

# LEXINGTON HOUSING AUTHORITY

Creating Affordable Housing Opportunities in Lexington since 1934



## FY2019 Moving To Work Annual Report

Submitted February 11, 2020



*[blank page]*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Short Term Goals</b> .....	2
<b>Long Term Goals</b> .....	3
<b>General Operating Information</b> .....	6
Housing Stock Information.....	6
Leasing Information.....	7
Waiting List Information .....	8
Information on Statutory Objectives & Requirements .....	9
<b>Implemented Activities</b> .....	11
Activity 1 – Increase Minimum Rent Across All Housing Programs.....	11
Activity 5 – Streamline HQS Inspection Policy for HCV .....	23
Activity 10: Housing Choice Voucher Tenant-Based Special Partners Programs.....	26
Activity 12 – Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners .....	29
Activity 13 Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements.....	32
Activity 14 – Rent Reform: Elimination of Earned Income Disallowance .....	46
Activity 16 – HCV Rent Reform Study .....	48
Activity 17 – Limit Interim Re-examinations for Public Housing Households.....	58
Activity 21 – Triennial Certifications for HCV Homeownership Participants .....	63
Activity 22 – HCV Time Limit Pilot Program .....	66
Activity 23 – Rent Reasonableness Determinations To Be Made By LHA Staff.....	71
on LHA-Owned/Controlled Properties	
<b>Not Yet Implemented Activities</b> .....	73
<b>Activities on Hold</b> .....	75
<b>Activities Closed Out</b> .....	76
<b>Sources and Uses of Funds</b> .....	80
<b>Administrative</b> .....	81
Review/Audits/Inspections .....	81
Evaluation Results .....	81
MTW Statutory Requirements Certification .....	82
MTW Energy Performance Contract Flexibility Data .....	83

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority (LHA) was designated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as a High Performer in 2011 prior to entering the Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration. The LHA submitted a formal application seeking admittance to the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program in November 2010. HUD announced LHA's selection for program admittance in March 2011, and the Housing Authority formally entered the MTW program on November 10, 2011 with the execution of an MTW Agreement between HUD and LHA. In April 2016, HUD extended the agreements of all 39 MTW agencies until 2028. FY2019 marked the LHA's eighth year in the Demonstration.

The MTW demonstration allows public housing authorities to design and test activities and policies that further at least one of the statutory goals to reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness; encourage self-sufficiency households with children; and, increase housing choices for low-income families.

HUD's MTW program gives a select group of public housing authorities (PHAs) funding and policy flexibility not available to traditional PHAs. As of 2019, a total of 39 agencies have signed MTW agreements with HUD.

The LHA was established in 1934 to provide safe and desirable affordable housing to low and moderate-income individuals and families while partnering with community agencies to promote increased self-sufficiency and a higher quality of life for its residents. The agency provides housing assistance to low-income households in Lexington-Fayette County through the public housing and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs. The Authority is governed by a Board of Commissioners, a group of dedicated citizens and local officials appointed in accordance with state housing law, who establish and monitor agency policies and are responsible for preserving and expanding the Authority's resources and ensuring the Authority's ongoing success.

The mission of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority (LHA) MTW Program is to:

*Serve as a prudent financial steward of federal, state and local resources, endeavoring to more effectively provide safe and desirable affordable housing, while furthering the self-sufficiency of families within Lexington-Fayette County.*

## SHORT TERM GOALS

### Smoke-Free LHA

HUD's smoke-free policy went into effect July 31, 2018. The LHA established a smoke-free policy for all public housing and some tax credit/mixed-finance. LHA properties are smoke-free as well as all LHA management offices. The policy is in accordance with PIH Notice 2017-3 and HUD's Final Rule CFR 965.653 (Smoke-free public housing). The policy prohibits the use of tobacco products in all public housing living units and interior areas (including but not limited to hallways, rental and administrative offices, community centers, day care centers, laundry centers, and similar structures), as well as in outdoor areas within 25 feet from public housing and administrative office buildings (collectively, "restricted areas") in which public housing is located.

The LHA partnered with the Lexington Fayette County Health Department to offer cessation support to residents and employees who wanted. In addition, Mental Health America of Kentucky reached out to LHA and offered a day of training that addressed the smoke-free rule, best practices for enforcement from the American Lung Association and printed materials on smoking cessation.

### Renovation of Ballard Towers Underway

LHA began renovation of Ballard Apartments (non-MTW units) April 29, 2019. LHA was awarded 9% low-income housing tax credits (LIHTC) to finance the renovation project in March 2018. The renovation includes new energy efficient windows, new energy efficient bath fixtures and LED lighting fixtures, as well as aesthetically pleasing interiors with new floor finishes, new kitchen cabinets, new entry and interior doors, and an updated paint scheme.

Ballard Apartments is an eight-story high rise located in downtown Lexington, with 134 one-bedroom units serving persons aged sixty-two and over. Ballard Place Apartments was originally constructed in 1978 by LHA. The building was rehabilitated in 1999. Eighteen years after that renovation, the building had inefficient plumbing fixtures, lighting, windows, and outdated décor. The old windows lack energy efficiency and are allowing water intrusion; which is causing damage to the units and the building. The renovation is scheduled for completion in June 2020.

## LONG TERM GOALS

### Public Housing Repositioning - Voluntary Conversion of Connie Griffith Towers

Early in 2019 LHA staff convened a Board Retreat with commissioners, senior staff and consultants to consider options for repositioning the public housing stock. A big step in the agency's repositioning efforts began in 2014 with the conversion of Pimlico Apartments (renamed Centre Meadows) to Project-Based Vouchers through HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD). The RAD conversion of Pimlico's 206 units left LHA with 1,097 units of public housing. In June 2019, HUD approved the voluntary conversion application for Connie Griffith Manor, a 183-unit, public housing high rise for seniors, reducing the LHA's public housing stock down to 914 units.

### Professional Development and Leadership

The LHA continues to develop programs that encourage professional development growth and cultivate leaders. In 2018 LHA offered staff the Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy, a leadership development program was aimed at employees with an interest in cultivating their leadership skills. Following the first Leadership class interest was marginal for a second class. LHA continues to encourage professional development among employees through training available through local, regional and national industry groups. LHA continues to seek opportunities for professional growth and make them available to all employees.

### Craft Local Initiatives to Address Long-Term Needs

To ensure LHA's participation in the MTW demonstration program meets the specific needs of the Lexington-Fayette community, the agency will continue to craft local initiatives to address long term needs and meet the following MTW objectives:

1. To reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures;
2. To 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
3. To increase housing choices for low-income families.

To further both the federal and local MTW objectives listed above; the LHA has sought and received HUD approval to implement 22 MTW activities since entering the program in 2011. The following chart summarizing the LHA's MTW activities. The numbers in the statutory objectives column of the table corresponds with the numbered descriptions below.

## Lexington Housing Authority Proposed/Approved MTW Activities

Activity	Activity Description	Plan Year Proposed/ Modified	Status	Statutory Objective
1	Minimum Rent Increase to \$150 Across All Housing Programs	-FY2012-13 -FY2014 Significantly Modified	Implemented agency-wide April 1, 2014	2
2	Management Team III Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy for Bluegrass HOPE VI Public Housing Residents	-FY2012-FY2013	Closed Out FY2014 and replaced with Activity 13	1
3	Triennial Recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV Elderly/Disabled Households	-FY2012-FY2013 Significantly - Modified FY2014 -FY2016 Request Approval to change HUD Form 9886	Closed Out(FY2018)	1
4	HCV Rent Reform Controlled Study: No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy	FY2012-FY2013	Closed Out FY2015	1 & 2
5	Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for HCV Units	- FY2012-13 -FY2014 (Significantly Modified)	Implemented FY2015	1
6	Biennial Housekeeping Inspection Policy for Public Housing Residents	FY2012-FY2013	-Not Implemented -Closed out	1
7	Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval	FY2012-FY2013	Not Implemented until necessary	3
8	Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers	-FY2012-FY2013 -FY2014 Significantly Modified	Modified in FY2014 - Pimlico Converted to PBV w/ RAD/Not Implemented	3
9	Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street	FY2012-FY2013	Not Implemented Resources used for RAD revitalization of Pimlico	3
10	HCV (Tenant-Based) Special Partners Programs	-FY2012-FY2013 -FY2014 Significantly Modified	Ongoing	3
11	Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds: Emergency Reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers	- FY2012-FY2013 -FY2014 Significantly Modified	Not Implemented until/ necessary for emergency capital repairs	3
12	Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for HCV Special Partners With Designated Units	FY2014	Ongoing	2 & 3
13	Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements	FY2014	Implemented April 1, 2014	2
14	Elimination of Earned Income Disallowance	FY2015	Ongoing	1

15	Limit HCV Landlord Rent Increases to the Lesser of 2%, the HUD Fair Market Rent (FMR) or Comparable Rent	FY2015	Closed Out (FY2016)	1
16	HUD/MDRC HCV Rent Reform Demonstration	FY2015	Ongoing	2
17	Limit Interim Re-examinations for Public Housing Households	FY2016	Ongoing	1
18	Streamlined HQS Inspection of LHA-Owned/Controlled Property	FY2017	Ongoing	1
19	Tenant-Based Rental Assistance for Youth Aging Out of Foster Care	FY2017	Ongoing	3
20	Assign Project-Based Vouchers To LHA Owned and Controlled Units Without Bid Process	FY2017	Ongoing	3
21	Triennial Certifications For HCV Homeownership Participants (Rent Reform)	FY2017	Ongoing	1
22	HCV Time Limit Pilot Program (Rent Reform)	FY2018	Ongoing	1, 2 & 3
23	Rent Reasonableness Determinations To Be Made By LHA Staff on LHA-Owned/ Controlled Properties	FY2018 Amended Plan	Ongoing	1
24	Elimination of Project-Based Voucher Choice Mobility at LHA-Owned/ Controlled Units (proposed FY2019).	FY2019	Ongoing	1

## II – GENERAL OPERATING INFORMATION

### A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION

#### i. Actual New Project Based Vouchers

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

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF VOUCHERS NEWLY PROJECT-BASED		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
Connie Griffith Apts.	183	0	Voluntary conversion application approved June 3, 2019 conversion scheduled for December 1, 2019.	No	183 unit high-rise apartment building, designated for age 62 and over, will be converted from public housing to PBVs. Voluntary conversion application approved June 3, 2019 conversion scheduled for December 1, 2019.
	183	0			

**Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based**

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

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

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

Conversion of 183 units from public housing to PBVs did not occur by the end of the FY2019 Plan year. Conversion to PBVs is anticipated for December 1, 2019.

#### ii. Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers

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

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
Centre Meadows	206	206	Leased/Issued	Yes	Family site comprised of 1, 2- and 3-bedroom units
	206	206			

**Planned/Actual Total Existing Project-Based Vouchers**

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

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

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

N/A

#### iii.

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

ACTUAL OTHER CHANGES TO MTW HOUSING STOCK IN THE PLAN YEAR
Description

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

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

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALL ACTUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES DURING THE PLAN YEAR
1408-Management Improvements-PHA Wide Software Upgrade \$129,530 1410-Administration-\$177,145 1430-Fees and Costs-PHA Wide A & E Fees \$12,757 KY004000001-Lexington South: Unit water leak repair; single-family window and roof replacements \$157,753 KY004000002-Lexington West: Site drainage repair, roof replacements \$140,735 KY004000003-Unnamed: Roof replacements \$105,017 KY004000004-Connie Griffith Manor: Unit interior repair, stairwell repair 53,362 KY004000007-Homownership: Unit water leak repair, HVAC replacement \$5878 KY004000008-Sugarmill Apartments: Replace heating unit \$4980 KY004000010-Bluegrass Apartments: Unit interior repair \$3015

**B. LEASING INFORMATION**

**i. Actual Number of Households Served**

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

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED THROUGH:	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED**	
	Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
MTW Public Housing Units Leased	10968	12624	914	1052
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized	30228	28692	2519	2391
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based	4656	7272	388	606
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership	0	#	0	0
<b>Planned/Actual Totals</b>	<b>45852</b>	<b>48588</b>	<b>3821</b>	<b>4049</b>

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

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

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

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

105% utilization rates for MTW vouchers account for the difference between the planned and actual households served.

LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL CATEGORY	MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TO BE SERVED*	
		Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
Tenant-Based	Local, Non-Traditional Uses of MTW Funds for Special Partners/#12	4656	7272	388	606
Property-Based	N/A	0	0	0	0
Homeownership	N/A	0	0	0	0
		4656	7272	388	606

**Planned/Actual Totals**

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

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

HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL SERVICES ONLY	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS PER MONTH	TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE PLAN YEAR
N/A	0	0

**ii. Discussion of Any Actual Issues/Solutions Related to Leasing**

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

HOUSING PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL LEASING ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS
MTW Public Housing	During FY2019 units at Connie Griffith were held for use in relocating households at a non-MTW development undergoing rehab. This will continue into FY2020.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Connie Griffith Apartments, 183-unit public housing development through voluntary conversion will convert to PBVs on December 1, 2019. Thereby, reducing the LHA's public housing portfolio to 914 units.
Local, Non-Traditional	N/A

**C. WAITING LIST INFORMATION**

**i. Actual Waiting List Information**

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

WAITING LIST NAME	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ON WAITING LIST	WAITING LIST OPEN, PARTIALLY OPEN OR CLOSED	WAS THE WAITING LIST OPENED DURING THE PLAN YEAR
HCV	Community Wide	2879	Closed	No
Public Housing	Regional/Site-Based	2721	Closed	Yes
Centre Meadows	PBV/Site-Based	1111	Closed	Yes

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:

There is duplication across the public housing, HCV and PBV waiting lists.

ii. **Actual Changes to Waiting List in the Plan Year**

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

WAITING LIST NAME	DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL CHANGES TO WAITING LIST
N/A	n/a
N/A	n/a

**D. INFORMATION ON STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND REQUIREMENTS**

i. **75% of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income**

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

INCOME LEVEL	NUMBER OF LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL HOUSEHOLDS ADMITTED IN THE PLAN YEAR
80%-50% Area Median Income	0
49%-30% Area Median Income	0
Below 30% Area Median Income	606
	606

**Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted**

ii. **Maintain Comparable Mix**

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

BASELINE MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (upon entry to MTW)					
FAMILY SIZE	OCCUPIED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS	UTILIZED HCVs	NON-MTW ADJUSTMENTS*	BASELINE MIX NUMBER	BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE
1 Person	421	818	0	1253	34%
2 Person	310	529	0	848	23%
3 Person	298	505	0	811	22%
4 Person	135	313	0	443	12%
5 Person	49	168	0	221	6%
6+ Person	24	72	0	111	3%
TOTAL	1237	2405	0	3687	100%

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

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

N/A
-----

MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (in Plan Year)				
FAMILY SIZE	BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE**	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED IN PLAN YEAR^	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED IN PLAN YEAR^^	PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM BASELINE YEAR TO CURRENT PLAN YEAR
1 Person	34%	1498	37%	3%
2 Person	23%	891	22%	-1%
3 Person	22%	769	19%	-3%
4 Person	12%	526	13%	1%
5 Person	6%	243	6%	0%
6+ Person	3%	122	3%	0%
TOTAL	100%	4049	100%	0%

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

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

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

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

N/A

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

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

MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY*	MTW PHA LOCAL DEFINITION OF SELF SUFFICIENCY
Local, Non-Traditional Uses of MTW Funds for Special Partners/#12	43	A household with earned income of \$15,080 or more annually
N/A	0	n/a
N/A	0	n/a
	43	(Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities)

**Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency**

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

## IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES

### Activity 1 - Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 Across All Housing Programs

**i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended**

Approved/FY 2012 – FY 2013 - Implemented/May 1, 2012

Amended/FY2014 – Implemented April 1, 2014

**ii. Description/Update**

All non-elderly/non-disabled public housing and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) tenants pay \$150 in minimum rent. The LHA increased the minimum rent to \$150 across all housing programs excluding elderly and/or disabled households and households participating in HCV special partner programs in April 2014.

During FY2019 LHA provided housing through the public housing and HCV programs to more than 8,700 household members (head, co-head, spouse, other adults and youth) with an average household size of three (2.566%). Household characteristics by program are as follows:

Households Characteristics	Public Housing	HCV	PBV (Centre Meadows)	Total Households Served
	1142	1,943	255	3,340
<b>AGE</b>				
18-31	295	366	128	789
32-46	384	903	70	1357
47-61	211	445	48	704
62 +	252	229	9	490
<b>GENDER</b>				
Female	947	1757	224	2928
Male	195	186	31	412
<b>RACE</b>				
Black	935	1511	205	2651
White	201	425	50	676
American Indian/Alaska Native	3	2	0	5
Asian	3	4	0	7
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	1	0	1
<b>ETHNICITY</b>				
Hispanic	11	31	5	47
Non-Hispanic	1131	1912	250	3293

### Public Housing Move-Ins/Move-Outs

During FY2019 (July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019) 273 families moved into LHA public housing properties. In comparison, 156 families left LHA properties. The following table compares FY2018 and 2019 EOPs for public housing sites reasons for EOPs.

<b>EOP Reasons</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>
Deceased	15	13
Eviction writ served / Court Judgement / Non-Payment of Rent	59	56
Moved due to rent increase	2	1
Move out – Voluntary	31	42
Move result of 30-Day notice/Non-Compliance of Lease	13	27
Moved to avoid court	7	9
Moved without giving notice	12	18
Received Section 8 Voucher	17	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>171</b>

There were 67 transfers during FY2019 between public housing properties and the public housing and HCV (Section 8) programs compared to 50 transfers during FY2018.

