

*The Housing Authority of the
City of Lincoln, Nebraska*



**MOVING TO WORK
ANNUAL REPORT**

Fiscal Year 2019-2020

Submitted: 06/25/2020

**<THIS PAGE IS RESERVED FOR INSERTION OF
HUD'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE FOR THE MTW REPORT>**

LINCOLN HOUSING AUTHORITY

NE002

5700 R Street

Lincoln, NE 68505

Phone: 402-434-5500

Fax: 402-434-5502

Email: Info@L-housing.com

Website: www.L-housing.com

Lincoln Housing Authority Board of Commissioners

Orville Jones III, Chair

Dallas McGee, Vice Chair

Becky Hanna

Roger Massey

Peggy Weatherford

Lincoln Housing Authority Executive Staff

Chris Lamberty, Executive Director

Stan Sunblade, Assistant Director

Marilyn Crawford, Executive Secretary

Martha Hakenkamp, Tenant-Based Housing Manager

Dan Brown, Human Resources Manager

Thomas Judds, Planning and Development Manager

Jim Loos, Network Administrator

Susan Tatum, Tenant Services Manager

This Moving to Work (MTW) Annual Report is prepared in accordance with the “Amended and Restated Moving to Work Agreement” between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Lincoln Housing Authority. This agreement was signed by both parties in April, 2008 and extended the MTW program until the end of the housing authority’s 2018 Fiscal Year. The agreement was subsequently extended to the end of the housing authority’s 2028 Fiscal Year. The required elements of the report are detailed in HUD Form 50900 (OMB Control Number: 2577-0216 Expiration Date: 01/31/2021)

Cover Photo: www.Urban-Photos.com

I.	Introduction.....	2
	A. Table of Contents.....	2
	B. Overview of short-term and long term MTW Goals and Objectives.....	4
	C. MTW Initiatives.....	10
II.	General Housing Authority Operating Information.....	11
	A. Housing Stock Information.....	11
	B. Leasing Information.....	14
	C. Wait List Information.....	19
	D. Information on Statutory Objectives and Requirements.....	21
III.	Proposed MTW Activities.....	25
IV.	Approved MTW Activities.....	26
	A. Implemented Activities.....	26
	Rent Reform Initiatives	
	Rent Reform 1 Interim Re-examinations.....	27
	Rent Reform 2 Minimum Earned Income.....	35
	Rent Reform 3 Rent Calculations.....	45
	Rent Reform 4 Rent Choice.....	61
	Rent Reform 5 Average Utility Allowances.....	66
	Rent Reform 6 Biennial Re-examinations.....	71
	Other Initiatives	
	Initiative 1 Income Eligibility.....	78
	Initiative 2 Responsible Portability.....	82
	Initiative 4 HQS Inspections Waiver.....	86

	Initiative 5 Inspections & Rent Reasonableness Determinations.....	91
	Initiative 6 Project-Based Voucher Units.....	95
	Initiative 7 RentWise Tenant Education.....	102
	Initiative 8 Resident Services Program.....	107
	Initiative 9 Landlord Incentive HAP.....	111
B.	Not Yet Implemented.....	114
C.	On Hold.....	114
D.	Closed Out.....	114
V.	Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	115
A.	Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	115
B.	Local Asset Management Plan.....	115
VI.	Administrative.....	116
A.	Reviews, Audits, and Inspections	
B.	Evaluation Results	
C.	MTW Statutory Requirement Certification	
D.	MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data	
E.	LHA Request and HUD Approval Letters Regarding VASH under MTW	
F.	Request for Inspection and Unit Information Form	
Appendix		Appendix
		Page
A.	Agency Certification for the Statutory Requirements.....	1
B.	LHA Request and HUD Approval Letters Regarding VASH under MTW.....	3
C.	Request for Inspection and Unit Information Form.....	17

B. OVERVIEW OF SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM MTW GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Lincoln Housing Authority is one of a small number of housing authorities across the country participating in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Moving to Work demonstration program. Originally authorized under the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996, the MTW program offers public housing authorities the opportunity to design and test innovative, locally-designed housing and self-sufficiency strategies. The statutory goals of the MTW demonstration are:

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

Lincoln Housing Authority and HUD entered into a five-year MTW Agreement in May, 1999. This agreement was amended several times to extend the demonstration program. In 2008, a new Amended and Restated MTW Agreement was signed. This agreement extended the MTW demonstration at Lincoln Housing Authority until 2018. In April 2016, the agreement was extended to 2028.

From the beginning of the demonstration, we have approached MTW reforms with the idea that some persons may always need to receive a basic level of housing assistance - due to age, disability, low wages or other reasons - and that the varying needs of those persons would be best served by maintaining a simplified income-based rent structure. We also understand that for a great many people, housing assistance can and should be a temporary step to greater self-sufficiency. By encouraging work and individual responsibility, we have achieved a high percentage of working families and a strong voucher turnover rate without implementing arbitrary time limits or unaffordable rent structures. In conjunction with an open waiting list and a strong preference system, this has allowed us to continue to issue new vouchers to many of the neediest persons in Lincoln, Nebraska

Lincoln Housing Authority continues to be aware of the need to expand the supply of affordable housing in our community. However, we have not wanted to do so at the risk of decreasing the number of deep subsidy units available through the Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing Programs. Since the inception of MTW, however, we have been able to leverage non-

HUD sources to add additional rental units, mostly through the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program. While these units do not receive deep subsidies, they have expanded the supply of affordable housing available to low and moderate income families and broadened the choice of available units to voucher holders. This past year we have purchased another parcel of property for a future housing development.

