting into the LDCHA's jurisdiction must participate in the MTW program.

Households that have both elderly/disabled members and non-disabled adult members are considered mixed eligibility households and are placed in the MTW rent structure.

Flat rents are not applied in the MTW rent structure, and MTW participants are not eligible for the flat rent option.

Homeownership

Households who have an annual gross income that exceeds 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) are offered an opportunity to join the homeownership program. Households who do not join the homeownership program may remain in their public housing unit until their gross annual income reaches 80% AMI at which time they become responsible for paying the full contract rent without subsidy. The LDCHA encourages households to leave the housing assistance program when a household's gross annual income reaches 100% AMI, so that higher income households not interested in purchasing a home will move into the private rental market, thereby opening up units of affordable housing for households at or below 80% of AMI.

Households participating in Section 8 voucher must leave the program when their rent obligation equals the full contract rent for their unit for six consecutive months. This is a provision of the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment contract which serves as a term limit for higher income households.

Rent Hardship Policy

The LDCHA's Rent Hardship Policy permits a degree of rent relief if the household experiences a loss of earned income equal to or greater than 50% of total reported earned income, then the MTW Hardship Rent shall be reset to \$50 a month for the household for a three consecutive month period, *OR*, if loss of earned income is at least 25% but is less than 50% of total reported earned income, the MTW Hardship Rent shall be reset \$100 a month for the household for a three consecutive month period. A household may have a hardship rent reduction only once every 12 months from the end of the approved hardship. Hardship requests are denied when there is no loss of employment income being counted in the calculation of the MTW rent, when the tenant has had a hardship rent reduction in the past 12 months, or when the tenant refuses to complete intensive re-employment activities through Resident Services.

If the family's income loss is due to a condition that then qualifies the individual for a disability under ADA, the household's designation is changed from MTW to income-based and they are recertified.

Hardships

Hardships granted:

Public Housing	17
Section 8	24
Total	41

Reasons hardships granted:

Employment Loss	34
Medical	7
Total	41

MTW Rent Impact Analysis

The following analysis looks at the amount of rent MTW participants were paying during the Plan Year and compares it to the rent they would have paid if operating under standard federal regulations using the 30% income-based rent model with mandatory income exclusions. This analysis does not take into consideration the impact the "flat rent" option that public housing residents would have in the absence of the MTW Program. The flat rent option is not available to MTW participants.

During the plan year, there were:

162	Public housing units
317	Tenant-based vouchers
479	Total households that participated in the MTW rent structure

This evaluation does not draw comparisons between public housing and tenant-based rents because of the effect that local rental market conditions have on tenant-based rents. The MTW rent formula for tenant-based participants includes a maximum subsidy based on the voucher payment standard. Tenant-based participants that rent a unit costing more than the maximum payment standard have an additional rent responsibility.

Public Housing Participants

Included in this analysis are:

49	30%	At the minimum rent for their bedroom size
37	23%	At the maximum rent.
76	47%	Paying a rent equal to 30% of their AGI as determined by MTW factors.
162	100%	Public housing households

Higher Rents

Households paying a higher monthly rent under MTW than they would pay under standard federal regulations: 82, or 51%.

This population includes households with income that would have been excluded under other federal statutes. Therefore a conclusion cannot be drawn as to the true impact of the rent structure on this population except to say that these households with income now have a rent obligation where they otherwise did not under standard federal regulations. The rents for this group ranged from an average monthly:

Low: \$ 4 more for a 2 bedroom unit
High: \$ 433 more for a 3 bedroom unit

Lower Rents

Households paying a lower monthly rent under MTW than would under standard income-based formula rents: 78, or 48%

Their rents ranged from an average monthly:

Low: \$ 2 less in rent for a 3 bedroom unit
High: \$1,585 less in rent for a 3 bedroom unit

The aggregate average MTW rent paid for each bedroom size unit was less than the average that would have been paid under the income-based formula except for 2-bedroom units. The differences are shown below:

Bedroom Size	Avg MTW Rent	Avg Income-based Rent
1 Bedroom	\$295	\$329
2 Bedroom	\$322	\$359
3 Bedroom	\$404	\$429
4 Bedroom	\$422	\$620

Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Participants

In the public housing analysis above, the starting and primary element affecting a tenant's rent amount is total household income. This is not the case in tenant-based assistance where rent subsidies are capped at the payment standard and tenants pay the difference between the cap and actual rent charged.

Section 8 Households that participated in the MTW rent structure during the Plan Year:

150	47%	At the minimum rent, and
54	17%	At the maximum rent for their unit size, and
113	36%	Paying 30% of their AGI as determined by MTW factors.
317	100%	Total

Twenty-five (25) households selected a unit that required them to pay a rent higher than the maximum rent for their bedroom size. The monthly overage ranged from:

Low: \$ 11 more for a 3 bedroom unit
 High: \$ 1,110 more for a 5 bedroom unit

108	34%	Higher monthly rent under MTW than they would pay under conventional income-based rent formula,
196	62%	Lower monthly rents under the MTW formula, and
13	4%	Same monthly rent
317	100%	Total

The aggregate average MTW rent was less than the average that would have been paid under the income-based formula for all bedroom sizes.

Bedroom Size	Avg MTW Rent	Avg Income-based Rent
1 Bedroom	\$337	\$350
2 Bedroom	\$370	\$400
3 Bedroom	\$461	\$551
4 Bedroom	\$500	\$595

Maximum Rent Households

Households at maximum rent for their bedroom size for both public housing and Section 8 TBRA participants:

150, or 31% of all MTW participants.

Discretionary Exemptions

Discretionary exemptions from the rent structure and work requirement granted:

Public Housing	1
Section 8	3
Total	4

Alternate Rent Historic Outcomes

Avg Gross Income / Participants / Home- ownership	MTW YEAR	AVG GROSS INCOME	AVG TENANT RENT	AVG HAP TO OWNER	AVG CONTRACT RENT	AVG FAMILY SIZE	MTW RENT PARTI-CI- PANTS	HOME- OWNER- SHIP
BASELINE Year 2	2000 - 2001 YR 2	16,434	296	213	622	3	391	
	2001 - 2002 YR 3	16,660	303	223	653	3	401	1
	2002 - 2003 YR 4	17,967	288	375	676	3	517	5
BENCHMARK Increase metrics over time	2003 - 2004 YR 5	19,564	329	378	731	3	492	5
	2004 - 2005 YR 6	19,901	332	403	737	3	479	5
	2005 - 2006 YR 7	19,274	324	436	768	3	450	2
	2006 - 2007 YR 8	20,372	349	422	786	3	456	9
	2007 - 2008 YR 9	21,625	368	439	814	3	440	5
	2008 - 2009 YR 10	20,446	367	499	874	3	426	7
	2010 YR 11	19,776	358	510	872	3	411	7
	2011 YR 12	19,793	355	513	870	3	411	3
	2012 YR 13	21,060	376	551	929	3	477	8
	2013 YR 14	22,558	388	539	937	3	478	7
	2014 YR 15	23,937	411	521	950	3	472	5
	2015 YR 16	24,429	424	526	961	3	485	10
OUTCOME	2016 YR 17	24,345	417	536	977	3	479	2
	OVERALL AVERAGE	20,509	355	443	822	3	454	5