### Housing Choice Voucher (HCV/Section 8) Program Move-Ins/Move-Outs

Comparing FY2019 to FY2018, the most frequent reasons for moveouts in HCV program continue to be port-outs to other jurisdictions, evictions, voluntary termination and moving without LHA approval. HCV program EOPs (move-outs) were down 13% (411 EOPs to 357 EOPs) over the previous year and EOPs (move-outs) were up 30% (9 EOPs) over the previous year at Centre Meadows (PBV site). The table below demonstrates reasons for EOPs in the HCV program.

<b>EOP Reasons</b>	<b>Centre Meadows (PBV)</b>		<b>HCV</b>	
	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>
Port-Out	2	0	40	81
*Eviction	18	18	76	87
Voluntary Move-Out	14	8	68	69
Move w/o Housing Authority Approval	4	3	46	58
Zero HAP	0	1	37	32
Deceased	1	0	29	24
Voucher Expired	0	0	27	31
Criminal Activity	0	0	11	9
Miscellaneous EOP	0	0	23	20
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>411</b>

\*Evictions include failure to report true household composition; failure to show for appointment; failure to allow inspection of unit; failure to make payment on overpaid assistance; failure to occupy unit as primary residence; failure to maintain utility service/appliances; and, failure to provide information.

## **Hardships and Annual Reevaluation**

Participants in the LHA's public housing program and HCV rent reform study may request a hardship at any time. An approved hardship may reduce a household's rent portion for an additional interim recertification beyond the normal one-per-year option and may lower the household's TTP (but only as low as the \$150 minimum rent).

In FY2019, 21 hardship requests were processed and 18 were granted and three were denied. Compared to FY2018, 16 hardships requests were made with ten (10) being granted and six (6) denied. The majority of the requests were for loss of income due to job loss, loss of a household member and income, and medical reasons that caused loss of a job or reduction in hours worked.

A Hardship Review Committee reviews hardship requests on a case-by-case basis. The household must provide proof it is unable to continue to pay the current rent share because of a financial hardship, including:

- The family's income has decreased because of loss of employment through no fault of the family and the family demonstrates efforts towards regaining employment;
- A death has occurred in the family which eliminates a prior source of income; or
- Other circumstances determined to warrant an exemption by the LHA.
- The qualifying financial hardship must be long-term (a minimum of 4 months) and will set the household's Total Tenant Payment (TTP) at 30 percent of current income, but no lower than the minimum rent for up to six (6) months.

Based on results seen in the HUD standard metrics and only slight changes in hardships and evictions, LHA intends to maintain this activity as stated.

### **iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

### **iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

The MTW PHA made no planned or unplanned changes or modifications to the metrics given in the Annual MTW Plan in the Plan Year.

### **v. Actual Significant Changes**

There were no significant changes made activity in the Plan Year through an Annual MTW Plan amendment.

### **vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

This activity has seen gradual increases in rental revenue and earned income among work-able households, but noticeable fluctuation appears in nearly all metrics tables. It is encouraging that heads of household reporting earned income increased in the public housing and the HCV program. Noticeably, CM met only two of the standard metrics for this activity (rental revenue and households transitioning to self-sufficiency). CM earned income increased \$918 (5.3%) from FY2018 to FY2019 but households reporting earned income decreased 25% (211 households) between FY2018 and FY2019. A closer look at CM resident satisfaction is required.

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity #1

CE#5: INCREASE RENTAL REVENUE								
UNIT OF MEASURE: Average Gross Rental Revenue of non-elderly, non-disabled, non-special partner program households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)								
PROGRAM	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	BENCHMARK ACHIEVED?
LIPH (Public Housing)	\$2,576,196 (\$1,612,512) Average Rental Revenue	\$2,888,208 (\$2,017,152)	\$3,490,820 (\$2,109,288)	\$3,637,812 (\$2,676,180)	\$3,671,868 (\$2,803,644)	\$3,466,643 (\$2,769,132)	\$3,532,824 (\$2,034,444) 720 HHs	YES
PBV (Centre Meadows)	\$392,399 (\$290,262) 158 HHs	\$672,684 (\$497,592) 165 HHs	N/A	N/A	\$615,588 (\$390,972)	\$756,456 (\$520,772)	\$675,804 (\$548,766) 195 HHs	YES
*HCV	\$6,423,672 HAP (\$348 MCPU) 1,540 HHs	\$6,661,080 HAP (\$381 MCPU) 1,458 HHs	\$7,007,724 HAP (\$441 MCPU) 1,325 HHs	\$7,514,400 HAP (\$483 MCPU) 1,296 HHs	\$10,034,004 HAP (\$536 MCPU) 1,561 HHs	\$7,504,176 HAP (\$508 MCPU) 1,231 HHs	\$8,357,640 (\$514 MCPU) 1,355 HHs	NO
*LHA has re-evaluated the metric for HCV households affected by this policy and determined that a more accurate analysis can be achieved by tracking Annual Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) and monthly cost per unit (MCPU). Should this activity be a success for HCV participants the HAP/CPU paid should decrease, as HCV does not receive rental revenue. Previously gross/net and TTP were being analyzed.								

SS#1: INCREASE IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME								
UNIT OF MEASURE: Average Gross Annual Earned Income of non-elderly, non-disabled, non-special partner program households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)								
PROGRAM	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	BENCHMARK ACHIEVED?
LIPH (Public Housing)	\$11,487 Average Earned Income of 759 HHs	\$12,857 Expected Average Earned Income of 699 HHs	\$17,209 Actual Average Earned Income of 324 (24%) of 768 HHs	\$19,518 Actual Average Earned Income of 598 (82%) of 728 HHs	\$20,634 Actual Average Earned Income of 658 (81%) of 809 HHs	\$20,807 Actual Average Earned Income of 602 (83%) of 727 HHs	\$22,048 Actual Average Earned Income of 618 (86%) of 720 HHs	YES
PBV (Centre Meadows)	\$15,231 Average Earned Income of 130 (82%) of 158 HHs (2016)	\$18,277 Average Earned Income of 165 HHs	N/A	N/A	\$14,726 Average Earned Income of 140 (75%) of 186 HHs	\$17,264 Average Earned Income of 163 (83%) of 196 HHs	\$18,182 Average Earned Income of 152 (78%) of 195 HHs	NO
HCV	\$8,316 Average Earned Income of 1,540 HHs	\$8,535 Average Earned Income of 1,458 HHs	\$14,597 Average Earned Income of 520 (39%) of 1,325 HHs	\$14,555 Average Earned Income of 844 (65%) of 1,296 HHs	\$15,990 Average Earned Income of 836 (68%) of 1,231 HHs	\$17,807 Actual Average Earned Income of 836 of 1,231 HHs	\$19,115 Actual Average Earned Income of 1,047 (77%) of 1,355 HHs	YES
AGENCY-WIDE	\$9,902 2,299 LIPH & HCV HHs	\$10,696 Expected Average Earned Income of 2,157 HHs	\$15,903 Average Earned Income of 844 (71%) of 2,304 HHs	\$17,037 Average Earned Income of 1,442 (71%) of 2,024 HHs	\$17,112 Average Earned Income of 1,726 (67%) of 2,556 HHs	\$18,626 Average Earned Income of 1,634 (76%) of 2,154 HHs	\$19,795 Average Earned Income of 1,817 (80%) of 2,270 HHs	

SS#3: INCREASE IN POSITIVE OUTCOMES IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS								
UNIT OF MEASURE: Category 6 – Heads of Household Reporting Earned Income - non-elderly, non-disabled, non-special partner program households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)								
PROGRAM	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	BENCHMARK ACHIEVED?
LIPH (Public Housing)	504/759 (66%)	493/699 (71%)	324/768 (42%)	598/728 (82%)	658/809 (81%)	602/727 (83%)	618/720 (86%)	YES
PBV (Centre Meadows)	130/158 (82%) (2016)	165 (100%)	N/A	N/A	140/186 (75%)	163/196 (83%)	152/195 (78%)	NO
HCV	806/1,540 (52%)	789/1,458 (54%)	520/1,325 (39%)	844/1,296 (65%)	964/1,561 (62%)	836/1,231 (68%)	1,047/1,355 (77%)	YES
AGENCY-WIDE			844/2,093 (40%)	1,442/2,024 (71%)	1,762/2,556 (69%)	1,601/2,154 (74%)	1,817/2,270 (80%)	

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity #1

SS#3: INCREASE IN POSITIVE OUTCOMES IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS								
UNIT OF MEASURE: Category 5 – Heads of Household Reporting No Earned Income - non-elderly, non-disabled, non-special partner program households affected by this policy in dollars (decrease)								
PROGRAM	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	BENCHMARK ACHIEVED?
LIPH (Public Housing)	255 (34%)	206 (29%)	444 (59%)	130 (22%)	151 (19%)	125 (17%)	102 (14%)	YES
PBV (Centre Meadows)	28 (18%) (2016)	0	N/A	N/A	46 (25%)	33 (17%)	43 (22%)	NO
HCV	734 (48%)	669 (46%)	805 (61%)	452 (35%)	597 (38%)	395 (32%)	308 (23%)	YES
AGENCY-WIDE			1,249/2,093 (60%)	582/2,024 (29%)	794/2,556 (31%)	553/2,154 (26%)		

SS#4: HOUSEHOLDS REMOVED FROM TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)								
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).								
PROGRAM	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	BENCHMARK ACHIEVED?
LIPH (Public Housing)	42/759 (6%)	32/699 (5%)	266/768 (35%)	95/728 (13%)	166/809 (21%)	175/727 (24%)	98/720 (14%)	NO
PBV (Centre Meadows)	38/158 (24%) (2016)	0	N/A	N/A	7/186 (4%)	9/196 (5%)	3/195 (1%)	NO
HCV	86 (6%)	91 (6%)	58/1,325 (4%)	47(4%)	60/1,561 (4%)	38/1,231 (3%)	33/1,355 (2%)	YES
AGENCY-WIDE			324/2,093 (16%)	142/2,024 (7%)	233/2,556 (9%)	222/2,154 (10%)	134/2,270 (6%)	

SS#8: HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY (Self-sufficiency defined as any household with annual earned income of at least \$15,080 = \$7.25 (minimum wage) x 40 hours x 52 weeks)								
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of households with earned income of at least \$15,080 per year (increase).								
PROGRAM	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	BENCHMARK ACHIEVED?
LIPH (Public Housing)	50	56	220 (29%)	385 (53%)	428 (53%)	399 (55%)	419 (58%)	YES
PBV (Centre Meadows)	72	88	N/A	N/A	58 (31%)	97 (49%)	89 (46%)	YES
HCV	329	408	237 (18%)	373 (29%)	474 (30%)	457 (37%)	625 (46%)	YES
AGENCY-WIDE			457	758	960	953 (44%)		

Public Housing Disparate Impact Analysis – Table 1

Public Housing Work-Able Population	Heads of Household							Average Gross Annual Earned Income						
	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019 Actual	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual
All Households	860	704	768	728	809	727	720	\$10,512	\$13,263	\$14,367	\$16,112	\$16,782	\$17,229	\$18,924
Gender														
Female	774	636	700	654	711	660	654	\$10,610	\$13,392	\$14,388	\$15,593	\$15,982	\$16,864	\$18,443
Male	86	68	68	74	98	67	66	\$9,623	\$12,049	\$14,156	\$20,326	\$22,589	\$24,277	\$23,978
Race (Multiple selections permitted)														
Black	677	577	642	606	657	607	614	\$10,959	\$13,635	\$14,485	\$16,259	\$16,871	\$18,228	\$19,094
White	179	126	118	116	145	118	102	\$9,267	\$11,668	\$13,910	\$15,645	\$16,527	\$15,287	\$17,729
American Indian / Native Alaskan	4	3	1	1	1	0	3	\$9,407	\$15,847	\$13,595	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,682
Asian / Pacific Islander	5	5	5	3	3	1	1	\$13,170	\$12,172	\$16,777	\$18,919	\$13,151	\$21,288	\$37,440
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	4	4	2	2	3	1	0	\$8,120	\$10,683	\$6,500	\$13,000	\$19,015	\$25,324	-
Other	3	-	-	-	\$0	0	0	-	-	-	-	\$0	-	-
Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic	843	688	752	708	784	711	711	\$10,514	\$13,254	\$14,135	\$16,093	\$16,745	\$17,745	\$18,891
Hispanic	17	16	16	20	25	16	9	\$10,411	\$13,627	\$17,075	\$15,181	\$17,948	\$17,379	\$21,586
Age of Head of Household														
18-31	421	284	310	309	345	307	277	\$9,284	\$12,198	\$14,939	\$15,486	\$14,886	\$15,804	\$16,519
32-46	292	289	327	309	340	313	325	\$11,734	\$13,598	\$15,247	\$16,420	\$17,476	\$18,073	\$19,299
47-61	147	131	131	110	124	107	118	\$11,600	\$14,830	\$14,981	\$18,616	\$20,157	\$22,020	\$23,541
Excluded Households														
Elderly/Disabled Households	363	358	323	368	406	445	422	\$971	\$1,341	\$688	\$1,397	\$2,287	\$2,976	\$2,860

Public Housing Disparate Impact Analysis – Table 2

Public Housing Work-Able Population	Heads of Household							Average Total Annual Adjusted Income						
	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019 Actual	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual
All Households	860	704	768	728	809	727	720	\$11,197	\$14,478	\$19,388	\$16,389	\$16,667	\$16,641	\$16,315
Gender														
Female	774	636	700	654	711	660	654	\$11,245	\$14,588	\$15,617	\$15,966	\$16,133	\$16,477	\$15,976
Male	86	68	68	74	98	67	66	\$10,764	\$13,447	\$15,680	\$20,133	\$20,538	\$21,630	\$19,669
Race (Multiple selections permitted)														
Black	677	577	642	606	657	607	614	\$11,656	\$14,789	\$16,179	\$16,679	\$17,464	\$17,677	\$16,479
White	179	126	118	116	145	118	102	\$10,022	\$13,199	\$13,460	\$15,011	\$13,341	\$14,127	\$15,257
American Indian / Native Alaskan	4	3	1	1	1	0	3	\$3,333	\$10,271	\$8,731	\$12,635	\$14,328	\$0	\$12,098
Asian / Pacific Islander	5	5	5	3	3	1	1	\$7,930	\$10,810	\$8,820	\$8,923	\$7,524	\$17,988	\$36,000
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	4	4	2	2	3	1	0	\$6,890	\$12,044	\$10,346	\$13,360	\$12,627	\$26,272	-
Other	3	-	-	-	\$0	0	0	\$568	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic	843	688	752	708	784	711	711	\$11,245	\$14,510	\$12,669	\$16,009	\$16,788	\$17,073	\$16,293
Hispanic	17	16	16	20	25	16	9	\$8,798	\$13,099	\$15,222	\$16,197	\$12,855	\$16,332	\$18,016
Age of Head of Household														
18-31	421	284	310	309	345	307	277	\$9,320	\$12,473	\$12,571	\$15,999	\$14,859	\$14,862	\$13,383
32-46	292	289	327	309	340	313	325	\$13,162	\$15,548	\$16,844	\$14,282	\$16,736	\$17,519	\$17,007
47-61	147	131	131	110	124	107	118	\$12,667	\$16,465	\$20,511	\$19,428	\$21,505	\$21,701	\$21,289
Excluded Households														
Elderly/Disabled Households	363	358	323	368	406	445	422	\$11,051	\$11,555	\$10,368	\$10,560	\$12,689	\$12,954	\$11,246

Public Housing Disparate Impact Analysis – Table 3

Public Housing Work-Able Population	Average Gross Rent Payment						Average Increased Rent Burden							
	FY 2013 Baseline	FY 2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual
All Households	\$281	\$352	\$487	\$416	\$422	\$420	\$410	\$21	\$71	\$206	\$135	\$141	\$139	\$129
Gender														
Female	\$284	\$354	\$399	\$377	\$408	\$416	\$402	\$20	\$70	\$115	\$93	\$124	\$132	\$118
Male	\$260	\$335	\$267	\$467	\$520	\$542	\$491	\$26	\$75	\$7	\$207	\$260	\$282	\$231
Race (Multiple selections permitted)														
Black	\$290	\$358	\$412	\$424	\$441	\$446	\$414	\$21	\$68	\$122	\$130	\$151	\$156	\$124
White	\$257	\$324	\$347	\$380	\$341	\$359	\$386	\$17	\$67	\$90	\$123	\$84	\$102	\$129
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$116	\$262	\$218	\$316	\$358	\$0	\$302	\$34	\$146	\$102	\$200	\$242	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$208	\$284	\$222	\$223	\$188	\$450	\$900	\$27	\$76	\$14	\$15	-\$20	\$242	\$692
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$210	\$305	\$272	\$334	\$316	\$657	-	\$4	\$95	\$62	\$124	\$106	\$447	-
Other	\$83	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$67	-	-	-			
Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic	\$282	\$352	\$417	\$407	\$425	\$431	\$410	\$35	\$70	\$135	\$125	\$143	\$149	\$128
Hispanic	\$251	\$337	\$359	\$411	\$321	\$408	\$450	\$21	\$86	\$108	\$160	\$70	\$157	\$199
Age of Head of Household														
18-31	\$249	\$318	\$322	\$365	\$377	\$377	\$337	\$21	\$69	\$73	\$116	\$128	\$128	\$88
32-46	\$317	\$379	\$428	\$437	\$423	\$441	\$428	\$17	\$62	\$111	\$120	\$106	\$124	\$111
47-61	\$305	\$368	\$196	\$504	\$543	\$545	\$534	\$27	\$63	\$156	\$199	\$238	\$240	\$229
Excluded Households														
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$260	\$267	\$259	\$265	\$319	\$325	\$283	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