The city of Lincoln and the state of Nebraska have been fortunate to have maintained low unemployment rates for an extended number of years. This has been an important factor in the Moving to Work Demonstration. The Nebraska Department of Labor reports the statewide unemployment rate in March of 2020 was 4.2 % and in April 2020 rose to 8.3%. Unemployment rate data for Nebraska goes back to 1976 and the increase in the unemployment rate of 4.1% between March of 2020 and April 2020 was the largest monthly increase ever. The national unemployment rate for April 2020 was 14.7%. The Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) had an unemployment rate of 3.7% in March 2020 and rose to 9.3% in April 2020. The current data clearly reflects the impact of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic on Nebraska and Lincoln's labor market. Because of the anticipated financial impact of the historic rising unemployment, LHA suspended the implementation of Rent Reform Initiative 2: MEI at the end of March, 2020. We are uncertain what on-going effect this pandemic will have on Lincoln Housing Authority's MTW initiatives.

Since beginning the Moving To Work program, Lincoln Housing Authority has concentrated its efforts in the following long-term operational vision for the MTW program.

- Retain program flexibility to meet the many changes encountered in program funding, local housing market conditions, and the needs of the families and individuals participating in Lincoln's Moving To Work program.
- Continue to seek ways to simplify and streamline the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program and Public Housing programs while protecting the integrity of the program and accepting accountability for administrative requirements. The Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program has been needlessly complicated for participants, landlords, and implementing staff. The complexity of the system resulted in several areas where errors occurred with substantial frequency. Tenants have been confused about deductions allowed and disallowed and how their portion of rent is determined. Landlords have been frustrated by the amount of paperwork and complex rules and regulations that the landlord must follow to be paid. The complexity has limited landlord participation, which in turn limits housing choices for voucher holders.

- Continue to promote opportunities for tenant self-sufficiency either through education or meaningful work experience. The need for lower-income participants to complete their education and expand their work experiences will provide a solid base for continued success in their personal and family development.
- Continue the various community partnerships required to enhance participant opportunities in expanding family support services such as social services, education, transportation, and health care programs.

PROGRESS REPORT ON GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Lincoln Housing Authority has a number of goals and specific objectives that are integral to our success as a Moving To Work housing authority. Many of these goals have been integral to our MTW program since the beginning and will continue to be a focal point for the duration of our MTW agreement.

GOAL I

Increase the number of Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing participants working or making progress towards educational goals, work experience, and self-sufficiency.

GOAL I OBJECTIVES:

- Provide incentives for work-able participants to work or seek self-sufficiency through job training or education. Also provide disincentives to work-able participants who choose not to work, seek job training, or further education.
- Form community and state partnerships to provide needed programs and services that encourage participation in recognized self-sufficiency programs.

PROGRESS REPORT: Since the beginning of the MTW initiative, LHA has had a Minimum Earned Income (MEI) requirement which serves as an incentive to work. Two notable exemptions to this requirement are given for participants who are involved in education or approved self-sufficiency programs. We have MOUs with state government and local non-profits to provide self-sufficiency programs for purposes of this exemption. LHA rewards working families by not immediately increasing rent when participants go to work or advance in their work. Rather, that increase in rent is delayed until the household's next annual review. A positive indicator of the success of this objective is the employment rate in work-able households: 90% in public housing and 84% in housing choice vouchers. In addition, approximately 17% of our households end their participation in federal housing assistance each year.

GOAL II

Reduce administrative costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal housing assistance expenditures while ensuring the continued integrity of the program.

GOAL II OBJECTIVES:

- Simplify the operation of the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program and the Public Housing program with the purpose of reducing calculation errors, staff review time, and program administrative costs. Simplification also reduces the burden on tenants by requiring fewer meetings and fewer documents.
- Work with landlords, housing participants, and human service organizations to identify areas of needed change in the operation of the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program and the Public Housing program.

PROGRESS REPORT: LHA has implemented several initiatives to simplify our programs to improve tenant satisfaction, reduce errors, and make more effective use of staff time. These initiatives have been effective and have allowed us to increase the number of vouchers, work with special programs such as VASH and Mainstream, and participate in the low-income tax credit program while concurrently reducing the total number of staff in the agency. Through our agency planning process, resident and landlord advisory boards, resident councils, participation in the Lincoln Human Services Federation (Cause Collective) and numerous other community groups, we are able to interact with key stakeholders and obtain both formal and informal feedback on housing authority operations. This includes the addition of an initiative for landlord incentives which has shortened the time to lease vouchers and increased the number of landlords participating in this difficult rental market. The number of landlords participating in the voucher program increased from 747 in October 2014 to 766 in March 2020. Given the tight rental market in Lincoln that is an accomplishment for this program. Although this number remains higher than when we began the initiative, the number of landlords has again been decreasing in recent years as the rental market has continued to remain tight with increasing rents. For this reason we increased the incentive from \$150 to \$200 in 2020. We've also seen some consolidation of ownership and management of rental properties which can affect this metric.