HCV Disparate Impact Analysis – Table 4

HCV Population	Heads of Household							Average Gross Annual Eaned Income						
	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual
All Work-Able Households	1,454	1,430	1,325	1,296	1,561	1,231	1,355	\$8,632	\$8,626	\$8,335	\$9,479	\$9,875	\$12,573	\$14,770
Gender														
Female	1,404	1,378	1,177	1,167	1,424	1,138	1,272	\$8,697	\$8,669	\$8,701	\$9,873	\$9,901	\$12,742	\$14,856
Male	50	52	148	129	137	93	83	\$7,995	\$7,497	\$5,424	\$5,917	\$9,606	\$9,402	\$13,454
Race (Multiple selections permitted)														
Black	1,183	1,160	962	1,036	1,266	1,006	1,112	\$8,942	\$8,811	\$8,975	\$10,066	\$10,319	\$12,950	\$15,140
White	277	275	358	257	287	221	238	\$7,561	\$7,938	\$3,816	\$7,221	\$8,046	\$10,816	\$12,986
American Indian / Native Alaskan	5	4	2	2	4	1	2	\$6,298	\$4,940	\$3,029	\$3,329	\$9,324	\$28,288	\$28,022
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	0	0	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	\$2,126	\$12,480	\$15,229
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$22,260	-	-	-	\$0	-	-
Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic	1,438	1,410	1,262	1,274	1,526	1,205	1,326	\$8,654	\$8,605	\$5,753	\$9,481	\$9,917	\$12,618	\$14,840
Hispanic	16	20	63	22	35	26	29	\$10,432	\$10,156	\$7,345	\$9,641	\$8,060	\$9,995	\$11,576
Age of Head of Household														
18-31	497	386	329	289	482	359	338	\$8,258	\$7,821	\$8,593	\$9,456	\$8,701	\$11,449	\$12,585
32-46	759	824	711	741	850	689	800	\$9,231	\$9,351	\$9,150	\$10,379	\$10,958	\$13,695	\$16,060
47-61	198	220	285	266	229	183	217	\$7,579	\$7,324	\$6,003	\$7,016	\$8,324	\$10,427	\$13,416
Excluded Households														
Elderly/Disabled	1,196	717	983	709	623	709	588	\$1,810	\$1,203	\$732	\$1,269	\$1,584	\$1,446	\$1,614

HCV Disparate Impact Analysis – Table 5

HCV Population	Heads of Household							Average Total Annual Adjusted Income						
	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual	FY2013 Baseline	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual
All Work-Able Households	1,454	1,430	1,325	1,296	1,561	1,231	1,355	\$10,501	\$10,325	\$9,887	\$11,328	\$9,948	\$11,202	\$13,815
Gender														
Female	1,404	1,378	1,177	1,167	1,424	1,138	1,272	\$10,547	\$10,403	\$10,231	\$11,605	\$10,013	\$11,288	\$14,096
Male	50	52	148	129	137	93	83	\$8,958	\$8,254	\$7,146	\$8,824	\$9,281	\$9,599	\$9,516
Race (Multiple selections permitted)														
Black	1,183	1,160	962	1,036	1,266	1,006	1,112	\$10,787	\$10,444	\$10,205	\$11,809	\$10,213	\$11,392	\$14,268
White	277	275	358	257	287	221	238	\$9,341	\$9,805	\$8,595	\$9,431	\$8,696	\$10,298	\$11,579
American Indian / Native Alaskan	5	4	2	2	4	1	2	\$7,354	\$7,557	\$12,892	\$8,279	\$17,215	\$31,540	\$27,242
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	0	0	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	\$5,930	\$20,128	\$13,789
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	\$0	\$12,264	\$7,104	\$6,624	\$11,668	\$0	\$7,584
Other**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic	1,438	1,410	1,262	1,274	1,526	1,205	1,326	\$10,475	\$10,294	\$8,648	\$11,316	\$10,000	\$11,325	\$12,422
Hispanic	16	20	63	22	35	26	29	\$12,096	\$12,466	\$9,082	\$12,006	\$7,719	\$5,542	\$9,921
Age of Head of Household														
18-31	497	386	329	289	482	359	338	\$9,035	\$8,513	\$8,558	\$9,801	\$8,768	\$9,900	\$9,525
32-46	759	824	711	741	850	689	800	\$11,774	\$11,499	\$11,120	\$12,407	\$10,699	\$11,898	\$13,766
47-61	198	220	285	266	229	183	217	\$9,238	\$9,104	\$8,344	\$9,982	\$9,648	\$11,206	\$11,498
Excluded Households														
Elderly/Disabled	1,196	717	983	709	623	709	588	\$8,879	\$10,225	\$9,549	\$9,007	\$9,706	\$10,540	\$10,240

## HCV Disparate Impact Analysis – Table 6

HCV Population	Average TTP							Average Increased Rent Burden						
	FY2013 Actual	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual
All Work-Able Households	\$271	\$357	\$289	\$314	\$280	\$305	\$339	\$35	\$86	\$18	\$43	\$9	\$34	\$68
Gender														
Female	\$273	\$360	\$299	\$322	\$282	\$307	\$343	\$34	\$87	\$26	\$49	\$9	\$34	\$70
Male	\$237	\$271	\$207	\$246	\$268	\$274	\$285	\$47	\$34	-\$30	-\$9	\$31	\$37	\$48
Race (Multiple selections permitted)														
Black	\$279	\$360	\$297	\$325	\$286	\$309	\$345	\$34	\$81	\$18	\$46	\$7	\$30	\$66
White	\$242	\$341	\$256	\$273	\$250	\$287	\$309	\$38	\$99	\$14	\$31	\$8	\$45	\$67
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$189	\$221	\$323	\$224	\$462	\$788	\$650	\$34	\$32	\$189	\$35	\$273	\$599	\$461
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	\$223	\$317	\$345	-	-	-	-	\$244	\$94	\$122
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$0	\$436	\$178	\$166	\$403	\$150	\$166	\$0	\$436	\$178	\$166	\$403	-\$286	\$166
Other**	\$50	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$100	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic	\$271	\$356	\$240	\$314	\$281	\$308	\$340	\$35	\$85	-\$31	\$43	\$10	\$37	\$69
Hispanic	\$306	\$394	\$257	\$313	\$254	\$190	\$309	\$21	\$88	-\$49	\$7	-\$52	-\$116	\$3
Age of Head of Household														
18-31	\$237	\$297	\$261	\$287	\$255	\$276	\$283	\$42	\$60	\$24	\$50	\$18	\$39	\$46
32-46	\$302	\$392	\$318	\$337	\$296	\$320	\$365	\$29	\$90	\$16	\$35	-\$6	\$18	\$63
47-61	\$242	\$328	\$246	\$282	\$275	\$312	\$330	\$38	\$86	\$4	\$40	\$33	\$70	\$88
Excluded Households														
Elderly/Disabled	\$227	\$320	\$241	\$238	\$243	\$266	\$271	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Centre Meadows Impact Analysis Table 7

Centre Meadows Population	Heads of Household				Average Gross Annual Earned Income			
	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
All Households	158	174	196	195	\$12,532	\$12,672	\$14,357	\$14,172
Gender								
Female	144	154	181	181	\$12,561	\$12,363	\$14,268	\$14,310
Male	14	20	15	14	\$12,239	\$13,806	\$15,441	\$12,398
Race (Multiple selections permitted)								
Black	129	143	163	164	\$12,126	\$12,491	\$14,513	\$13,570
White	28	30	32	31	\$14,237	\$13,539	\$13,458	\$17,356
American Indian / Native Alaskan	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	1	1	0	\$17,233	\$12,492	\$17,803	\$0
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other**	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic	156	172	193	191	\$12,356	\$12,535	\$14,365	\$14,095
Hispanic	2	2	3	4	\$26,232	\$24,482	\$13,840	\$17,854
Age of Head of Household								
18-31	107	118	123	117	\$12,438	\$12,260	\$14,677	\$12,131
32-46	37	43	52	58	\$12,671	\$13,004	\$14,548	\$18,621
47-61	14	13	21	20	\$12,883	\$15,313	\$12,014	\$13,213
Excluded Households								
Elderly/Disabled Households	45	42	57		\$487	\$659	\$870	\$674

## Centre Meadows Impact Analysis – Table 8

Centre Meadows Population	Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			
	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
<b>All Households</b>	\$13,964	\$12,001	\$12,629	\$11,827
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	\$13,819	\$11,930	\$12,351	\$12,020
Male	\$15,457	\$12,548	\$15,981	\$9,336
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>				
Black	\$14,067	\$12,318	\$12,409	\$11,046
White	\$13,407	\$10,670	\$13,620	\$11,997
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$16,273	\$6,580	\$16,843	\$0
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other**	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic	\$13,819	\$12,099	\$12,602	\$11,649
Hispanic	\$25,272	\$3,540	\$14,395	\$14,873
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>				
18-31	\$13,582	\$11,684	\$11,825	\$11,822
32-46	\$14,402	\$13,048	\$13,297	\$12,168
47-61	\$16,252	\$12,928	\$15,683	\$10,872
<b>Excluded Households</b>				
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$11,679	\$10,962	\$9,816	\$9,326

## Centre Meadows Impact Analysis – Table 11

Centre Meadows Population	Average Gross Rent Payment				Rent Burden		
	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
<b>All Households</b>	\$355	\$303	\$322	\$289	-\$52	-\$33	-\$66
<b>Gender</b>							
Female	\$352	\$302	\$314	\$284	-\$50	-\$38	-\$68
Male	\$387	\$314	\$410	\$352	-\$73	\$23	-\$35
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>							
Black	\$357	\$312	\$316	\$284	-\$45	-\$41	-\$73
White	\$342	\$267	\$346	\$316	-\$75	\$4	-\$26
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$407	\$164	\$421	\$0	-\$243	\$14	\$0
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other**	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
Non-Hispanic	\$351	\$306	\$321	\$288	-\$45	-\$30	-\$63
Hispanic	\$632	\$89	\$363	\$342	-\$543	-\$269	-\$290
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>							
18-31	\$347	\$293	\$304	\$260	-\$54	-\$43	-\$87
32-46	\$363	\$326	\$333	\$337	-\$37	-\$30	-\$26
47-61	\$393	\$323	\$397	\$322	-\$70	\$4	-\$71
<b>Excluded Households</b>							
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$292	\$274	\$246	\$260	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Activity 5 - Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for Housing Choice Voucher

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Proposed and Approved FY2012 – FY2013 Plan; Significantly Modified FY2014 Plan and FY 2015

### ii. Description/Update

HUD regulations require that housing authorities inspect every HCV unit at least annually to ensure they meet Housing Quality Standards (HQS). With MTW authority, the LHA created a star rating inspection program for HCV units. The Housing Authority's rating system intends to uphold HUD's high standards of decent, safe, and sanitary housing maintained in good repair for all HCV households. The star rating System for HCV property owners offers alternative inspection schedules that will offer cost-savings over time.

The LHA's streamlined, cost-effective approach that enforces Housing Quality Standards (HQS) at the most at-risk/problematic properties and reduces inspection frequency at high-quality properties. The star-rated system is designed for HCV property owners that evaluates owners on multiple factors including:

- Past inspection scores;
- Results of new drive-by inspections;
- Proportion of units that have been abated in the past; and
- Past complaints reported by voucher holders

These factors are used to assign a Star Rating from one ★ through three ★★★ stars to each landlord. These ratings are then used to determine the quantity and frequency of future inspections.

Intervals between HQS inspections of HCV units is determined by the landlord's star rating as follows:

Star Rating	Inspection Interval	Evaluation Criteria
★	12-month interval between HQS inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A high percentage of units have historically failed annual HQS</li><li>• 20% or more of units go into abatement annually or 20% or more of units receive complaint inspections</li></ul>
★★	24- month interval between HQS inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any landlord with 3 or fewer units on the program (subject to increased rating after three years with no failed inspections)</li><li>• Landlords new to the program</li><li>• Fewer than 20% of units go into abatement annually</li><li>• Fewer than 20% of units required complaint inspections over the previous year</li></ul>
★★★	36-month interval between HQS inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No complaint inspections over the previous year</li><li>• No failed drive by inspections</li><li>• Landlords self-certify biennially that all units meet HQS</li></ul>

Practically no change over the previous year's results because 2-star landlords must have three years of no failed inspections. The 3-star rating dropped from 72 to 65 in FY2019. LHA will monitor changes in ratings periodically to be sure ratings to 3-star are increasing. See the landlord star-rating comparisons from FY2018 to FY2019 below:

<b>Year</b>	<b>1-Star Rating</b>	<b>2-Star Rating</b>	<b>3-Star Rating</b>
FY2018	4	780	72
FY2019	4	779	65

**iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

**iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

There have been no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

**v. Actual Significant Changes**

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

**vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

The LHA has not met the benchmark for this activity since tracking began. Although elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes are on a triennial certification schedule as well as the HCV Rent Reform Study Group, inspections from moves and initials increased over the previous year. Inspection numbers have steadily decreased over the FY2015 baseline number (see Activity 5- Table 1). HCV utilization rate is consistently at or above 100% which may account for the increases.

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 5

Activity 5) Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for Housing Choice Voucher						
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings						
Unit of Measurement: Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).						
*Baseline	*Benchmark	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
\$32,868 2,739 Initial and Annual Inspections @ \$24.00 per hour times 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	\$16,440 1,370 Initial and Annual Inspections @ \$24.00 per hour times 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	\$21,852 1,821 Initial and Annual Inspections @ \$24 per hour X 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	**\$30,300 2,525 Initial and Annual Inspections @ \$24 per hour X 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	\$25,296 2,108 Initial and Annual Inspections @ \$24 per hour X 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	\$28,476 2,373 Initial and Annual Inspections @ \$24 per hour X 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	No
Data Source: Emphasys * The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes were reported starting FY2016. **FY2017 Outcome incorrectly reported – numbers have been revised in this report.						

Activity 5) Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for Housing Choice Voucher						
CE #2: Staff Time Savings						
Unit of Measurement: Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).						
*Baseline	*Benchmark	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
1370 hours 2,739 Inspections@ 30 minutes each	685 hours 1,370 Inspections @ 30 minutes each	911 hours 1,821 Inspections @ 30 minutes each	**1,263 hours 2,525 Inspections @ 30 minutes each	1,054 hours 2,108 Inspections @ 30 minutes each	1,187 hours 2373 Inspections @ 30 minutes each	No
Data Source: Emphasys *The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes were reported starting FY2016. **FY2017 Outcome incorrectly reported – numbers have been revised in this report.						

## Activity 10: Housing Choice Voucher Tenant-Based Special Partners Programs

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Activity Proposed, Approved, and Implemented in FY 2012 – FY 2013

### ii. Description/Update

Through MTW Activity 10, two social service agencies provide stable tenant-based voucher assistance and special services to specific populations. New Vista (formerly Bluegrass.org) and Community Action Council (CAC) are the special partner programs receiving the flexibility of this activity. New Vista receives 22 tenant-based vouchers and provides wraparound services for persons with severe mental illness or substance abuse diagnoses who have completed treatment and are involved in recovery services. Community Action Council (CAC) receives ten tenant-based vouchers and provides case management to youth aging out of foster care. The assistance for this program is capped at ten (10) tenant-based vouchers. The Foster Care initiative was proposed and approved in the FY2017 MTW Annual Plan.

Of the thirty-two (32) vouchers set aside for these two special partner programs, 29 vouchers or 91% were utilized during FY2019. New Vista (formerly Bluegrass.org) has been a partner with LHA for several years and provides outstanding case management to clients suffering with mental illness, substance abuse and those in recovery. CAC is responsible for case management of foster care youth aging out who have opted to extend their commitment with the Cabinet for Health and Human Services.

LHA sees the services that these two providers offer in the community vital to reaching some of the most vulnerable families in need of affordable housing. Although utilization has not reached 100% for both providers, LHA is committed to offer assistance to these populations. See the utilization comparisons below.

Provider	Vouchers Allotted		Vouchers Utilized	
	FY2018	FY2019	FY2018	FY2019
Community Action Council	10	10	3	4
New Vista	25	22	25	25
Totals	35	32	28	29

**iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

**iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

There have been no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

**v. Actual Significant Changes**

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

**vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

The LHA will monitor the metrics for this activity to determine if benchmarks are consistently not being met, if this is the case staff will re-evaluate requirements and make adjustments where needed.

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 10

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
\$44,892 New Vista - \$35,292 CAC - \$9,600	New Vista - \$35,292 CAC - \$48,000	New Vista – \$117,412 CAC – \$21,614	New Vista – \$122,786 CAC – \$28,740	No
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting				

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs				
SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement –Employment Status: Category 5 Unemployed (reporting no earned income)				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
New Vista -2 CAC - 1	0	New Vista – 2 CAC – 3	New Vista – 21 CAC - 1	NO
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting				

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs				
SS4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement – Number of households affected by Activity #10 receiving TANF assistance (decrease).				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
New Vista – 4 CAC - 0	17	New Vista – 5 CAC – 1	New Vista – 6 CAC – 2	YES
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting				

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 10

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs				
SS8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement – Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least <sup>1</sup> \$15,080 per year.				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
New Vista – 2 CAC – 0	35	New Vista – 3 CAC – 1	New Vista – 3 CAC – 0	NO
<sup>1</sup> \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year				
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs				
HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement – Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
26	35	New Vista – 25 CAC – 3	New Vista – 25 CAC – 4	NO
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs				
SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement – Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Bluegrass.org - \$8,600 CAC- \$3,600	\$15,080	New Vista – \$11,689 CAC – \$4,297	New Vista –\$11,113 CAC – \$12,019	NO
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting				

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs				
HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement – Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
3 months	3 months	New Vista – 0 CAC – 0	New Vista – 0 CAC – 0	YES
Data Source: Special Partner reporting				

## Activity 12 – Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Activity Proposed, Approved, and Implemented in FY 2014

### ii. Description/Update

The Housing Authority provides monthly rental subsidy to eight (8) special partners who have agreed to house and provide wraparound social services to a minimum of 388 families with special needs. These agencies serve individuals with mental illness and/or substance abuse issues; individuals recently released from prison or jail; families in need of financial literacy, credit management, and homeownership resources; single parents enrolled full-time in higher education; and homeless individuals and families.

- With Housing Authority approval, special partner organizations are permitted to require that participants reside in designated service-enriched housing units in order to receive rental subsidy; and
- With Housing Authority approval, special partner organizations are permitted to house program participants in HUD-defined special housing types. Within these special housing type units, partner organizations will also be permitted to request Housing Authority approval to house up to two unrelated adults in a zero- or one-bedroom unit.

The following social service providers are serving the number of vouchers allotted with some providers serving as much as 56% more than allotted – 606 families were served during FY2019. The LHA funded \$136,928 monthly to the 8 social service providers. These providers are expected to serve a minimum of 388 participants.

Special Partner Program	Households Served	# of Vouchers	Families Served FY2017	Families Served FY2018	Families Served FY2019
Canaan House	Individuals who have been diagnosed with mental illness	17	17	17	19
Greenhouse 17	Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking	25	24	24	26
Hope Center	Persons who have substance abuse problems and are in need of voluntary or court-mandated treatment	144	317	291	304
New Beginnings	Individuals who have been diagnosed with a mental illness	29	33	30	30
Oasis Rental Assistance	Families in need of financial literacy, credit management and homeownership resources	30	36	32	36
One Parent Scholar House	Single parents who are full-time students in a post-secondary educational institution	80	123	113	115
Serenity Place (Chrysalis House)	Parents with children: who have recently been released from jail or are homeless	40	54	53	53
Urban League	Elderly	23	22	22	23
<b>Totals</b>		<b>388</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>606</b>

**iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

**iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

There have been no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

**v. Actual Significant Changes**

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

**vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

The LHA will monitor the metrics for this activity to determine if benchmarks are consistently not being met, if this is the case staff will re-evaluate requirements and make adjustments where needed.

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 12

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners				
*SS7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measure – Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) savings in dollars (decrease).				
*Baseline (FY2017)	*Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
\$335 monthly per unit cost	\$224 monthly per unit cost	\$223 monthly per unit cost	\$282 monthly per unit cost	No
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				
*LHA adjusted the baseline and benchmark for this activity to reflect the HAP monthly per unit cost. A decrease in HAP would indicate a savings/increase in revenue.				

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners				
SS8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measure – Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least <sup>1</sup> \$15,080 per year.				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
28	40	32	43	YES
<sup>1</sup> \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year				
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 12

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners				
HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement – Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
198	238	166	166	NO
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners				
HC #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities				
Unit of Measurement – Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).				
Baseline (FY2017)	*Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
0	0	0	0	YES
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				
*LHA adjusted the benchmark for this activity.				

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners				
HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Unit of Measurement – Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).				
Baseline (FY2017)	Benchmark	FY2018 Outcome	FY2019 Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
626	640	582	606	NO
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				

## Activity 13 – Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements (Rent Reform)

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Proposed FY 2014

Technical Amendment January 14, 2016

### ii. Description/Update

Impose a minimum earned income calculation for work able, non-elderly, non-disabled families, including full-time students, residing at self-sufficiency units or Centre Meadows regardless of employment status.

Program	Minimum Hours	Hourly Rate	Current Annual Imputed Income
Self-Sufficiency Level 1	37.5	Federal Minimum Wage	$\$7.25 \times 37.5 \times 52 = \$14,138$
Self-Sufficiency Level 2	20	Federal Minimum Wage	$\$7.25 \times 20 \times 52 = \$7,540$
Centre Meadows	20	Federal Minimum Wage	$\$7.25 \times 20 \times 52 = \$7,540$

Households served at self-sufficiency units was up slightly in FY2019 (838 households) over FY2018 (831). Statistics that stand out regarding these units show slight increases in earned income for SSI & SSII units and CM units; households reporting no earned income decreased for SSI & II units but increased by 30% for CM households. Activity 1 - \$150 Minimum Rent Across all Programs demonstrates similar outcomes in earned income and households reporting earned income. Although SSI & SSII self-sufficiency units are included with the public housing (LIPH) reporting in Activity 1, seventy-seven (77) LIPH units are not included with the SSI & SSII units. Households receiving TANF assistance went down at SSI & SSII units as well as CM. Closer monitoring of CM metrics and a closer look at resident satisfaction is needed. CM experienced instability in operations staff without a permanent manager for nearly two years which may have some bearing on less than favorable outcomes. The increase in earned income for both groups is encouraging.

## FY2019 Characteristics of SSI, SSII and Centre Meadows Households

Households	SSI	SSII	Centre Meadows	Total
Total	218	425	195	838
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	204	383	181	768
Male	14	42	14	70
<b>Race</b>				
Black	183	370	164	717
White	33	53	31	117
Asian	1	0	0	1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
American Indian / Alaska Native	1	2	0	3
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Hispanic	2	7	4	13
Non-Hispanic	216	418	191	825
<b>AGE</b>				
18-31	70	180	117	367
32-46	106	184	58	348
47-61	42	61	20	123

Units	Average Annual Earned Income		Households Reporting Earned Income	
	FY2018	FY2019	FY2018	FY2019
SSI & II	\$21,166	\$22,552	539	643
Centre Meadows	\$17,264	\$18,182	163	152
	Households Reporting No Earned Income		Households Receiving TANF	
	FY2018	FY2019	FY2018	FY2019
SSI & II	96	79	130	73
Centre Meadows	33	43	9	3

### iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

### iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

There have been no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

### v. Actual Significant Changes

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

### vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

Staff continues to monitor the analysis for this activity and will likely consider re-evaluating benchmarks. LHA will conduct a needs assessment survey for CM households as well as encourage self-sufficiency initiatives.

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 13

Activity 13: Rent Reform - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements							
<b>SS #1: INCREASE IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>							
Category 6: Other (Heads of Household Reporting Earned Income).							
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome FY2018	Outcome 2019	Benchmark Achieved?
SSI/SSII (PUBLIC HOUSING)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2015	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2019	Yes
	303	628	542	568	539	643	
CENTRE MEADOWS (PBV)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2016	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2019	No
	130	165	N/A	140	163	152	

Activity 13: Rent Reform - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements								
<b>SS #1: INCREASE IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>								
UNIT OF MEASURE: Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).								
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2015	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome FY2018	Outcome 2019	Benchmark Achieved?
SSI/SSII (PUBLIC HOUSING)	\$12,800 Average gross annual earned income from 648 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2013	Expected average gross annual earned income from 639 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2015	Actual average gross annual earned income from 490 of 628 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2015	Actual average gross annual earned income from 542 of 646 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2016	Actual average gross annual earned income from 568 of 683 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2017	Actual average gross annual earned income from 539 of 635 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2018	Actual average gross annual earned income from 564 of 643 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2019	YES
	\$12,800	\$13,704	\$19,544	\$18,151	\$21,397	\$21,166	\$22,552	
CENTRE MEADOWS (PBV)	Average annual earned income from 119 of 144 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2016	Expected average annual earned income from 165 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2017	Actual average annual earned income from non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2015	Actual average annual earned income from non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2016	Actual average annual earned income from 140 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2017	Actual average annual earned income from 163 of 196 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2018	Actual average annual earned income from 152 of 195 non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2019	No
	\$15,231	\$18,277	N/A	N/A	\$14,727	\$17,264	\$18,182	

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 13

Activity 13: Rent Reform - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements							
SS #1: INCREASE IN POSITIVE OUTCOMES IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS							
Category 5: Unemployed Heads of Household (Reporting No Earned Income)							
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome FY2018		Benchmark Achieved?
SSI/SSII (PUBLIC HOUSING)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report no earned income as of June 30, 2015	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2019	No
	95 of 628	0	104	115	96	79	
CENTRE MEADOWS (PBV)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report no earned income as of June 30, 2016	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse no report earned income as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report no earned income as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report no earned income as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report no earned income as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report no earned income as of June 30, 2019	No
	28 of 158	0	N/A	46	33	43	

Activity 13: Rent Reform - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements								
SS #4: NON-ELDERLY/NON-DISABLED HOUSEHOLDS REMOVED FROM TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)								
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2015	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome FY2018	Outcome 2019	Benchmark Achieved?
SSI/SSII (PUBLIC HOUSING)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2019	No
	26	20	187	81	135	130	73	
CENTRE MEADOWS (PBV)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2016	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse report receive TANF as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head/co-head/co-head/spouse receive TANF as of June 30, 2019	No
	38	0	N/A	N/A	7	9	3	

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 13

Activity 13: Rent Reform - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements							
SS #6: REDUCING PER UNIT SUBSIDY COSTS FOR PARTICIPATING HOUSEHOLDS							
Unit of Measure – Average amount of Section 8 and/or Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease)							
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome FY2018	Outcome 2019	Benchmark Achieved?
SSI/SSII (PUBLIC HOUSING)	Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household affected by this policy in dollars as of June 30, 2015	Expected average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2016	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2016	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2017	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2018	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2019	No
	\$2,921 (\$243 MPUC)	\$2,191 (\$183 MPUC)	\$3,017 (\$251 MPUC)	\$2,783 (\$233 MPUC)	\$2,696 (\$225 MPUC)	\$2,415 (\$201 MPUC)	
CENTRE MEADOWS (PBV)	Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household affected by this policy in dollars as of June 30, 2016	Expected average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2017	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2016	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2017	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2018	Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per non-elderly/non-disabled household as of June 30, 2019	No
	\$399	\$299	N/A	\$5,543 (\$462 MPUC)	\$5,361 (\$447 MPUC)	\$5,636 (\$478 MPUC)	

Activity 13: Rent Reform - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements							
SS #7: INCREASE IN AGENCY RENTAL REVENUE PER MONTH							
Unit of Measure – PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).							
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome FY2018	Outcome 2019	Benchmark Achieved?
SSI/SSII (PUBLIC HOUSING)	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2015	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2016	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2016	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2017	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2018	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2019	Yes
	\$134,619	\$193,851	\$278,328	\$233,777	\$288,887	\$248,198	
CENTRE MEADOWS (PBV)	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2016	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2017	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2016	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2017	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2018	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2019	No
	\$392,700 (\$32,700 monthly)	\$672,684 (\$56,057 monthly)	N/A	\$519,803 (\$43,317 monthly)	\$520,772 (\$43,398 monthly)	\$417,350 (\$34,779 monthly)	

## HUD Standard Metrics – Activity 13

Activity 13: Rent Reform - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements								
SS #8: HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY								
The LHA define self-sufficiency as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 per year. Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.								
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2015	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome FY2018	Outcome 2019	Benchmark Achieved?
SSI/SSII (PUBLIC HOUSING)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2019	Yes
	48	58	314	364	372	368	393	
CENTRE MEADOWS (PBV)	Non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2016	Expected non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2016	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2017	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2018	Actual non-elderly/non-disabled households where the head of household meets the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2019	Yes
	72	88	N/A	N/A	58	97	89	

## Activity 13 – Impact Analysis

### Self-Sufficiency I (SSI) Households

Self-Sufficiency I Population	Heads of Household					
	<i>FY2013</i>	<i>FY2015</i>	<i>FY2016</i>	<i>FY2017</i>	<i>FY2018</i>	<i>FY2019</i>
<b>All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households</b>	210	230	206	204	211	218
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	201	222	194	191	196	204
Male	9	8	12	13	15	14
<b>Race</b> ( <i>Multiple selections permitted</i> )						
Black	170	193	169	170	175	183
White	39	34	34	32	35	33
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	0	0	0	0	1
Asian / Pacific Islander	2	0	2	1	0	1
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	1	1	1	1	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
Non-Hispanic	204	220	198	197	205	216
Hispanic	6	10	8	7	6	2
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>						
18-31	88	82	72	83	85	70
32-46	88	106	100	90	92	106
47-61	34	42	34	31	34	42
<b>Excluded Households</b>						
Elderly/Disabled Households	35	36	48	46	75	64

## Activity 13 – Impact Analysis

### SSI Households

Self-Sufficiency I Population	Average Total Annual Adjusted Income						Average Gross Annual Earned Income					
	FY2013	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2013	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	\$16,431	\$19,512	\$20,595	\$20,853	\$19,090	\$20,303	\$16,555	\$19,270	\$21,365	\$21,620	\$21,580	\$20,303
<b>Gender</b>												
Female	\$16,399	\$19,512	\$20,483	\$20,334	\$18,781	\$20,105	\$16,525	\$19,270	\$20,782	\$21,129	\$20,942	\$24,658
Male	\$17,154	\$17,513	\$29,783	\$28,476	\$23,124	\$23,184	\$17,228	\$16,659	\$30,800	\$28,837	\$29,915	\$33,383
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>												
Black	\$16,581	\$20,390	\$21,254	\$21,606	\$19,296	\$20,778	\$16,281	\$19,365	\$21,505	\$21,795	\$21,860	\$25,614
White	\$17,164	\$15,215	\$20,580	\$16,660	\$17,855	\$17,120	\$18,048	\$19,494	\$21,394	\$20,586	\$20,071	\$22,838
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$5,184	\$36,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,778	\$29,827	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,682
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$10,090	\$19,512	\$12,084	\$12,356	\$0	\$36,000	\$20,313	\$19,259	\$19,726	\$21,252	\$0	\$37,440
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$0	\$15,771	\$15,376	\$26,320	\$26,272	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,324	\$25,324	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ethnicity</b>												
Non-Hispanic	\$16,511	\$19,761	\$21,029	\$20,851	\$19,109	\$20,240	\$16,508	\$19,310	\$21,471	\$21,647	\$21,615	\$25,161
Hispanic	\$13,711	\$19,512	\$20,916	\$20,931	\$18,450	\$27,060	\$18,145	\$19,259	\$18,738	\$20,862	\$20,361	\$28,787
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>												
18-31	\$13,189	\$16,002	\$16,582	\$14,483	\$15,135	\$16,646	\$13,760	\$15,519	\$17,752	\$16,872	\$17,582	\$21,984
32-46	\$17,554	\$22,040	\$22,175	\$23,436	\$19,473	\$20,088	\$17,177	\$21,210	\$21,821	\$23,844	\$21,814	\$23,550
47-61	\$21,916	\$24,141	\$27,050	\$30,411	\$27,940	\$26,940	\$22,179	\$21,697	\$27,678	\$27,877	\$30,941	\$34,693
<b>Excluded Households</b>												
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$15,369	\$15,174	\$14,449	\$23,140	\$18,399	\$15,051	\$4,429	\$3,892	\$5,031	\$6,283	\$6,768	\$8,693

Self-Sufficiency I Population	Average Gross Rent Payment						Average Increased Rent Burden				
	FY2013	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	\$380	\$462	\$531	\$524	\$479	\$508	\$82	\$151	\$144	\$99	\$128
<b>Gender</b>											
Female	\$378	\$462	\$518	\$511	\$472	\$503	\$84	\$140	\$133	\$94	\$125
Male	\$426	\$467	\$745	\$725	\$569	\$580	\$41	\$319	\$299	\$143	\$154
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>											
Black	\$387	\$477	\$538	\$544	\$484	\$519	\$90	\$151	\$157	\$97	\$132
White	\$365	\$475	\$515	\$421	\$446	\$428	\$110	\$150	\$56	\$81	\$63
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$130	\$550	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$569	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$439
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$278	\$493	\$302	\$309	\$0	\$900	\$215	\$24	\$31	\$0	\$622
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$0	\$394	\$384	\$658	\$657	\$0	\$394	\$384	\$264	\$657	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ethnicity</b>											
Non-Hispanic	\$381	\$500	\$531	\$524	\$479	\$506	\$119	\$150	\$143	\$98	\$125
Hispanic	\$351	\$493	\$523	\$523	\$461	\$677	\$172	\$172	\$172	\$110	\$326
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>											
18-31	\$312	\$401	\$422	\$368	\$383	\$416	\$89	\$110	\$56	\$71	\$104
32-46	\$405	\$555	\$558	\$587	\$487	\$502	\$150	\$153	\$182	\$82	\$97
47-61	\$489	\$607	\$681	\$761	\$695	\$674	\$118	\$192	\$272	\$206	\$185
<b>Excluded Households</b>											
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$343	\$358	\$361	\$426	\$461	\$379	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Activity 13 – Impact Analysis

### Self-Sufficiency II (SSII) Households

Self-Sufficiency II Population	Heads of Household					
	FY 2013	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
<b>All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households</b>	419	398	440	479	424	<b>425</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	379	362	389	430	382	<b>383</b>
Male	40	36	51	49	42	<b>42</b>
<b>Race</b> ( <i>Multiple selections permitted</i> )						
Black	351	256	376	401	365	<b>370</b>
White	71	59	63	76	58	<b>53</b>
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	1	1	1	1	<b>0</b>
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	3	1	0	1	0	<b>0</b>
Other	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
Non-Hispanic	415	394	435	469	415	<b>418</b>
Hispanic	4	4	5	10	9	<b>7</b>
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>						
18-31	223	176	207	227	191	<b>180</b>
32-46	137	173	174	191	173	<b>184</b>
47-61	59	49	59	61	60	<b>61</b>
<b>Excluded Households</b>						
Elderly/Disabled Households	153	154	240	201	244	<b>226</b>