In addition to our MTW initiatives, Lincoln Housing Authority began the process to convert all public housing units from the public housing model to a project-based voucher model to stabilize the funding while continuing to offer high quality assisted housing. Due to the good condition of LHA's public housing units, the plan is for a simple conversion of subsidy with minimal additional financing or rehabilitation. LHA intends to continue to own and operate the units as income-based rental housing, either directly or through a controlled affiliate. As of October 1, 2019, LHA completed the transition of Mahoney Manor to project-based vouchers through the

Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. We are also preparing an application under the Section 18 disposition requirements for scattered site public housing, although that could be slowed by the recent Covid-19 pandemic. LHA intends to project-base Tenant Protection Vouchers in the scattered site units. We are concerned that the RAD funding formula will result in contract rents that are significantly below market at conversion, and the RAD rules could result in rent increases for some tenants who currently pay higher ceiling rents. We intend to use MTW flexibility to enact a fair and reasonable rent policy for the RAD converted units and/or Section 18 disposition units. RAD conversion and/or Section 18 disposition will result in elimination of the Public Housing Capital Fund and Public Housing Operating Fund. LHA will operate the converted properties and establish capital improvement reserves from the rental income stream, which is how LHA operates all its other rental properties. The current Capital Fund 5-year plan will be used as a basis for future capital improvement planning.

GOAL III

Expand the spatial dispersal of assisted rental units and increase housing choices for voucher holders.

GOAL III OBJECTIVES:

- Provide incentives to seek housing opportunities outside areas of low-income concentration.
- Create affordable housing opportunities in growth areas of the community.

PROGRESS REPORT: Our housing choice voucher data shows we have been able to increase the spatial dispersal of rental units including housing opportunities outside areas of low-income concentration. Through participation in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program and bond-financing, LHA has developed 342 units over the past 20 years in middle and upper income growth neighborhoods, and acquired 86 additional units of low income housing. In August 2019, LHA completed the purchase of 13.6 acres of land for a new development. LHA estimates 120 or more units will be built in a LIHTC development on this site. The land is currently located in a newly developing area just outside the city limits, and city utilities are scheduled to be built to the site in 2021. It is clear that the location of LIHTC properties outside areas of concentration is critical to increasing housing opportunities and choices for voucher holders as these properties are required to accept vouchers unlike other private market developments. Through participation in special voucher programs, i.e. VASH and Mainstream, we have also increased our authorized vouchers during our participation in MTW, including the additional 52 Mainstream Vouchers in 2020. LHA continues to seek land for further development of affordable housing but limited availability and high land prices are a major

barrier to development. LHA is also participating in the development of the first City of Lincoln Affordable Housing Coordinated Action Plan. Expected to be finalized in 2020, this plan should result in a new city-wide efforts to development and preserve affordable housing in Lincoln.

C. MTW INITIATIVES

For fiscal year 2018-2019, the housing authority continued to implement the following MTW initiatives. These are described and reported on in Section IV. Approved MTW Activities:

Rent Reform Initiatives

- Interim Reexaminations
- Minimum Earned Income
- Rent Calculations at 27% with no deductions
- Rent Choice Capped at 50% (voucher only)
- Average Utility Allowances (voucher only)
- Biennial Re-Examinations for elderly and disabled households

Other Initiatives

- Income Eligibility
- Responsible Portability (voucher only)
- Housing choice voucher inspection waiver for properties where the annual or initial inspections are without deficiencies.
- Inspections and rent reasonableness regardless of ownership or management status
- Project-based Section 8 Units
- RentWise Tenant Education
- Resident Services Program at Crossroads House
- Landlord Incentive HAP (voucher only)

II. General Operating Information

A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION

i. ACTUAL NEW PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS

Property Name	NUMBER OF VOUCHERS NEWLY PROJECT-BASED		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
To be selected	20	0	NA	No	LHA has an ongoing plan to accept applications to project-base 20 vouchers to serve persons with disabilities. The project will be selected through another competitive process and will have a separate, site-based waiting list.
Public Housing	200	0	Planning	No	Section 18 Disposition of AMP 2 and AMP 3, 200 units of scattered site family Public Housing
Mahoney Manor	120	120	Leased	Yes	Conversion Date October 1, 2019
	340	120			

* Planned column matches Annual MTW Plan

Differences between the Planned and Actual Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based:

As noted above, LHA has an ongoing plan to accept applications to project-base 20 vouchers to serve persons with disabilities. No applications were received in the past fiscal year. One previous application was not approved because the site did not meet environmental requirements. Mahoney Manor was completed through a RAD transaction. The conversion of the scattered sites public housing units remain in the planning stage.

ii. ACTUAL EXISTING PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS

Property Name	NUMBER OF PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned	Actual			
Crossroads House	58	58	Leased	No	Fiscal Year 14-15 was the final transition year to project-based vouchers at Crossroads House which has 58 units in total. Currently, all eligible residents are under PBV assistance.
Victory Park	70	70	Leased	No	This project consists of 45 project-based VASH vouchers and 25 tenant-based VASH vouchers. These are all designated for Victory Apartments on the VA campus in Lincoln. Reporting on non-MTW vouchers is no longer required but is included here because LHA has been approved to implement select MTW initiatives with VASH vouchers.
	128	128			