## Activity 13 – Impact Analysis

### SSII Households

Self-Sufficiency II Population	Average Total Annual Adjusted Income						Average Gross Annual Earned Income					
	FY 2013	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY 2013	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
<b>All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households</b>	\$16,431	\$13,381	\$15,182	\$15,282	\$16,556	<b>\$15,452</b>	\$11,012	\$12,926	\$14,936	\$15,031	\$16,168	<b>\$17,005</b>
<b>Gender</b>												
Female	\$11,813	\$13,112	\$14,680	\$14,904	\$15,953	<b>\$15,000</b>	\$10,848	\$12,679	\$14,269	\$14,276	\$15,626	<b>\$16,461</b>
Male	\$15,238	\$16,092	\$19,014	\$18,602	\$22,040	<b>\$19,577</b>	\$13,450	\$15,412	\$20,023	\$21,663	\$21,100	<b>\$21,965</b>
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>												
Black	\$12,244	\$15,160	\$15,455	\$15,731	\$16,957	<b>\$15,292</b>	\$11,051	\$17,463	\$14,870	\$14,646	\$16,156	<b>\$17,008</b>
White	\$11,594	\$11,881	\$13,534	\$13,318	\$14,008	<b>\$16,898</b>	\$11,363	\$10,910	\$15,291	\$16,940	\$16,160	<b>\$16,940</b>
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$5,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$6,759</b>	\$7,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$18,182</b>
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$5,400	\$16,344	\$16,344	\$0	\$17,988	<b>\$0</b>	\$7,800	\$17,304	\$17,304	\$18,200	\$21,288	<b>\$0</b>
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$9,186	\$4,920	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$10,826	\$13,000	\$0	\$21,320	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>												
Non-Hispanic	\$12,129	\$13,381	\$15,150	\$15,442	\$16,566	<b>\$15,452</b>	\$11,057	\$12,926	\$14,898	\$14,922	\$16,149	<b>\$16,963</b>
Hispanic	\$13,246	\$11,277	\$17,964	\$7,781	\$16,081	<b>\$15,432</b>	\$15,145	\$13,846	\$18,247	\$20,133	\$16,982	<b>\$19,528</b>
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>												
18-31	\$10,494	\$11,935	\$13,915	\$14,139	\$15,091	<b>\$13,212</b>	\$10,459	\$12,541	\$14,390	\$13,381	\$15,186	<b>\$15,678</b>
32-46	\$13,416	\$14,256	\$15,479	\$15,532	\$17,143	<b>\$16,599</b>	\$11,295	\$13,491	\$15,026	\$15,781	\$16,456	<b>\$18,205</b>
47-61	\$15,397	\$15,489	\$18,743	\$18,756	\$19,527	<b>\$18,603</b>	\$13,044	\$12,318	\$16,585	\$18,826	\$18,466	<b>\$17,301</b>
<b>Excluded Households</b>												
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$10,372	\$10,355	\$11,075	\$12,805	\$13,122	<b>\$11,607</b>	\$597	\$513	\$936	\$1,990	\$1,856	<b>\$2,293</b>

Self-Sufficiency II Population	Average Gross Rent Payment						Average Increased Rent Burden				
	FY 2013	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
<b>All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households</b>	\$297	\$342	\$384	\$385	\$416	<b>\$386</b>	\$45	\$87	\$88	\$119	<b>\$89</b>
<b>Gender</b>											
Female	\$294	\$336	\$372	\$375	\$401	<b>\$375</b>	\$42	\$78	\$81	\$107	<b>\$81</b>
Male	\$340	\$402	\$475	\$465	\$551	<b>\$489</b>	\$62	\$135	\$125	\$211	<b>\$149</b>
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>											
Black	\$300	\$385	\$391	\$396	\$335	<b>\$382</b>	\$85	\$91	\$96	\$35	<b>\$82</b>
White	\$289	\$305	\$341	\$334	\$292	<b>\$423</b>	\$16	\$52	\$45	\$3	<b>\$134</b>
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$135	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$169</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$34</b>
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$135	\$409	\$409	\$0	\$362	<b>\$0</b>	\$274	\$274	\$0	\$227	<b>\$0</b>
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$230	\$150	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	-\$80	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>											
Non-Hispanic	\$298	\$305	\$383	\$389	\$416	<b>\$386</b>	\$7	\$85	\$91	\$118	<b>\$88</b>
Hispanic	\$332	\$310	\$449	\$195	\$402	<b>\$386</b>	-\$22	\$117	-\$137	\$70	<b>\$54</b>
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>											
18-31	\$268	\$306	\$355	\$357	\$380	<b>\$330</b>	\$38	\$87	\$89	\$112	<b>\$62</b>
32-46	\$321	\$363	\$391	\$399	\$429	<b>\$415</b>	\$42	\$70	\$78	\$108	<b>\$94</b>
47-61	\$360	\$397	\$469	\$469	\$493	<b>\$465</b>	\$37	\$109	\$109	\$133	<b>\$105</b>
<b>Excluded Households</b>											
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$260	\$259	\$277	\$323	\$329	<b>\$293</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Activity 13 – Impact Analysis

### Centre Meadows (CM) Households

Centre Meadows Population	Heads of Household			
	FY 2016 Baseline	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	158	186	196	195
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	144	171	181	181
Male	14	15	15	14
<b>Race</b> <i>(Multiple selections permitted)</i>				
Black	129	157	163	164
White	28	28	32	31
American Indian / Native Alaskan	0	0	0	0
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	1	1	0
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic	156	184	193	191
Hispanic	2	2	3	4
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>				
18-31	107	124	123	117
32-46	37	45	52	58
47-61	14	17	21	20
<b>Excluded Households</b>				
Elderly/Disabled Households	45	42	57	60

## Activity 13 – Impact Analysis

### CM Households

Centre Meadows Population	Average Gross Annual Earned Income				Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			
	FY 2016 Baseline	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2016 Baseline	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	\$12,532	\$11,084	\$14,357	\$14,172	\$13,964	\$10,762	\$12,629	\$11,827
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	\$12,561	\$11,083	\$14,268	\$14,309	\$13,819	\$10,719	\$12,351	\$12,020
Male	\$12,239	\$11,098	\$15,441	\$12,398	\$15,457	\$11,257	\$15,981	\$11,992
<b>Race</b> <i>(Multiple selections permitted)</i>								
Black	\$12,126	\$10,678	\$14,513	\$13,571	\$14,067	\$10,847	\$12,409	\$11,170
White	\$14,237	\$13,324	\$13,458	\$17,356	\$13,407	\$10,437	\$13,620	\$15,387
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$17,233	\$12,238	\$17,803	\$0	\$16,273	\$6,580	\$16,843	\$0
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
Non-Hispanic	\$12,356	\$10,939	\$14,365	\$14,095	\$13,819	\$10,841	\$12,602	\$13,673
Hispanic	\$26,232	\$24,482	\$13,840	\$17,855	\$25,272	\$3,540	\$14,395	\$11,146
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>								
18-31	\$12,438	\$10,820	\$14,677	\$12,131	\$13,582	\$10,263	\$11,825	\$10,778
32-46	\$12,671	\$11,986	\$14,548	\$18,621	\$14,042	\$10,715	\$13,297	\$11,311
47-61	\$12,883	\$10,624	\$12,014	\$13,213	\$16,252	\$14,526	\$15,683	\$13,596
<b>Excluded Households</b>								
Elderly/Disabled Households	\$487	\$1,617	\$870	\$674	\$11,679	\$10,207	\$9,816	\$9,326

## Activity 13 – Impact Analysis

### CM Households

Centre Meadows Population	Average Gross Rent Payment				Rent Burden		
	FY2016 Baseline	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	\$355	\$276	\$322	\$289	-\$79	-\$33	-\$66
<b>Gender</b>							
Female	\$352	\$275	\$314	\$284	-\$77	-\$38	-\$68
Male	\$387	\$281	\$410	\$352	-\$106	\$23	-\$35
<b>Race</b> ( <i>Multiple selections permitted</i> )							
Black	\$357	\$279	\$316	\$284	-\$78	-\$41	-\$73
White	\$342	\$264	\$346	\$316	-\$78	\$4	-\$26
American Indian / Native Alaskan	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian / Pacific Islander	\$407	\$164	\$421	\$0	-\$243	\$14	\$0
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
Non-Hispanic	\$351	\$278	\$321	\$288	-\$73	-\$30	-\$63
Hispanic	\$632	\$89	\$363	\$342	-\$543	-\$269	-\$290
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>							
18-31	\$347	\$266	\$304	\$260	-\$81	-\$43	-\$87
32-46	\$363	\$270	\$333	\$337	-\$93	-\$30	-\$26
47-61	\$393	\$363	\$397	\$322	-\$30	\$4	-\$71
<b>Excluded Households</b>							
Elderly/Disabled Households	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Metric	Program	*FY 2013 Baseline	**FY2014 Benchmark	***FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual	Data Source
Imputed minimum annual earned income	SS I	N/A	\$14,138	\$14,138	\$14,138	\$14,138	\$14,138	\$14,138	\$14,138	U.S. Dept. of Labor, Federal Minimum Wage
	SSII	N/A	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	
	Centre Meadows	N/A	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	
Avg. (Median) gross annual earned income reported by families	SS I	\$16,555 (\$16,653)	\$18,457 (\$16,653)	\$18,140 (\$17,503)	\$19,270 (\$18,761)	\$20,695 (\$20,898)	\$21,620 (\$21,039)	\$21,580 (\$19,864)	\$25,194	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	SSII	\$11,012 (\$10,460)	\$13,497 (\$10,460)	\$12,486 (\$11,700)	\$12,926 (\$12,896)	\$14,193 (\$14,040)	\$15,031 (\$14,022)	\$16,168 (\$15,708)	\$17,005	
	Centre Meadows	\$3,395 (\$0)	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	\$12,532 (\$13,845)	\$11,084 (\$10,288)	\$14,357 (\$14,775)	\$14,172	
# (%) of families reporting no annual earned income	SS I	44 (21%)	0 (0%)	46 (22%)	43 (19%)	22 (11%)	21 (10%)	22 (5%)	17	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	SSII	118 (28%)	0 (0%)	93 (23%)	95 (24%)	82 (19%)	94 (20%)	74 (35%)	62	
	Centre Meadows	98 (67%)	0 (0%)	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	28 (18%)	46 (25%)	33 (17%)	43	
# (%) of families reporting annual earned income less than the minimum imputed earned income	SS I	61 (29%)	0 (0%)	54 (26%)	36 (16%)	28 (14%)	48 (24%)	50 (24%)	26	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	SSII	159 (38%)	0 (0%)	130 (33%)	22 (6%)	41 (9%)	24 (5%)	98 (23%)	127	
	Centre Meadows	\$4,340 (\$2,400)	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	31 (20%)	16 (9%)	46 (24%)	57	
Avg. (Median) total adjusted annual income reported by families	SS I	\$16,431 (\$14,652)	\$18,333 (\$16,246)	\$18,882 (\$16,744)	\$19,512 (\$17,508)	\$21,025 (\$19,532)	\$20,853 (\$19,331)	\$19,090 (\$18,060)	\$20,303 (\$20,544)	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	SSII	\$12,101 (\$11,184)	\$14,587 (\$13,148)	\$13,953 (\$11,708)	\$13,381 (\$12,114)	\$15,082 (\$14,456)	\$15,282 (\$14,223)	\$16,566 (\$14,813)	\$15,452 (\$13,735)	
	Centre Meadows	\$4,340 (\$2,400)	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	\$13,964 (\$14,574)	\$10,762 (\$8447)	\$12,629 (\$12,265)	\$11,204 (\$9,134)	
Avg. (Median) monthly gross rent payment of families	SS I	\$380 (\$387)	\$427 (\$407)	\$426 (\$419)	\$493 (\$438)	\$531 (\$488)	\$524 (\$484)	\$479 (\$452)	\$508 (\$514)	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	SSII	\$297 (\$281)	\$358 (\$330)	\$345 (\$293)	\$342 (\$305)	\$384 (\$361)	\$385 (\$356)	\$416 (\$371)	\$386 (\$344)	
	Centre Meadows	\$179 (\$150)	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	\$355 (\$365)	\$276 (\$211)	\$322 (\$307)	\$289 (\$241)	
# (%) of families requesting hardship exemption	SS I	N/A	21 (10%)	0	0	0	0	4	1	WinTen2/ Emphasys/ Property Manager Log
	SSII	N/A	42 (10%)	0	0	0	0	1	2	
	Centre Meadows	N/A	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	0	0	0	0	
# (%) of families granted hardship exemption	SS I	N/A	11 (5%)	0	0	0	0	2	1	WinTen2/ Emphasys/ Property Manager Log
	SSII	N/A	21 (5%)	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Centre Meadows	N/A	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant	0	0	0	0	

## Activity 14 – Rent Reform: Elimination of Earned Income Disallowance (Rent Reform)

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended Proposed/Implemented FY 2015

### ii. Description/Update

LHA staff proposed to eliminate the Earned Income Disallowance (EID) calculation for public housing and HCV households. Monitoring the family members who receive the EID calculation from hire date through 48 cumulative months was difficult to track because households don't always report when employment status starts and stops. In addition, many who received the benefit quit their jobs at the end of the two-year exclusion to avoid an increase in the household rent. For those reasons and the administrative burden, the LHA proposed to eliminate the EID calculation.

This activity has achieved the anticipated result to eliminate the burdensome task of tracking the employment starts and stops of the 23 households that were receiving EID. Currently no new households receive the EID. During FY2019, eight (8) of the 23 households that formerly received EID continue to receive housing assistance.

No disparate impact analysis was done for this activity as no new households have been added. Households affected by this policy are decreasing as they leave the program.

#### Impact: Assessing Costs and Benefits

Metric	FY 2014 Baseline	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Actual
*Total number EID Households (continue to receive assistance)	23	19	19	10	10	8
Dollar value of staff time spent processing EID	\$452	0	0	0	0	0
Avg. gross annual earned income reported by EID families	\$6,570	\$6,915	\$7,990	\$8,238	\$10,564	\$6,796
Average total gross annual income reported by families	\$11,586	\$11,982	\$14,783	\$13,517	\$11,177	\$14,214
Average gross rent (TTP)	\$248	\$287	\$287	\$312	\$383	\$194
# (%) Estimated cost savings from eliminating EID	0	\$452	\$452 <del>\$373</del>	\$452 <del>\$197</del>	\$452	\$452

**iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

**iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

There were no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

**v. Actual Significant Changes**

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

**vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

There have been no challenges in achieving benchmarks for this activity.

Activity 14 - Rent Reform - Earned Income Disregard (EID) Elimination							
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution							
Unit of Measurement – Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).							
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved
25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Yes
Data Source: WinTen2, staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records							

Activity 14 - Rent Reform - Earned Income Disregard (EID) Elimination							
CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue							
Unit of Measurement - Rental revenue in dollars (increase).							
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome FY2015	Outcome FY2016	Outcome FY2017	Outcome 2018	Outcome 2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
\$68,544 (\$35,964)	\$96,474	\$26,112	\$49,896	\$8,820	*\$8,196 **\$49,812	*\$0 **\$39,228	YES
Sum total gross (net) annual rental revenue from 23 households receiving EID as of June 30, 2013	Expected sum total net annual rental revenue from 23 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2015	Actual sum total net annual rental revenue from 23 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2015	Actual sum total net annual rental revenue from 19 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2016	Actual sum total net annual rental revenue from 10 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2017	Actual sum total net annual rental revenue from 4 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2018	Actual sum total net annual rental revenue from 4 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2019	

## Activity 16 – HCV Rent Reform Study

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Activity Proposed and Implemented FY2015

### ii. Description/Update

The HUD commissioned HCV Rent Reform Study is now in the second triennial certification schedule. The Study sets forth alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies for the study group and traditional HCV rent calculation and recertification schedules apply to the control group. During the three-year recertification schedule until a household's next recertification date, any increase in earnings it achieves will not cause the amount of rent and utilities it pays to go up.

The alternative rent policy is intended to be roughly cost-neutral from the perspective of housing agencies and HUD. This means that the combination of HAP and administrative expenditures should remain about the same as the total expenditures for assisting the same number of voucher holders under the traditional rent policy. Ideally, those expenditures would fall, creating an opportunity to provide housing assistance to more families for the same amount of money.

Households were enrolled to either the study or control group in July 2015. Initially 516 households were assigned to the control group and 513 assigned to the study group. In FY2019 366 households remained in the study group and 333 remained in the control group. Average HAP paid for control group households - \$557 and \$502 for the study group which indicates more household income in the study group because less HAP was paid.

Household income for the study group went down from in FY2018 to in FY2019 but FY2018 data was not available for the study group therefore earned income for all work-able households was used. Going forward data can be extracted for study group participants.

RRS Group	Household Count	Avg. HAP to Owner	Annual Certifications	Interim Certifications
Control	333	\$557	333	273
Study	366	\$502	366	231
<b>Totals</b>	<b>699</b>		<b>699</b>	<b>504</b>

### iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

### iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

There were no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year. Please see HUD Standard Metrics table at the end of this activity. Please note that many of the baseline and benchmark metrics show a three-year period now that year four (FY2019) is reported baseline/benchmarks are based on four years of data collection with year one (FY2016) being the enrollment year.

### v. Actual Significant Changes

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

Most benchmarks have been achieved that deal with time to complete certifications, interims. FY2019 marks the first triennial for the study because enrollment began in July 2015 (FY2016). Reports were available in FY2019 for earned income of study participants that were not available in previous reporting periods. LHA will monitor future reporting periods now that a report is available.

## Activity 16 – HUD Standard Metrics

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost per Annual Certification	<b>YEAR 1: \$18,879</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$18,879</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$18,879</b> <b>TOTAL: \$56,637</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$18,879</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>SAVINGS: \$37,758</b>	<b>FY2016: 510/\$13,754.70</b> <b>FY2017: 3/\$80.91</b> <b>FY2018: 0/\$0</b> <b>FY2019: 365/\$9,844.05</b> <b>TOTAL: \$23,679.66</b>	<b>YEAR 1: YES</b> <b>YEAR 2: NO</b> <b>YEAR 3: YES</b> <b>YEAR 4: YES</b> <b>TOTAL SAVINGS: \$51,836.34</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Annual Certification - \$26.97</b></li> <li>• <b>700 - Study Group Participants</b></li> <li>• <b>Hard cost (mail and reproduction costs) - .72</b></li> <li>• <b>Staff Cost per hour - \$26.25</b></li> <li>• <b>1 hour - Average time spent per annual certification</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per annual recertification after implementation of activity - \$26.97</b></li> <li>• <b>700 - Study Group Participants</b></li> </ul>	<b>Actual cost of Annual Certification</b>  <b>YEAR 1:</b> <b>510 x \$26.97 = \$13,754.70</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>3 x \$26.97 = \$80.91</b> <b>YEAR 3:</b> <b>0 x \$26.97 = \$0</b> <b>YEAR 4:</b> <b>365 x 26.97 = \$9,844.05</b>	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost per Interim Certification	<b>YEAR 1: \$15,624.70</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$15,624.70</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$15,624.70</b> <b>TOTAL: \$46,874.10</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$11,488.75</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>TOTAL: \$11,488.75</b>	<b>FY2016: \$3,728.92</b> <b>FY2017: \$3,243.11</b> <b>FY2018: \$1,943.24</b> <b>FY2019: \$3,033.03</b> <b>TOTAL: \$11,948.30</b>	YES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Interim Certification = \$13.13</b></li> <li>• <b>1.7</b> average number of interims per household (HH) per year</li> <li>• <b>times 700</b> Study Group participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost per Interim Certification - \$13.13</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Average time to perform an interim - .50 hours</i></li> <li>• <i>times the average cost per staff hour - \$26.25 per hour</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Interim Certification - \$13.13</b></li> <li>• <b>1.25</b> average number of interims per HH per year <b>700</b> Study Group participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost per Interim Certification - \$13.13 is equal to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to perform an interim - .50 hours</li> <li>• <i>times the average cost per staff hour - \$26.25 per hour</i></li> </ul>	<p>Actual cost of Interim Certification</p> <p><b>FY2016:</b> <b>284 interims</b> - .63 average number of interims per HH</p> <p><b>FY2017:</b> <b>247 interims</b> - .69 average number of interims per HH</p> <p><b>FY2018:</b> <b>148 interims</b> - .52 average number of interims per HH</p> <p><b>FY2019</b> <b>231 interims</b> - .64 average number of interims per HH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Times cost per interim certification = <b>\$13.13</b></li> </ul>	

ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost per Streamlined Interim Certification	<b>YEAR 1: \$6,433.70</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$6,433.70</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$6,433.70</b> <b>TOTAL: \$19,301.10</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$3,214.40</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$3,214.40</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$3,214.40</b> <b>SAVINGS: \$9,643.20</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$4,995.56</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$4,344.73</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$2,603.32</b> <b>YEAR 4: \$4,063.29</b> <b>TOTAL: \$16,006.90</b>	<b>YES</b>  <b>SAVINGS: \$9,727.90</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Interim - \$13.13</b></li> <li>• average number of interims per household per year <b>.7/500 per year</b></li> <li>• <b>700</b> the number of Study Group participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost per Interim</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to perform an interim - <b>.50 hours</b></li> <li>• <b>times</b> the average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Streamlined Interim - \$6.56</b></li> <li>• average number of interims per household per year <b>.7/500 per year</b></li> <li>• <b>700</b> the number of Study Group participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost per Streamlined Interim</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>\$6.56</b></li> <li>• Average time to perform an interim - <b>.25</b></li> <li>• <b>times</b> average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> </ul>	<p>Actual cost of Streamlined Interim Certification</p> <p>FY2016: 284 interims FY2017: 247 interims FY2018: 148 interims FY2019: 231 interims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Streamlined Interim - \$17.59</b></li> <li>• average number of interims per household per year</li> <li>• Number of Study Group participants</li> <li>• <b>Cost per Streamlined Interim</b> is equal to: <b>\$17.59</b></li> <li>• Average time to perform an interim - <b>.67 hours (40 minutes)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>times</b> average cost per staff hour - <b>\$17.59</b></p>	<p>Explanation to be provided</p>

ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost of Rent Calculation	<b>YEAR 1: \$13,781</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$13,781</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$13,781</b> <b>TOTAL: \$41,343</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$9,187.50</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>TOTAL: \$9,187.50</b> <b>SAVINGS: \$32,155.50</b>	<b>FY2016: \$13,387.50</b> <b>FY2017: \$78.75</b> <b>FY2018: \$0</b> <b>FY2019: \$9,607.50</b> <b>TOTAL: \$23,073.75</b>	<b>YEAR 1: NO</b> <b>YEAR 2: NO</b> <b>YEAR 3: YES</b> <b>YEAR 4: YES</b> <b>SAVINGS: \$32,050.25</b>
	<p>Baseline is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current time to perform rent calculation <b>.75 hours</b></li> <li>• <b>times</b> the average cost per staff hour <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• <b>times</b> the number of Study Groups <b>700 =</b></li> </ul> <p><b>\$13,781.25</b></p> <p><b>Cost of Rent Calculation</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources <b>.50</b></li> <li>• <b>plus</b> the "Cost to Determine Adjusted Income - <b>.25 hours</b></li> </ul>	<p>Benchmark is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current time to perform rent calculation <b>.50 hours</b></li> <li>• <b>times</b> the average cost per staff hour <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• <b>times</b> the number of Study Groups <b>700 =</b></li> </ul> <p><b>\$9,187.50</b></p> <p><b>Cost of Rent Calculation</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources <b>.50</b></li> <li>• <b>plus</b> the "Cost to Determine Adjusted Income - <b>0 hours</b></li> </ul>	<p>Actual cost of Rent Calculation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current time to perform rent calculation <b>1 hour</b></li> <li>• <b>times</b> the average cost per staff hour <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• <b>times the number of Study Group</b></li> </ul> <p><b>FY2016: 510</b> rent calculations <b>FY2017: 3</b> rent calculations <b>FY2018: 0</b> rent calculations <b>FY2019: 366</b> rent calculations <b>\$23,073.75</b></p> <p><b>Cost of Rent Calculation</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources <b>1 hour</b></li> <li>• <b>plus</b> the "Cost to Determine Adjusted Income - <b>0 hours</b></li> </ul>	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity.	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost to Determine Income from Assets	<b>YEAR 1: \$4.59</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$4.59</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$4.59</b> <b>TOTAL: \$13.77</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>TOTAL SAVINGS: \$13.77</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 4: \$0</b> <b>TOTAL SAVINGS: \$18.36</b>	<b>YEAR 1: YES</b> <b>YEAR 2: YES</b> <b>YEAR 3: YES</b> <b>YEAR 4: YES</b> <b>TOTAL: \$18.36</b>
	<b>Cost to determine income from assets equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average time to verify asset, calculate income, perform quality control - <b>.25 hours</b></li> <li>times the cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>Times the percent of households with income from assets valued at <b>\$5,000</b> - <b>0.001%</b></li> <li><i>times</i> the number of study participants – <b>700</b></li> </ul>	<b>Cost to determine income from assets equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average time to verify asset, calculate income, perform quality control - <b>.25 hours</b></li> <li>times the cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>Times the percent of households with income from assets valued at <b>\$25,000</b> - <b>0%</b></li> <li><i>times</i> the number of study participants – <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Actual cost to determine income from assets	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost to Determine Utility Allowance	<b>YEAR 1: \$4,593.75</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$4,593.75</b>	<b>FY2016: \$3,345.60</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>YEAR 2: \$4,593.75</b>	<b>YEAR 2: \$0</b>	<b>FY2017: \$19.68</b>	<b>NO</b>
	<b>YEAR 3: \$4,593.75</b>	<b>YEAR 3: \$0</b>	<b>FY 2018: \$0</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>TOTAL: \$13,781.25</b>	<b>TOTAL: \$4,593.75</b>	<b>FY2019: \$2,400.96</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>TOTAL SAVINGS: \$9,187.50</b>	<b>SAVINGS: \$9,187.50</b>	<b>TOTAL COST: \$5,766.24</b>	<b>TOTAL SAVINGS: \$12,608.76</b>
	<b>Cost per utility allowance equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time to Determine Utility Allowance - <b>.25</b></li> <li>Times the average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li><i>times</i> the number of study participants <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>	<b>Cost per utility allowance equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time to Determine Utility Allowance - <b>.25</b></li> <li>Times the average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li><i>times</i> the number of study participants <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 510</b> Study Group Participants  <b>YEAR 2: 3</b> Study Group Participants  <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> Study Group Participants  <b>YEAR 4: 366</b> Study Participants	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Time to Determine Utility Allowance	<b>YEAR 1: 175</b> <b>YEAR 2: 175</b> <b>YEAR 3: 175</b> <b>TOTAL: 525 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 175</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>TOTAL: 175 hours</b> <b>SAVINGS: 350</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 127.50</b> <b>YEAR 2: .75</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>YEAR 4: 91.50</b> <b>TOTAL: 219.75 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: YES</b> <b>YEAR 2: NO</b> <b>YEAR 3: YES</b> <b>YEAR 4: YES</b> <b>TOTAL SAVINGS: 480.25 hours</b>
	Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance - .25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>	Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance - .25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>	Actual Time to Determine Utility Allowance  Year 1 - 510  Year 2 - 3  Year 3 - 0  Year 4 - 366	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Time To Complete Annual Certification	<b>YEAR 1: 700 hours</b> <b>YEAR 2: 700 hours</b> <b>YEAR 2: 700 hours</b> <b>TOTAL: 2,100 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 700 hours</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0 hours</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0 hours</b> <b>SAVINGS: 1,400 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 637.50 hrs.</b> <b>YEAR 2: 3.75 hrs.</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0 hrs.</b> <b>YEAR 4: 457.50 hrs</b> <b>TOTAL: 1,098.75 hrs</b>	<b>YEAR 1: YES</b> <b>YEAR 2: NO</b> <b>YEAR 3: YES</b> <b>YEAR 4: YES</b> <b>TOTAL SAVINGS: 1,701.25 hours</b>
	<b>Time to Complete Annual Certification – 1 hour</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>times</i> the number of the Study Group – <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Complete Annual Certification is equal to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average time spent to schedule, interview and verify - <b>.75 hours</b></li> <li><i>plus</i> the average time spent to conduct quality control of the annual certification - <b>.25 hours</b></li> </ul>	<b>Time to Complete Annual Certification – 1 hour</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>times</i> the number of the Study Group – <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Complete Annual Certification is equal to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average time spent to schedule, interview and verify - <b>.75 hours</b></li> </ul> <i>plus</i> the average time spent to conduct quality control of the annual certification - <b>.25 hours</b>	<b>Actual Time to Complete Annual Certification is equal to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average time spent to schedule, interview and verify - <b>1 hour</b></li> <li><i>times</i> the number of the Study Group – <b>Year 1 – 510</b> <b>Year 2 – 3</b> <b>Year 3 – 0</b> <b>Year 4 – 366</b></li> </ul> <i>plus</i> the average time spent to conduct quality control of the annual certification - <b>.25 hours</b>	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Time To Determine Tenant Rent</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 525 hours</b> <b>YEAR 2: 525 hours</b> <b>YEAR 3: 525 hours</b> <b>TOTAL: 1,575 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 350 hours</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>SAVINGS: 1,225 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 765 hours</b> <b>YEAR 2: 4.5 hours</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>YEAR 4: 366 hours</b> <b>SAVINGS: 964.50 hours</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<p>The Baseline is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent .75</b> times the number of Study Group – 700 = 525 hours</li> </ul> <p><b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources .50 hours</li> <li>• <i>plus</i> Time to Determine Adjusted Income .25 hours = .75 hours</li> </ul>	<p>Benchmark is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent . 50</b> times the number of Study Group – 700 = 350 hours</li> </ul> <p><b>New Time to Determine Tenant Rent</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources .50 hours</li> <li>• <i>plus</i> Time to Determine Adjusted Income 0 hours = .50 hours</li> </ul>	<p>Actual time to complete Determine Tenant Rent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent 1 HOUR</b> times the number of Study Group =</li> </ul> <p><b>Year 1 - 510 hours</b>  <b>Year 2 = 3 hours</b>  <b>Year 3 = 0 hours</b>  <b>Year 4 = 366 hours</b></p> <p><b>New Time to Determine Tenant Rent</b> is equal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources .50 hours</li> <li>• <i>plus</i> Time to Determine Adjusted Income = .50 hours</li> </ul>	

ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY				
CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Time to Determine Income from Assets	YEAR 1: 0.175 hours YEAR 2: 0.175 YEAR 3: 0.175 TOTAL: 0.5 hours	YEAR 1: 0 YEAR 2: 0 YEAR 3: 0 TOTAL: 0 SAVINGS: 0.5 hours	YEAR 1: 0 YEAR 2: 0 YEAR 3: 0 YEAR 4: 0 TOTAL: 0 SAVINGS: 0.5 hours	YEAR 1: YES YEAR 1: YES YEAR 3: YES YEAR 4: YES TOTAL: 0
	Baseline is equal to: • Time to Determine Income from Assets over \$5,000 - .25 hours • times percent of households with income from assets over \$5,000 = .001% • times the number of Study Group 700	Benchmark is equal to: • Time to Determine Income from Assets over \$25,000 - .25 hours • times percent of households with income from assets over \$25,000 = 0% • times the number of Study Group 700	Actual Time to Determine Income from Assets	

ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY				
CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average Error Rate in Determining TTP	0 (UNAVAILABLE)	0 (UNAVAILABLE)	0 (UNAVAILABLE)	N/A
	Baseline is equal to: Average error rate In Determining the TTP is (currently not tracked)	Benchmark is equal to: percent Average error rate In Determining the TTP	Actual average error rate in determining TTP	
Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance	0 (UNAVAILABLE)	0 (UNAVAILABLE)	0 (UNAVAILABLE)	N/A
	Baseline is equal to: Not Currently Tracked	Benchmark is equal to: % Average error rate In Determining the Utility Allowance	Actual average error rate in determining Utility Allowance	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Average Earned Income of Non-Elderly Non-disabled Households</b>	<b>\$16,140</b>	<b>\$16,463</b>	<b>*YEAR 1 = N/A Year 2 = N/A Year 3 = \$14,209 Year 4 = \$12,470</b>	<b>NO</b>
	Baseline is equal to: Average Earned Income of Non-elderly Non-disabled Households of Study Group	Benchmark is equal to: Annual increase of 2% in the Average Earned Income of Non-Elderly Non-disabled Households of Study Group	Average Earned Income of Non-Elderly Non-disabled Households of Study Group	

\*Year 1 – 3 - LHA did not have a report that would pull average earned income of the Study Group alone. The income used in Year 3 is the average earned income of all HCV work-able households with earned income. In FY2019 a report was available for average earned income of Study Group.

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
(1) Employed	41%/287	43%/301	<b>FY2018: *257 Year 4: 259 (71%)/366</b>	<b>YES</b>
(5) Unemployed	55%/385	53%/371	<b>FY2018: *93 Year 4: 106 (30%)/366</b>	<b>YES</b>
*In previous years LHA did not have a report that would pull employment status of the Study Group. In FY2019 data was available for the employment status of Study Group participants.				

## **Activity 17 – Limit Interim Re-examinations for Public Housing Households (Rent Reform)**

### **i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended**

Proposed/Implemented FY 2016

### **ii. Description/Update**

Interim reductions in the rent portion are limited to one per household between regularly scheduled re-examination periods. For households who are not elderly or disabled, interim adjustments are limited as follows:

- Households may only request an interim reduction once between regularly scheduled re-examination periods.
- Interim decreases will only be processed for loss of employment due to reduction in work force or closure of the place of employment where employment income loss is not covered by severance or separation benefits.
- In calculating the reduction, all household income, including previously unreported income, is counted;
- The household's loss of income must be expected to last longer than four (4) months;
- All interim rent reductions are temporary.
- An exception to this policy allows for an interim at any time for compliance in 50058 reporting and is limited to the following: the addition of a household member, the death or removal of a household member.

This activity is ongoing. FY2019, 306 interims were reported, up slightly over the previous year's 282 interims. Earned income of work-able households was up slightly over the previous year's \$20,807 (FY2018) to \$22,048 (FY2019).

LHA sees this activity as successful with a 50% decrease in interims compared to baseline numbers. Although average earned income was down slightly over the previous year, earned income was only 2% (\$22,048) less than the benchmark of \$22,446. The reduction in interims and increase in earned income indicates that the intended outcome of this activity to eliminate excessive interims has been effective.