Differences between the Planned and Actual Existing Number of Vouchers Project-Based:

Not Applicable

iii. ACTUAL OTHER CHANGES TO MTW HOUSING STOCK IN THE PLAN YEAR –

There were no other changes to our MTW housing stock.

iv. **GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALL ACTUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES DURING THE PLAN YEAR**

General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year (April 1, 2019 thru March 31, 2020)

Capital Fund Program Grant	AMP	Property Name(s)	Nature of Work	Amount	Miscellaneous Information as of March 31, 2020
NE26P002501-19	1	Mahoney Manor Apartments - Senior High Rise	Administration	\$ 73,055.00	
\$734,582	1	Mahoney Manor Apartments - Senior High Rise	Fees & Costs	\$ 27,018.46	
	1	Mahoney Manor Apartments - Senior High Rise	RAD Activity	\$ 630,482.00	
				\$ 730,555.46	
	2	Larson, Hall, Hanson, P-30 & Pedersen (Scattered Sites)	Fees & Costs	\$ 27.96	
				\$ 27.96	
	3	A-12 & F-39 (Scattered Sites)	Fees & Costs	\$ 27.96	
				\$ 27.96	
				\$ 730,611.38	Grant 99.5% obligated & 99.5% expended

Capital Fund Program Grant	AMP	Property Name(s)	Nature of Work	Amount	Miscellaneous Information as of March 31, 2020
NE26P002501-18	1	Mahoney Manor Apartments - Senior High Rise	Fees & Costs	\$ 12,075.00	
\$701,884	1	Mahoney Manor Apartments - Senior High Rise	Security Cameras	\$ 62,721.00	
				\$ 74,796.00	
	2	Larson, Hall, Hanson, P-30 & Pedersen (Scattered Sites)	Fees & Costs	\$ 27.96	
	2	Larson, Hall, Hanson, P-30 & Pedersen (Scattered Sites)	Concrete Repairs	\$ 36,165.00	
	2	Hall, P-30 & Pedersen (Scattered Sites)	Retaining Walls	\$ 91,843.00	
	2	P-30 (Scattered Sites)	Replace Air Conditioners	\$ 57,675.00	
				\$ 185,710.96	
	3	A-12 & F-39 (Scattered Sites)	Fees & Costs	\$ 124.44	
	3	A-12 & F-39 (Scattered Sites)	Basement Seal & Pipe Insulation	\$ 78,435.00	
	3	F-39 (Scattered Sites)	Replace Water Taps	\$ 37,050.00	
	3	F-39 (Scattered Sites)	Concrete Repairs	\$ 6,186.00	
	3	F-39 (Scattered Sites)	Re-Roof	\$ 41,975.00	
	3	F-39 (Scattered Sites)	Wrap Carport Beams	\$ 12,160.00	
				\$ 175,930.44	
				\$ 436,437.40	Grant 98.4% obligated & 96.1% expended

B. LEASING INFORMATION

i. ACTUAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED THROUGH:	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED**	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
MTW Public Housing Units Leased	3,768	3,431	314	286
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers Utilized	33,840	33,017	2,820	2,751
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Home Ownership	0	0	0	0
Planned/Actual Totals	37,608	36,448	3,134	3,037

Instructions from HUD:

* “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 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).

**MTW report of MTW Households Served includes all households that received housing assistance, directly or indirectly, using any amount of MTW funds.

Differences between the Planned and Actual Households Served:

The 3768 planned unit months for Public Housing included AMP1 (Mahoney Manor) for the entire year. AMP1 was converted to project based vouchers utilizing provisions of the Rental Assistance Demonstration program (RAD) during the year reducing the number of months available. The RAD conversion was effective October 1, 2019 but project based voucher subsidy did not begin until January 1, 2020. AMP 1 lease-up data is included with Public Housing through December 2019. Adjusting for the conversion to project based vouchers, the Public Housing data reflects a 98.59% average occupancy rate with vacancies due to normal unit turnover.

LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL CATEGORY	MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED*	
		Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Tenant-Based	NA	0	0	0	0
Property-Based	NA	0	0	0	0
Homeownership	NA	0	0	0	0
Planned/Actual Totals		0	0	0	0

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

HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL SERVICES ONLY	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS PER MONTH	TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE PLAN YEAR
RentWise Tenant Education	42	500
Crossroads House Resident Services	34	65
TOTAL	76	565

ii. **DISCUSSION OF ANY ACTUAL ISSUES/SOLUTIONS RELATED TO LEASING**

HOUSING PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL LEASING ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS
------------------------	---

MTW Public Housing

Lincoln Housing Authority started the year with 320 public housing units and, after transferring AMP 1 (Mahoney Manor) to project based vouchers, finished the year with 200 public housing units. Fifty-six units vacated and 56 units were re-leased during the fiscal year, which reflects normal unit turnover. This included seven transfers within public housing for a net of 49 households leaving public housing. The turnover included 18 Mahoney Manor units (6 transfers) and 38 scattered-site family units (1 transfer). The turnover was slightly more than the past year but within the expected normal range. Other than typical unit turnover, all units were continuously occupied with no sustained vacancy issues. Mahoney Manor was counted in the public housing lease-up and turnover data through December 2019 since the project based voucher subsidy did not begin until January 2020.