### **iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

### **iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

There were no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

### **v. Actual Significant Changes**

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

## Activity 17 – HUD Standard Metrics

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>					
<b>Unit of Measurement</b> Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>\$8,679</b> $\$26.25 \times .50 = \$13.13$ per interim X 661 Interims Management Specialist hourly rate x time to do an interim	<b>\$4,333</b> $\$13.13 \times 330$ Interims	<b>\$4,491</b> $\$13.13 \times 342$ Interims	<b>\$3,703</b> $\$13.13 \times 282$ Interims	<b>\$4,018</b> $\$13.13 \times 306$ Interims	YES
Data Source: Emphasys					

<b>CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>					
<b>Unit of Measurement</b> Rental revenue in dollars (increase).					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>\$3,637,812</b> <b>(\$2,676,180)</b> Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity.	<b>\$4,387,366</b> <b>(\$3,227,589)</b> Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity.	<b>\$3,671,868</b> <b>(\$2,803,644)</b> Actual rental revenue after implementation	<b>\$3,466,643</b> <b>(\$2,769,132)</b> Actual rental revenue after implementation	<b>\$3,532,824</b> <b>(\$2,034,444)</b> Actual rental revenue after implementation	NO

<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>					
<b>Unit of Measurement</b> Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>330.5 hours</b> <b>661 interims x 30 minutes</b>	<b>165 hours</b> <b>330 interims</b>	<b>171 hours</b> <b>342 interims</b>	<b>141 hours</b> <b>282 interims</b>	<b>153 hours</b> <b>306 Interims</b>	YES
Data Source: Emphasys					

<b>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</b>					
<b>Unit of Measurement</b> Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>\$19,518</b> Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	<b>\$22,446</b> Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity.	<b>\$20,634</b> <b>Actual Average Earned Income of 658 of 809 HHs</b>	<b>\$20,807</b> <b>Actual Average Earned Income of 602 of 727 HHs</b>	<b>\$22,048</b> <b>Actual Average Earned Income of 618/720 HHs</b>	<b>NO</b>

<b>SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>						
<i>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.</i>						
<b>Unit of Measurement</b> Report the following information separately for each category:	Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
(6a) Other – Households reporting earned income	<b>598</b> Actual head(s) of households reporting earned income prior to implementation of the activity.	<b>878</b> Expected head(s) of households reporting earned income after implementation of the activity.	<b>658</b> Actual HHs reporting earned income as of June 30, 2017	<b>602</b> Actual HHs reporting earned income as of June 30, 2018	<b>618</b> Actual HHs reporting earned income as of June 30, 2019	<b>NO</b>
(6b) Other – Households with no earned income	<b>130</b> Head(s) of with no earned income prior to implementation of the activity.	<b>0</b> Expected head(s) of households with no earned income after implementation of the activity.	<b>151</b> Actual HHs reporting no earned income as of June 30, 2017	<b>125</b> Actual HHs reporting no earned income as of June 30, 2018	<b>102</b> Actual HHs reporting no earned income as of June 30, 2019	<b>NO</b>

<b>SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b>					
<b>Unit of Measurement</b> Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>95</b> Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity.	<b>0</b> Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	166	175	98	NO

<b>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>					
<b>Unit of Measurement</b> Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>385</b> Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Households with the head of household/co-head or spouse annually earning \$15,080 or more) prior to implementation of the activity.	<b>589</b> Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	428	399	419	NO

## Impact Analysis |

### Impact: Encouraging non-disabled/non-elderly adult household members to maintain employment

Metric	Baseline FY 2016	Benchmark FY2017	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
# of Households affected by this policy	728	809	809	727	720
# of Interims	661	330	342	282	306
Avg gross annual earned income reported by families	\$16,112	\$19,334	\$16,782	\$17,229	\$18,924
# (%) of families reporting no annual earned income	130	0	151	125	102
# (%) of families reporting annual earned income	598	493	658	602	618
Avg total adjusted annual income reported by families	\$19,518	\$20,634	\$16,667	\$16,641	\$16,315
Avg monthly gross rent payment of families	\$416	\$422	\$422	\$420	\$410
# (%) of families requesting hardship exemption	0	0	0	6	3
# (%) of families granted hardship exemption	0	0	0	2	2

## Activity 21 – Triennial Certifications for HCV Homeownership Participants (Rent Reform)

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Activity Proposed and Implemented FY2017

### ii. Description/Update

LHA staff implemented this activity to reduce the administrative burden of annual certifications for Homeownership households by conducting income reexaminations every three (3) years. Historically, staff saw minimal changes in income for homeownership households in the Housing Choice Voucher program. The elimination of these annual certifications will allow for more time for HCV specialist to devote to other administrative tasks.

In FY2019, thirty-one (31) households were homeownership participants, up by two households over FY2018. Nineteen (19) homeownership households had earned income averaging \$19,645 and eleven (11) households are elderly and/or disabled. The good news is that FY2019 earned income (\$4,741 or 32%) and adjusted income (\$9,732 or 66%) increased over the previous fiscal year.

See the summary of earnings and adjusted income:

Year	Participants	Average Annual Earned Income	Average Adjusted Income	Annual Certifications	Interim Certifications
FY2016	31	\$16,050	\$19,927		
FY2017	30	\$18,808	\$19,478		
FY2018	28	\$14,904	\$14,808	12	22
FY2019	31	\$19,645	\$24,540	9	22

### iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

### iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

There were no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

### v. Actual Significant Changes

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

### vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

The ‘cost per annual certification’ (CE#1 Agency Cost Savings) benchmark for this activity of zero is not possible because participants will enter and exit the program as would be expected and that was not considered in establishing the benchmark. An example, program participation decreased from 31 in FY2016 to 28 in FY2018. The LHA revised CE#1- Agency Cost savings benchmark in this report.

## Activity 21 – HUD Standard Metrics

C2: Staff Time Savings					
Unit of Measure: Cost Per Annual Certification					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Total Time to Complete the Task in Staff Time (decrease)  <b>31 hours</b> • 1 hour staff time to complete annual certification  • 31 Annual Certifications	Total Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).  Year 1: <b>31 hours</b> Year 2: <b>0 hours</b> Year 3: <b>10 hours</b>	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).			Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.  <b>YES</b>
		Year 1: <b>30 hours</b>	Year 2: <b>12 hours</b>	Year 3: <b>9 hours</b>	

CE1: Agency Cost Savings					
Unit of Measure: Cost Per Annual Certification					
Baseline	Benchmark	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Total Cost of Task in Dollars  -Cost Per Annual Certification = <b>\$28.53</b> x 31 Annual Certs = <b>\$884.43</b> -1 hour – Avg. time to complete Annual Cert  -Staff Hourly Costs <b>\$27.78</b>  -Hard Costs Per Certification <b>.75¢</b> (mail, paper, copies, etc.)	Total Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).  Year 1: <b>\$884.73</b> Year 2: <b>\$0</b> Year 3: <b>\$285.30</b>	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).			Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.  <b>YES</b>
		Year 1: 30 Certs x \$28.53 = <b>\$855.90</b>	Year 2: 12 Certs x \$28.53 = <b>\$342.36</b>	Year 3: 9 Certs x \$28.53 = <b>\$256.77</b>	

CE5: Increase Agency Rental Revenue					
Unit of Measure: Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) savings (decrease)					
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>FY2017</b>	<b>FY2018</b>	<b>FY2019</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved</b>
Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).			Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
\$154,860	\$154,860	\$147,588	\$152,352	\$156,168	<b>NO</b>

## Activity 21 – Impact Analysis

HCV Homeownership Households (FY2019)	Heads of Household				Average Total Annual Adjusted Income				Average Gross Annual Earned Income				Average Gross Rent Payment			
	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
					Baseline				Baseline				Baseline			
<b>Total Households</b>	31	28	28	31	\$19,927	\$19,478	\$14,808	\$24,540	\$16,050	\$18,808	\$14,904	\$19,645	\$956	\$908	\$1,098	\$757
<b>Gender</b>																
Female	29	27	26	28	\$20,414	\$19,772	\$15,198	\$25,743	\$17,157	\$19,479	\$15,186	\$21,749	\$966	\$919	\$1,004	\$771
Male	2	1	2	3	\$12,865	\$11,238	\$9,744	\$13,316	\$0	\$0	\$11,237	\$0	\$817	\$626	\$783	\$635
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>																
Black	24	24	23	25	\$20,351	\$20,399	\$14,949	\$25,467	\$17,795	\$20,454	\$16,787	\$21,377	\$963	\$916	\$1,019	\$784
White	7	4	5	6	\$18,476	\$15,055	\$14,160	\$20,680	\$10,069	\$10,905	\$7,800	\$12,428	\$932	\$873	\$816	\$646
American Indian / Native Alaskan	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian / Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Ethnicity</b>																
Non-Hispanic	31	28	28	31	\$19,927	\$19,478	\$14,808	\$24,540	\$16,050	\$18,808	\$14,904	\$19,645	\$498	\$895	\$1,098	\$757
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>																
18-31	1	0	2	2	\$57,580	\$0	\$9,781	\$25,841	\$63,340	\$0	\$15,552	\$32,483	\$1,019	\$0	\$1,363	\$829
32-46	16	18	12	15	\$22,782	\$23,116	\$20,801	\$33,814	\$21,348	\$24,821	\$26,314	\$30,216	\$1,020	\$925	\$1,101	\$825
47-61	10	7	10	10	\$15,259	\$14,021	\$11,766	\$15,530	\$8,240	\$9,010	\$4,982	\$8,116	\$895	\$896	\$848	\$677
62 and Over	4	3	4	4	\$10,764	\$9,168	\$6,952	\$11,642	\$2,688	\$3,584	\$5,153	\$2,405	\$838	\$840	\$848	\$668

## Activity 22 – HCV Time Limit Pilot Program (Rent Reform)

### i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Approved/FY2018 . Implemented/April 2018

### ii. Description/Update

The LHA's Time Limit Pilot program for HCV new admissions first year of implementation since enrollment began had 22 participants during FY2019. The Pilot Program aims to test time-limited housing assistance for work-able new admissions to the HCV Program for five (5) years with a potential two (2) year extension. Elderly households are exempt from this activity.

Work-able new admission participants are subject to:

- Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated based on 28% for work-able households
- A triennial recertification schedule
- Mandatory participation in LHA-provided case management
- Elimination of all deductions except childcare (elderly/disabled deduction, dependent deduction, medical expenses)
- Increases in income are excluded until the next certification
- Adult head of household, co-head or spouse must be employed at least 20 hours per week earning no less than local or federal minimum wage (whichever is higher); at least 25 hours per week employment beginning with their third year of program participation and at least 37.5 hours per week employment for the fourth and any subsequent year program participation.
- Should the participant not reach \$0 HAP at the end of five (5) years; the LHA will continue to provide rental assistance capped as follows:
  - 1 BR – \$200 maximum subsidy
  - 2 BR – \$300 max subsidy
  - 3 BR and over – \$400 max subsidy
- Minimum rent of \$150

Case management is a key component to the success of this initiative. Pilot program participants are required to meet with the case manager at least once quarterly. The case manager recommends resources to help each individual participant work toward their goals that include career planning, job retention skills and steps to job advancement, credit and debt management, adult education services and referrals, etc.

### Hardship Requests

During FY2019, two hardship requests were made for reductions in income and both were approved.

iii. **Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

There were no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

v. **Actual Significant Changes**

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

LHA believes that benchmarks will be met after the first complete 3-year certification schedule.

## Activity 22 – HUD Standard Metrics

CE #2: Staff Time Savings			
Unit of Measure: Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity.	Actual total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>1 hour X 25 Annual Certifications = 25 hours annually</b>	<b>1 hour X 8 Annual Certifications = 8 hours annually</b>	<b>1 hour X 22 Annual Certifications = 22 hours annually</b>	<b>No</b>
Data Source: Staff interviews.			

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue			
Unit of Measure: Rental revenue in dollars (increase).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
*Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>0</b>	<b>\$180,000</b> Expected HAP Payments after implementation of activity (in dollars).	<b>\$106,200</b> HAP Payments	<b>Yes</b>
*There is no rental revenue as the LHA is not the landlord however, HAP payments to the landlord can be tracked. A decrease in HAP would indicate activity success.			
Data Source: Emphasys Software and staff feedback.			

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings			
Unit of Measure: Total Cost of Annual Certification in dollars			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Cost of certifications prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity.	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost per Annual Certification \$26.97 X 25 maximum participants	Cost per Annual Certification \$26.97 X 25 maximum participants divided by 3 (years)	22 Annual Certifications	No
\$674	\$225	\$593	
Data Source: Emphasys Software and staff feedback.			

SS #1: Increase in Household Income			
Unit of Measure: Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>\$10,667</b> (avg. earned income of non-elderly/non-disabled households during FY2017)	<b>\$14,138</b> <b>(37.5 hours per week X (minimum wage) X 52 weeks)</b>	<b>\$18,368</b> Average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation (in dollars).	<b>Yes</b>
Data Source: Emphasys Software			

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment			
Unit of Measure: Number of employed head of household, co-head or spouse affected by this policy.			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Head(s) of households, co-heads or spouses employed prior to implementation of the activity. This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households, co-heads or spouses employed after implementation of the activity.	Actual head(s) of households, co-heads or spouses employed after implementation of the activity.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>No</b>
Data Source: Emphasys Software and staff feedback.			

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)			
Unit of Measure: Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease) affected by this policy.			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation of the activity. This number may be zero.	Expected number of households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of the activity.	Actual number of households receiving TANF after to implementation of the activity.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Data Source: Emphasys Software			

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency			
Unit of Measure: Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase) affected by this policy.			
The LHA defines self-sufficiency as a participant that is able to supply for their own needs with a reduced need for subsidy with an earned income of state or federal minimum wage (whichever is higher); at 37.5 hours per week; for 52 weeks.			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation of the activity. This number may be zero.	Expected number of households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation of the activity.	Actual number of households receiving TANF after to implementation of the activity.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Data Source: Emphasys Software			

## Activity 22 – IMPACT ANALYSIS

HCV Pilot Program Population	Heads of Household FY2019	Average Gross Annual Earned Income	Avg. Total Annual Adjusted Income	Avg. Total Tenant Payment (TTP)
All Households	22	\$18,368	\$16,795	\$393
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	19	\$18,546	\$16,766	\$393
Male	3	\$17,238	\$16,978	\$364
<b>Race</b>				
Black	18	\$17,899	\$16,971	\$396
White	4	\$20,477	\$16,002	\$382
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	-	-	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic	22	\$18,368	\$16,795	\$393
Hispanic	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>				
18-31	18	\$17,744	\$16,174	\$379
32-46	4	\$21,176	\$19,590	\$457
47-61	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Excluded Households</b>				
Elderly	0	0	0	\$0

## **Activity 23 – Rent Reasonableness Determinations To Be Made By LHA Staff on LHA-Owned/Controlled Properties**

### **i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended**

Activity Proposed and Implemented FY2018 Amended Plan (March 28, 2018)

### **ii. Description/Update**

The LHA received HUD approval to perform all rent reasonableness determinations on all Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) tenant and project-based units that are owned or managed by the LHA. The scheduling time required to secure a third-party entity required 5 to 7 days lead time as opposed to LHA staff being able to respond in less than 24 hours.

In addition to eliminating the third-party provider, LHA has opted to use GoSection8.com, an on-line service that assists landlords and public housing agencies by maintaining the largest and most accurate listing of voucher program rentals currently available in every market in the U.S. The time it takes to perform rent reasonableness determinations with the on-line service has been reduced from 8 hours to 30 minutes. The use of GoSection8.com has made it possible for LHA to improve administrative efficiencies, eliminate confusion for the voucher participant, and improve the response time for performing inspections.

A total of four (4) rent reasonableness determinations and 124 inspections were performed by LHA HCV staff for LHA properties during FY2019.

It is important to note that following an HCV audit from the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), the OIG determined that HUD did not comply with third-party provisions to conduct inspections and rent reasonableness determinations of LHA properties. The LHA has proceeded with this activity based on HUD approval.

### **iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes**

There are no non-significant changes or modifications to this activity during the Plan year.

### **iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection**

There were no changes to metrics/data collection during the Plan year.

### **v. Actual Significant Changes**

There are no significant changes or modifications to the activity as previously proposed and approved.

### **vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies**

The LHA has experienced no challenges in achieving benchmarks for this activity.

## Activity 23 – HUD Standard Metrics

CE1 Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measure: Total cost of rent reasonableness determinations in dollars (decrease).				
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome (FY2018)	Outcome (FY2019)	Benchmark Achieved
Cost of rent reasonableness determinations prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of rent reasonableness determinations after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of rent reasonableness determinations after implementation of the activity (in dollars).		Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>\$750.00 per unit</b> Cost per rent reasonableness determination performed by third-party vendor	<b>*\$48.00 per unit</b> Cost per rent reasonableness determination performed by LHA HCV staff	<b>*\$48 per unit</b> Cost per rent reasonableness determination performed by LHA HCV staff	<b>\$9.25 per unit</b> Cost per rent reasonableness determination performed by LHA HCV staff	<b>YES</b>
*This is the current salary per hour for LHA HCV inspectors. Data is based on staff interviews and Emphasys software.				

CE2 Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measure: Total time to complete reasonableness determinations in staff hours (decrease).				
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome (FY2018)	Outcome (FY2019)	Benchmark Achieved
Total staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity.	Actual total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity.		Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>7 days/168 hours</b> to schedule and complete rent reasonableness determinations performed by third-party vendor.	<b>1 day/24 hours</b> to complete rent reasonableness determinations performed by LHA HCV staff.	<b>1 day/24 hours</b> to complete rent reasonableness determinations performed by LHA HCV staff.	<b>4 hours</b> to complete rent reasonableness determinations performed by LHA HCV staff.	<b>YES</b>

## **B. NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES**

*Provide a brief description of the approved MTW activity that was proposed in an Annual MTW Plan, approved by HUD, and not yet implemented. Specify the Plan Year in which the MTW activity was first approved.*

*Discuss any actions taken towards the implementation plan for the MTW activity in the Plan Year. Relate these actions to the implementation plan and timeline the MTW PHA provided in the Annual MTW Plan.*

### **Activity 7 – Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval**

Activity Proposed and Approved - FY 2012-2013 Plan

Relief from HUD approvals prior to the acquisition of property will enhance LHA's ability to respond quickly to unique market conditions, making the Authority more competitive with other purchasers in the tight real estate markets typical of low poverty areas of the city. This relief will apply only to the acquisition of public housing units or vacant land purchased for the development of public housing units in non-impacted areas of the city.

#### Update

The LHA did not acquire properties during FY2019 where it was necessary to implement this activity. The LHA will develop a timeline for this activity should the Authority decide to acquire public housing units or land for the development of public housing.

---

### **Activity 8 – Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers**

Activity Proposed and Approved - FY 2012-2013 Plan

Activity Significantly Modified in FY2014

LHA continues to secure adequate funding to revitalize the Appian Hills public housing development. This site may be rehabilitated in its entirety or in phases, as determined by the Authority. Once a plan for revitalization is agreed upon that includes the substitution of project-based vouchers for public housing subsidies, LHA will submit an appropriate application for disposition of the affected portion(s) of the site as well as a request for tenant protection vouchers for residents of affected units.

#### Update

The LHA did not seek funding for this activity during FY2019. The LHA does not know when funding resources will be available for implementation of this activity.

---

### **Activity 9 – Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street**

Activity Proposed and Approved – LHA’s FY2012-FY2013

LHA plans to develop between five and eight project-based 3-bedroom townhomes on a vacant lot owned by the agency on Edmond Street. The property is adjacent to an existing 3-unit public housing site and close to the Authority’s Pine Valley Management Office.

The flexibilities provided through this MTW activity will be used to project-base the units at Edmond Street without a competitive process and to exceed the per-building cap typically placed on project-based voucher developments. Current project-based voucher rules limit percentage of project-based units to 25% of the units in the development. The LHA plans to project-base 100% of the units at this site.

#### Update

The activity has been not been implemented. The LHA intends to implement this activity once financial resources become available. The LHA will develop a timeline for this activity should the Authority decide to develop the Edmond Street property.

---

### **Activity 11 – Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds: Emergency Reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers**

Activity Proposed/Approved in FY2012-2013 Plan

Activity Revised in FY2014 Plan/Revision Approved in FY2014

Through its FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, the LHA requested to retain the flexibility to use MTW funds should Ballard Tower (which is attached to an LHA-owned public housing site, Connie Griffith Manor; serves low-income, elderly households; and is managed, but not owned, by the LHA) require significant emergency capital repairs. MTW funds would only be used if the tax credit investor can demonstrate to the Authority’s satisfaction that it does not have the financial resources to complete the repairs itself. Despite the number/extent of unforeseen capital emergencies that might arise, the LHA will provide Ballard Place no more than \$300,000 in emergency funds in total.

#### Update

When this activity was proposed the LHA did not have a confirmed funding source for sorely needed capital improvements at Ballard. After the activity was approved, the site’s tax credit investors informed the LHA that they would indeed have sufficient funds to complete the needed work. Having spent a significant portion of their reserves to fund these improvements the Housing Authority was concerned about their ability to cover any additional emergency capital repairs, which prompted creation of this activity.

This activity has not yet been implemented and unlikely to be implemented in the near future because the LHA began the redevelopment of Ballard Apartments during FY2019 using a 2018 9% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) award. LHA was awarded an allocation of \$1,000,000.00 of 2018 9% LIHTC’s by the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC) for Ballard Apartments.

---

**Activity 20 – Assign Project-Based Vouchers to LHA Owned/Controlled Units Without Bid Process**

Activity Proposed and Approved FY2017

The LHA received approval to select existing and new LHA owned/managed property for project-based voucher assistance without a competitive bid process. Site selection for LHA owned or managed property will be based on the need to maintain and preserve affordable housing. Each site may create a separate wait list for applicants interested in renting project-based units. LHA will eliminate the restriction on the percentage of units leased in a building or project. The LHA has plans to project-base its own new construction projects in the coming year and this flexibility will have a positive impact for the agency and the clients we serve.

Update

This activity has not yet been implemented but will be implemented should the opportunity to do so become available. The LHA will develop a timeline for this activity should it be implemented.

---

**Activity 24 – Elimination of Project-Based Voucher Choice Mobility at LHA-Owned/Controlled Units****Activity Proposed/Approved in FY2019 Plan**

The Lexington Housing Authority will eliminate the project-based voucher Choice Mobility option to offer assistance for families who elect to move after one year of occupancy in LHA-owned/controlled project-based voucher units (24 CFR 983.261). The LHA is mindful of the overwhelming need for affordable housing and sees the benefit of offering tenant-based rental assistance to families on the waiting list while continuing to assist families who are currently housed and receiving rental assistance in PBV units. This activity will aid in reducing a family's time on the waiting list. This activity does not apply to RAD units, reasonable accommodation instances or Violence Against Women (VAWA) cases.

During FY2019 LHA converted 183 units of public housing at Connie Griffith Apartments to PBV through voluntary conversion. There was no need for this activity during FY2019 as PBV's were not issued for the site by the end of the fiscal year. Going forward LHA may exercise this flexibility.

---

**C. ACTIVITIES ON HOLD**

N/A

---

## D. ACTIVITIES CLOSED OUT

### Activity 2 – Management Team III Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy for Bluegrass HOPE VI Public Housing Residents (Approved/Implemented – FY2012-2013; Closed out FY2014)

The implementation of this activity made no discernable impact on the percentage of Bluegrass HOPE VI public housing families meeting the self-sufficiency requirement. Staff reported that many families simply waited for the six-month restriction to expire, and then requested a rent reduction shortly thereafter. Given its negligible impact, the LHA decided to terminate this activity.

#### ACTIVITY 2:

Impact 1: Encouraging non-disabled / non-elderly adult household members to work							
Metric	Study Group	FY 2011 Baseline	FY 2012 Actual <sup>1</sup>	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2013 Benchmark	Variance FY 2013 Actual to Benchmark	Data Source
Number (Percent) of families meeting the self-sufficiency work / education requirement	Control:	47 (90%)	46 (96%)	46 (85%)	47 (90%)	-2%	Management Team Records
	Treatment:	171 (88%)	131 (70%)	156 (88%)	184 (95%)	-18%	
Average (Median) amount of gross earned income reported by families per year	Control:	\$7,566 (\$6,022)	\$9,808 (\$9,807)	\$10,183 (\$10,400)	\$7,566	35%	WinTen2
	Treatment:	\$11,381 (\$11,222)	\$11,661 (\$11,775)	\$11,276 (\$10,696)	\$11,950	-6%	
Number (Percent) of families reporting \$0 gross earned income per year	Control:	20 (38%)	14 (29%)	18 (33%)	20 (38%)	-11%	WinTen2
	Treatment:	49 (25%)	33 (18%)	54 (30%)	25 (13%)	116%	
Average (Median) amount reported by families who report any gross earned income per year	Control:	\$12,691 (\$10,730)	\$13,847 (\$11,938)	\$15,275 (\$14,765)	\$12,691	20%	WinTen2
	Treatment:	\$15,226 (\$14,040)	\$14,160 (\$13,898)	\$16,187 (\$15,059)	\$15,987	1%	
Average (Median) total gross income reported by families per year	Control:	\$11,241 (\$10,324)	\$14,928 (\$12,936)	\$14,988 (\$14,765)	\$11,241	33%	WinTen2
	Treatment:	\$15,263 (\$14,868)	\$16,321 (\$15,184)	\$15,820 (\$14,803)	\$15,832	0%	
Average (Median) monthly gross rent of families	Control:	\$210 (\$197)	\$229 (\$189)	\$257 (\$197)	\$210	22%	WinTen2
	Treatment:	\$300 (\$286)	\$316 (\$298)	\$309 (\$267)	\$315	-2%	
Number (Percent) of families requesting rent reductions (control group) or hardship exemptions (treatment group) within 6 months of move in	Control:	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	2 (67%)	0%	Property Manager and MTW Coordinator Logs
	Treatment:	47 (44%)	1 (6%)	1 (2%)	15 (15%)	-93%	
Number (Percent) of families granted rent reductions (control group) or hardship exemptions (treatment group) within 6 months of move in	Control:	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	2 (67%)	0%	WinTen2 and MTW Coordinator Log
	Treatment:	47 (44%)	1 (6%)	1 (2%)	10 (10%)	-90%	
<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented May 1, 2012							
Impact 2: Assessing the cost / savings of this activity for LHA							
Metric	Study Group	FY 2011 Baseline	FY 2012 Actual <sup>1</sup>	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2013 Benchmark	Variance FY 2013 Actual to Benchmark	Data Source
Total monthly gross rent revenue from non-elderly / non-disabled households	Control:	\$10,918	\$11,222	\$13,866	\$10,918	27%	WinTen2
	Treatment:	\$58,131	\$49,566	\$55,030	\$61,038	-10%	
Dollar value of staff time spent processing rent reduction requests (control group) or hardship exemptions (treatment group) within 6 months of move in	Control:	\$45	\$23	\$35	\$45	-23%	Payroll System, Staff Interviews
	Treatment:	\$1,050	\$11	\$17	\$535	-97%	
<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented May 1, 2012							

### Activity #3 Triennial Recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV Elderly/Disabled Households (Approved/Implemented – FY2012-2013; Closed out FY2017)

The Housing Authority implemented this activity for all 183 units at Connie Griffith Towers, an elderly high rise, during FY 2012 – FY 2013. Through this activity, the LHA is recertifying households at Connie Griffith once every three years instead of annually. Between triennial recertifications, whenever the federal government adjusts benefits paid through fixed-income programs like Social Security and SSI, the LHA reserves the right to adjust resident household incomes and rent payments accordingly.

Per HUD Notice PIH 2016-05, Streamlining Administrative Regulations for Programs Administered by PHAs, triennial recertifications can be adopted at the PHAs discretion. The LHA elected to discontinue this activity going forward.

Rent Reform – Activity #3/Alternative Recertification Schedule for Elderly/Disabled Households						
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings						
Baseline		Benchmark	Outcome (FY2015)	Outcome (FY2016)	Outcome (FY2017)	Benchmark Achieved?
	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) during FY2015.	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) during FY2016.	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) during FY2017.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
1						
AGENCY-WIDE	<b>\$38,891</b> 881 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average cost of \$41.14 each before implementation of the activity	<b>\$13,189</b> Expected 273 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average cost of \$48.31 each during FY2015	<b>\$18,986</b> 393 actual public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by the average cost of each during FY2015	<b>\$13,141</b> 272 actual public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by the average cost of each during FY2016	<b>\$14,208</b> 322 actual public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by the average cost of each during FY2017.	No
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records						

Rent Reform – Activity #3/Alternative Recertification Schedule for Elderly/Disabled Households						
CE #2: Staff Time Savings						
Baseline		Benchmark	Outcome (FY2015)	Outcome (FY2016)	Outcome (FY2017)	Benchmark Achieved?
AGENCY-WIDE	<b>1,762</b> 881 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each before implementation of the activity	<b>546 hours</b> Expected 273 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY2015	<b>786 hours</b> 393 actual public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY2015	<b>544 hours</b> 272 actual recertifications of public housing and HCV households multiplied by an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY2016	<b>644 hours</b> 322 actual recertifications of public housing and HCV households multiplied by an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY2017	No
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records						

## Activity #4 - HCV Rent Reform Controlled Study: No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months

Rent Reform – Activity #3/Alternative Recertification Schedule for Elderly/Disabled Households						
CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue						
Baseline		Benchmark	Outcome (FY2015)	Outcome (FY2016)	Outcome (FY2017)	Benchmark Achieved?
CONNIE GRIFFITH	Rental revenue prior to implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	\$40,416	\$41,220	\$27,427	\$38,939	\$25,467	No
HCV ELDERLY/DISABLED	*\$195,345	*\$199,250	*\$246,286	\$845,208	\$246,326	No
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records						
*HAP to Owner – for the HCV Program HAP to owner should decrease if this metric is successful.						

### After Initial Occupancy (Closed out FY2015)

The implementation of this activity did not reduce the percentage of families requesting a rent reduction within 6 months of their effective move-in date. In fact, the percentage of families making such a request rose from 10% to 18% during FY2012 – FY2013. For those reasons, the LHA has decided to terminate this activity.

Metric	Study Group	FY2011*	FY2013	FY2014
Avg annual earned income reported by families at initial occupancy <sup>1</sup>	Control:	Not Available	\$6,222	\$3,313
	Treatment:		\$6,222	\$6,369
Avg monthly TTP at initial occupancy <sup>1</sup>	Control:	Not Available	\$239	\$233
	Treatment:		\$239	\$225
Avg gross annual earned income reported by families	Control:	\$4,645	\$8,633	\$3,913
	Treatment:		\$8,633	\$5,891
Avg total adjusted annual income reported by families	Control:	\$12,602	Unavailable	\$8,836
	Treatment:		\$10,501	\$10,011
Avg TTP of families	Control:		\$279	
	Treatment:	\$141 (Net)	\$271 (Gross)	\$285
# (%) of families requesting a) rent reduction (control) b) hardship exemption (treatment) within 6 months of move-in	Control:	81 (10%)	7 (10%)	7 (10%)
	Treatment:		1 (2%)	5(8%)
Total monthly HAP	Control:	\$1,320,599	\$660,300	\$213,480
	Treatment:			\$159,000
Dollar value of staff time spent processing of a) rent reduction requests (control group) b) hardship exemptions (treatment group) within 6 months of move-in	Control:	\$1,358	\$670	\$453
	Treatment:		\$134	0
Resident satisfaction with activity (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High)	Control:	Not Available	Medium (10)	**Not Available
	Treatment:		Low (5)	**Not Available
Employee satisfaction with activity (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High)	Control:	Not Available	Medium	**Not Available
	Treatment:			

**Activity #6 - Biennial Housekeeping Inspection Policy for Public Housing Residents**

(Proposed FY2012-2013; Closed out FY2014)

This activity was not implemented in FY 2012-FY2013 because it was determined that tracking the housekeeping ratings would require software modifications that would be cost prohibitive.

**Activity #15 – Limit HCV Landlord Rent Increases to the Least of 2%, HUD Fair Market Rent (FMR), or the Comparable Rent - Plan Year Activity Approved and Implemented FY2015 (Approved/Implemented FY2015; Closed out FY2016)**

The LHA proposed to limit annual contract rent increases for participating landlords to the least of a 2% increase in current contract rent, HUD's FMR or the comparable rent. This activity was closed out because LHA staff found that this activity placed a burden on the landlord and is negatively affecting landlords and hindering new landlords from making their units available to the HCV program.

ACTIVITY 15) LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD FAIR MARKET RENT (FMR), OR THE COMPARABLE RENT			
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings			
Unit of Measurement - Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
\$18,720	\$13,104	\$15,264	No
260 families moved with continued assistance at an average of \$72 to process each move during FY2014	Expected 182 families will move with continued assistance at an average cost of \$72 to process each move during FY2015	212 actual families moved with continued assistance multiplied by average cost to process each move during FY2015	
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys, staff interviews, staff logs, PHA financial records			

ACTIVITY 15) LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD FAIR MARKET RENT (FMR), OR THE COMPARABLE RENT			
CE #2: Staff Time Savings			
Unit of Measurement – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
650 hours	455 hours	530 hours	No
260 families moved with continued assistance multiplied by an average 2.5 hours of staff time required to process each move during FY2014	182 Expected families will move with continued assistance multiplied by the average 2.5 hours of staff time required to process each move during FY2015	212 actual families moved with continued assistance multiplied by average 2.5 hours of staff time required to process each move during FY2015	
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys, staff interviews, staff logs, PHA financial records			

ACTIVITY 15) LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD FAIR MARKET RENT (FMR), OR THE COMPARABLE RENT			
HC #4: Displacement Prevention			
Unit of Measurement – Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
HCV households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number). <b>Currently Not Tracked</b>	Expected HCV households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual HCV households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Explanation to be provided

The LHA has no way of tracking this metric.

## (V) SOURCES AND USES OF MTW FUNDS

### ANNUAL MTW REPORT

#### A. ACTUAL SOURCES AND USES OF MTW FUNDS

i. **Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year**

The MTW PHA shall submit unaudited and audited information in the prescribed Financial Data Schedule (FDS) format through the Financial Assessment System – PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system.

ii. **Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year**

The MTW PHA shall submit unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the FASPHA, or its successor system.

iii. **Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility**

No activities involved the use of single funds flexibility during the reporting year.

#### ACTUAL USE OF MTW SINGLE FUND FLEXIBILITY

N/A

#### B. LOCAL ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

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

No

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

No

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

No

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

LHA did not make any changes because we did not implement a LAMP.

## **VI. ADMINISTRATIVE**

### **A. REVIEWS, AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS**

The MTW PHA shall provide a general description of any HUD reviews, audits and/or physical inspection issues that require the MTW PHA to take action in order to address the issue.

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted a survey of the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) conversion of Centre Meadows and an audit of the HCV program beginning August of 2017. The OIG issued findings and the LHA has disputed certain findings and await a final decision from HUD .

The LHA completed and submitted the annual financial audit to the REAC system through the financial data schedule by 3/31/2019. Rubino and Company, CPA firm, conducted the audit with no findings.

### **B. EVALUATION RESULTS**

Dr. Amanda Sokan leads oversight of the MTW program evaluation process, with an overall mandate to assess, monitor and report on the effects of the LHA's MTW initiatives. Dr. Sokan is an independent consultant, who is currently employed by the University of Arizona, College of Public Health, Community Environment & Policy Department. Dr. Sokan served as lead evaluator of the LHA's MTW program when the LHA entered the Demonstration in 2011

LHA will provide evaluation of LHA's FY2019 MTW activities under separate cover during 2020.

## C. MTW STATUTORY REQUIREMENT CERTIFICATION

### CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS MOVING TO WORK ANNUAL REPORT

Acting on behalf of the Public Housing Agency (PHA) listed below, as its authorized PHA official, I approve the submission of the Annual Moving to Work Report for the PHA fiscal year July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

The Agency has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) ensure that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families, as defined in section 3(b)(2) of the 1937 Act; 2) assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families under MTW, as would have been served absent the demonstration, and 3) maintain a comparable mix of families by family size, as would have been served or assisted had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority  
PHA Name

KY004  
PHA Number/HA Code

I hereby certify that all the information stated herein, as well as any information provided in the Report, is true and accurate.

Austin J. Simms  
Name of Authorized Official

Executive Director  
Title

  
Signature

February 7, 2020  
Date

## **D. MTW ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACT FLEXIBILITY DATA**

**N/A**