The public housing units now consist entirely of single-family and duplex, scattered site homes. They are in good condition and blend-in well with the neighborhoods in which they are located. We anticipate that they will continue to be desirable rental units for families. We continue to see increased demands for higher levels of amenities. There are occasional difficulties re-leasing some units based on location, amenities, and/or applicant preferences, but we have no sustained vacancy issues.

We plan to convert the remaining public housing units to project-based vouchers. The income eligibility limit has been lowered to 50% of median income in anticipation of the conversion to Section 8. This will reduce the number of people who are eligible for the units; however, we currently have a sufficient number of applicants on the waiting list and do not anticipate this to be a significant leasing issue.

MTW Housing Choice Voucher

For CY19 the cumulative voucher utilization rate was 94% while the HAP expenditures were 92% of budget authority. A portability set-aside funding award in November of \$51,995 provided much needed assistance in covering port-out costs. The approval of the LHA portability policy change included in the FY20 MTW Plan has helped address issues of waiting list shopping. This change combined with a large PHA absorbing ports for over 18 months has significantly reduced LHA port costs. Between FY19 and FY20 LHA went from a high of port costs being 6.2% of total HAP expenditures to being 1.7% despite the fact that LHA kept its waiting list open and continuously issued vouchers throughout the year. Having additional HAP has allowed LHA to increase voucher issuance. In FY19 the agency issued 511 vouchers. In FY20 the agency issued 678. However, the continual steady turnover of exiting vouchers kept LHA lease up rates down.

Throughout FY19-20, the Lincoln rental market for affordable housing remained tight with unit vacancy rates being extremely low. In response, LHA continues to work on increasing lease-up rates. In conjunction with the release of the FY20 Fair Market Rents, LHA increased payment standards between 8-15% effective January 1, 2020. LHA's Landlord Incentive initiative continues to attract new landlords to the program – see Initiative 9. The Landlord Incentive was increased to \$200 with the approval of the FY21 MTW plan and the impact of this increase will be reflected in the next annual report. The agency's RentWise tenant education initiative is also designed to help with this issue by educating renters to be better tenants and to be better able to search for housing and market themselves as renters – see Initiative 7. The results of the efforts in FY20 show a modest 2% increase in 90 day voucher lease-up rates between the first and second halves of the year.

Rental application fees and the lack of tenant funds for security deposits continue to be a common leasing barrier for voucher holders. Many of the new voucher holders searching for rental units are paying at least 50-70% of their household income towards shelter expenses, so they can't find ways to save enough money to pay the rental application fee or a security deposit needed to use their voucher. LHA manages a homeless deposit assistance program funded by the city of Lincoln HOME funds but

despite expending over \$30,000 in the fiscal year, this program only assisted 10.3% of last year's admissions.

Local, Non-Traditional

Not Applicable

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.

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?
Housing Choice Voucher	Community Wide—Families, Elderly, & Disabled	3,305	Open	Yes*
Public Housing – Family	Community Wide-- Family Housing	247	Open	Yes*
Mahoney Manor – Project Based Voucher	Site-Based Elderly and Near Elderly	161	Open	Yes*
Crossroads House—Project-Based Vouchers	Site-Based—Age 55+	61	Open	Yes*

*Waiting lists were continuously open throughout the year.

Description of Duplication of Applicants Across Waiting Lists:

LHA maintained open waiting lists throughout the year. Applicants are encouraged to apply for all housing programs which will meet their needs and desires. In addition to the above, LHA also has waiting lists for non-MTW housing programs and applicants also apply for these housing programs as appropriate. These non-MTW housing programs include affordable and tax credit housing where vouchers can be used

ii. ACTUAL CHANGES TO THE WAITING LIST IN THE PLAN YEAR

Description of 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
Housing Choice Voucher	No changes
Family Public Housing	The eligibility income limit was changed to 50% of median income in anticipation of conversion to project based vouchers via Section 18. The working preference was also removed.
Mahoney Manor – Project Based Vouchers	The eligibility income limit was changed to 50% of median income to comply with the voucher program.
Crossroads House—Project-Based Vouchers	No changes

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 following table is data for the actual families housed upon admission during the Plan Year reported in the “Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based,” “Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based,” and Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership” categories. Lincoln Housing Authority had no MTW initiatives in these 3 categories. The data does not include households reported in the “Local, Non-Traditional Services Only” category.

INCOME LEVEL	NUMBE 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	0
TOTAL LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL HOUSHOLDS ADMITTED	0

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	122	954	164	1,240	40.1%
2 Person	32	651	-162	521	16.9%
3 Person	64	469	-178	355	11.5%
4 Person	51	286	28	365	11.8%
5 Person	26	130	152	308	10.0%
6+ Person	25	104	172	301	9.7%
TOTAL	320	2,604	176	3,090	100.0%

* “Non-MTW Adjustments” are defined as factors that are outside the control of Lincoln Housing Authority. HUD’s 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.

Justification for any “Non-MTW Adjustments:

The Non-MTW adjustments shown in the above table were submitted May 22, 2017 in our Annual MTW Report. The report was accepted by HUD February 1, 2018.

The original Occupied Public Housing Units and Utilized HCVS (baseline numbers shown in columns 2 and 3 above) were calculated from a June 1999 MTCS report (precursor to PIC). We are uncertain of the accuracy of the MTCS numbers at that time, but it is the only data we have from that time period. LHA has not implemented any MTW activities that would affect the distribution of household sizes other than the combination of the Voucher and Certificate program into one Voucher program at the beginning of the demonstration. All non-MTW agencies have since done this also. The change from Certificates to Vouchers affects the mix of families served from the waiting list, since the Certificate program had a set number of Certificates by bedroom size, and selection from the waiting list was determined by the bedroom size of the Certificate available. The switch to an all Voucher program results in the next family on the waiting list getting assistance regardless of family size or bedroom size. Over time the mix of families served in the Voucher program simply reflects the distribution of families who

apply. The trend since converting to an all-Voucher program is that we have served an increasing number of larger families and one person households. This would be a reflection of the demographics of our waiting list and not based on anything LHA has done through MTW.

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	40.1%	1,528	47.88%	7.75%
2 Person	16.9%	443	13.87%	(3.03%)
3 Person	11.5%	298	9.33%	(2.17%)
4 Person	11.8%	331	10.37%	(1.43%)
5 Person	10.0%	309	9.68%	(0.32%)
6+ Person	9.7%	284	8.89%	(0.81%)
TOTAL	100.0%	3,193	100.0%	0.0%

** The “Baseline Mix Percentage” figures given in the “Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)” table matches those in the column of the same name in the “Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)” table. The Baseline Mix Percentage was adjusted (see previous table) and accepted by HUD in a previous year.

^ The “Total” in the “Number of Households Served in Plan Year” column matches 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 are 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 are provided below.

Justification for any Variances of more than 5% between the Plan Year and Baseline Year:

LHA has not implemented any MTW activities that would affect the distribution of household sizes other than the combination of the Voucher and Certificate program into one Voucher program at the beginning of the demonstration. All non-MTW agencies have since done this also. The change from Certificates to Vouchers affects the mix of families offered from the waiting list, since the Certificate program had a set number of Certificates by bedroom size, and selection from the waiting list was determined by the bedroom size of the Certificate available. The switch to an all Voucher program results in the next family on the waiting list getting assistance regardless of family size or bedroom size. Over time the mix of families served in the Voucher program reflects the distribution of families who apply, reach the top of the list and continue on the program. The trend since converting to an all-Voucher program is that we have served an increasing number of larger families and one person households. This would be a

reflection of the demographics of our waiting list and not based on anything LHA has done through MTW. The one person households on the waiting list that include elderly and disabled individuals have continued to increase relative to other household sizes. American Community Survey data shows a 35% increase in the number of older adults in Lincoln since 2010 indicating that an aging population is helping to fuel this change. To the extent LHA has received additional voucher funding in recent years; it has been VASH or Mainstream Vouchers. These vouchers are more likely to serve one person households, which may contribute to the increase. Since we apply MTW principles to these programs, they are included in the household counts.

iii. NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN THE PLAN YEAR

MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY*	MTW PHA LOCAL DEFINITION OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY
Rent Reform #1, #2, #3	368	Households who voluntarily ended participation in rental assistance
HUD FSS Program (not MTW Activity)	19	Regular FSS Program and Completion Criteria
SUB TOTAL	387	
LESS: Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities	(11)	
TOTAL Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency	376	

III. Proposed MTW Activities

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

IV. Approved MTW Activities

A. IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES		
Rent Reform Initiatives		
Number	Description	Statutory Objective
Rent Reform 1	Interim Re-examinations	-Cost Effectiveness -Self-Sufficiency
Rent Reform 2	Minimum Earned Income	-Self-Sufficiency
Rent Reform 3	Rent Calculations	-Cost Effectiveness
Rent Reform 4	Rent Burden (Rent Choice)	-Housing Choice
Rent Reform 5	Average Utility Allowances	-Cost Effectiveness
Rent Reform 6	Biennial Re-Examinations	-Cost Effectiveness
Other Initiatives		
Initiative 1	Income Eligibility	-Cost Effectiveness
Initiative 2	Responsible Portability	-Cost Effectiveness
Initiative 3	Initiative 3 moved to Rent Reform 6 at HUD's request	
Initiative 4	HQS Inspections Waiver	-Cost Effectiveness
Initiative 5	Inspections & Rent Reasonableness Determinations	-Cost Effectiveness
Initiative 6	Project-Based Voucher Units	-Housing Choice -Cost Effectiveness
Initiative 7	RentWise Tenant Education	-Housing Choice -Cost Effectiveness
Initiative 8	Resident Services Program	-Housing Choice
Initiative 9	Landlord Incentive HAP	-Housing Choice

On the following pages, the following abbreviations are used: CE = Cost Effectiveness; HC = Housing Choice; and SS = Self-Sufficiency. In May, 2013, a revised HUD Form 50900 was approved for use by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). HUD Form 50900 provides details on the required elements of the Annual MTW and Annual MTW Report. The HUD Form 50900 was updated January 2018. This form requires the use of standard metrics, as applicable, in order to allow HUD to analyze and aggregate data across all PHA's with similar activities. On the following pages, we have identified the standard metric(s) applicable to each initiative.

Rent Reform 1

ACTIVITY: INTERIM RE-EXAMINATIONS

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Programs Affected: HCV & PH Programs

Plan Year Proposed: April 1, 1999

Plan Year Approved: FY 2000

Plan Year Implemented: July 1, 1999

Statutory Objectives: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures
Give incentives to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

This initiative reduces the requirement for interim re-examinations.

Income increase: If the family's income increases without a change in family composition, then LHA will wait until the annual re-examination to re-determine any possible rent increase. Families who report zero income will be required to report income changes at their quarterly certification and rents will be changed accordingly.

Income decrease: LHA will not lower rent for payments due to a temporary loss of income of one month (30 days) or less duration. If a family member has reduced or terminated employment income, LHA will make the rent decrease 90 days after the decrease in income occurred or after all verifications are received to re-determine eligibility, whichever is the latest. Families who terminate their employment for good cause will be eligible for an immediate interim review and rent decrease, if applicable. Good cause will include lay-off, reduction-in-force, accident, injury, or illness which precludes work. In consideration of hardship, families will be exempt from this 90 day re-employment period if they meet one of the exemptions for the Minimum Earned Income (MEI) requirement shown later in this plan (Rent Reform #2).

It should be noted that the policy on income increases does not require an MTW waiver. The section on income decreases, specifically the 90 day period for a rent adjustment requires MTW flexibility. This interim policy affects households who have reduced or terminated employment. It delays rent decreases for 90 days after the decrease in income occurred or after all verifications are received to encourage people to find immediate re-employment. HUD regulation at 24 CFR

982.516(b)(2) and (3) states “The PHA must make the interim determination within a reasonable time after the family request. Interim examinations must be conducted in accordance with policies in the PHA administrative plan”. However, the Housing Choice Voucher guidebook on page 12-10 defines “reasonable time” as the first day of the month following the date of the reported change.

We chose to list the above policies together. When LHA initially began the MTW program, the policy on income increases was part of our MTW plan as a way to encourage and reward households for increasing income such as through new employment. As family income increases, the family is not subject to an immediate re-examination of income and assets and the corresponding rent increase. The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act (QHWRA) of 1998 incorporated this part of Lincoln Housing Authority’s MTW initiative on interim reexaminations.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

LHA proposed and implemented this policy at the onset of its MTW program as an employment incentive to families. As families increased their income, they were not subject to an immediate re-examination of income and assets and the corresponding rent increase. The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act (QHWRA) of 1998 adopted this same initiative. Since the policies regarding income increases are not part of our MTW waivers, we are not collecting any data on this part of the activity.

The housing authority has continued to implement the policies on rent reduction due to decreased income. These policies encourage families to retain employment as well as to make it a priority to seek new employment when job losses occur. We believe this initiative has encouraged families to seek new employment without contacting the housing authority for a rent adjustment or to report job losses.

A local benchmark (see Additional Local Metrics below) for this initiative was to achieve 50% of the reported job changes achieving no rent decrease. This would represent an effective policy in that it will show people retaining their employment or being incentivized to seek new employment because a rent decrease was not forthcoming. We use a point in time system for data collection and our data shows that job changes or job losses for 54.8% of households and did not result in a rent decrease. We see fewer rent decreases following a job loss or job change because families who become unemployed are encouraged to seek and obtain new employment. Lincoln’s very low unemployment rate at 3.7% (March 2020) provides many opportunities for new employment. Our MTW employment requirements are effective in this environment. Persons who lost employment due to COVID-19 business closings were not subject to a 90 day delay.

Hardship data is also shown in Additional Local Metrics.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #1 Interim Re-examinations				
This initiative reduces the number of required interim re-examinations for decreases in earned income. The baseline agency cost is calculated from the number of interim re-examinations (see CE #2) that were required for decreases in household income prior to the initiative. Through this initiative, the interim reviews are no longer required.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (November 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of Interim re-examinations under this initiative (decrease).	Staff labor = 90 hours (See CE#2) X \$27.14 per hour = \$2,443	\$0	Staff labor = 0 hours (See CE#2) X \$27.14 per hour = \$0	Yes

CE #2 Staff Time Savings				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #1 Interim Re-examinations				
This initiative reduces the number of required interim re-examinations for decreases in earned income. The baseline is a measure of the number of additional interim re-examinations that were performed without this Rent Reform #1 Initiative on Interim Re-examinations. This baseline level was 120 interim re-examinations per year at .75 hours per interim re-examination.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (November 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of interim re-examinations under this initiative	120 interim re-examinations .75 hours per interim re-examination = 90 hours	0 hours	0 additional interim re-examinations @ .75 hour per interim re-examinations = 0 hours	Yes

CE #5 Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	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

Rent Reform #1 Interim Re-examinations

This change to the interim re-examination policy was not intended and will not have significant effect on rental revenue. However, we expect total revenue to go up moderately over time due to inflation

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	HCV: \$7,331,316 PH: \$ 997,006 TOTAL REVENUE: \$8,328,322	HCV: \$8,701,100 PH: \$1,276,866 TOTAL REVENUE: \$9,977,966	HCV: \$10,855,174 PH: \$1,268,021 TOTAL REVENUE: \$12,123,195	Yes

SS #1 Increase in Household Income

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
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 averaged 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 after implementation (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #1 Interim Re-examinations

The data for this initiative is the average earned income of households that have earned income. Households without earned income are not affected by this policy on interim re-examinations.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (April 2014)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average earned income of households with earned income.	PH \$22,643 HCV \$14,127	PH: \$22,000 HCV: \$14,000	PH \$29,291 HCV \$18,534	Yes

SS #3 Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following three rows.

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in a Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other	Head(s) of household in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

Rent Reform #1 Interim Re-examinations

For this metric, we are measuring two of the units from the standard units of measurement. Note that (6) Other is used with two definitions. The first "Other" Category is Work-Able Households employed full or part-time. This is a combination of (1) Employed Full-time and (2) Employed Part-time from the HUD instructions above. This was a necessary modification by LHA. Category (6) Other was also used to specifically show the outcome that this specific initiative has on the households affected by Rent Reform #1.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline April 2010	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
(3) Number of work-able households enrolled in an Educational Program as measured by reported educational benefit income	PH 29 out of 168 HCV 137 out of 1473 Total 166 out of 1641	166 out of 1641	PH 1 out of 146 HCV 37 out of 1,052 Total 38 out of 1,198	-
(3) Percent of work-able households enrolled in education program as measured by reported educational benefit income	PH 17% HCV 9% Total 10%	10%	PH 1% HCV 4% Total 3%	No---the percentage of households in education decreased from baseline, however, the percentage of employed households increased
(5) Unemployed-Number of Work-Able households	PH 34 out of 168 HCV 601 out of 1473 Total 635 out of 1641	656 out of 1641	PH 15 out of 146 HCV 170 out of 1,052 Total 185 out of 1,198	-
(5) Unemployed—Percent of Work-Able households	PH 20% HCV 41% Total 39%	40%	PH 10% HCV 16% Total 15%	Yes
(6) Other: Number of Work-Able Households who are employed full or part-time	PH 134 out of 168 HCV 872 out of 1473 Total 1,006 out of 1641	985 out of 1641	PH 131 out of 146 HCV 882 out of 1,052 Total 1,013 out of 1,198	-
(6) Other: Percentage of Work-Able Households who are employed full or part-time	PH 80% HCV 59% Total 61%	60%	PH 90% HCV 84% Total 85%	Yes

(6) Other: Number of households who transitioned from one job to another without a rent decrease during a period of unemployment of 90 days or less	0	120	204	Yes
(6) Other: Percentage of households who transitioned from one job to another without a rent decrease during a period of unemployment of 90 days or less	0%	50%	204 / 372 = 54.8 %	Yes

SS #4 Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Decrease)	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #1 Interim Re-examinations				
<p>HUD has requested this standard metric to be included with this initiative. This initiative on Interim Reviews has no effect on a family's participation in, use of, or eligibility for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Families will not be removed from or added to TANF as a result of this initiative. LHA gave a voucher admission preference for TANF families through January 31, 2015. New admissions as well as changes in current households receiving TANF will cause the numbers to vary over time but this variance is attributed to factors other than this initiative.</p>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (April 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving TANF Assistance (decrease)	PH: 25 HCV: 461 TOTAL = 486	PH: 25 HCV: 460 TOTAL = 485	PH: 13 HCV: 359 TOTAL = 372	Yes

SS #8 Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency

HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
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.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #1 Interim Re-examinations

PHA Definition of Self-Sufficiency: For this metric, LHA is defining self-sufficiency as families who voluntarily end participation in the voucher or public housing program.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency	HCV: 320 Households PH: <u>17 Households</u> TOTAL: 337 Households	HCV: 320 Households PH: <u>17 Households</u> TOTAL: 337 Households	HCV: 331 Households PH: <u>37 Households</u> TOTAL: 368 Households	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD's Standard metrics.

The following table shows the number of job losses or job changes during the target month. In 54.8% of the cases, no decrease in rent was required.

METRIC	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	OUTCOME
Reported job loss or job change with an effective action date in the month of November	Annual and Interim Reviews Effective 11/1/2010	Percentage of the job changes which did not result in a rent decrease	Annual and Interim Reviews Effective 11/1/2019
Total number of job losses or job changes	76		31
Number job losses or job changes requiring a rent decrease	15		14
Number of job losses or job changes which did not result in a rent decrease	61		17
Percent with no rent decrease	80%	50% or more	54.8%

Hardships: Of the 14 who required rent decreases, 7 received an immediate hardship rent reduction for good cause. Seven (7) received a rent reduction after a 90-day delay.

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Rent Reform 2

ACTIVITY: MINIMUM EARNED INCOME

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV & PH Programs
Plan Year Proposed: April 1, 1999
Plan Year Approved: FY 2000
Plan Year Implemented: July 1, 1999
Statutory Objectives: Give incentives to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

LHA will include a minimum amount of earned income when calculating Annual Income whether or not a family is working. The minimum amount of earned income for families with one eligible adult will be based on 25 hours per week of employment at the federal or state minimum wage, whichever is greater. The minimum amount of earned income for families with two or more eligible adult members will be based on 40 hours per week of employment at minimum wage. LHA will count the higher of the Minimum Earned Income (MEI) or the actual earned income for the household. The minimum earned income will be added to any unearned income the family receives. Eligible adults are persons 18 years of age or older who do not qualify for an exemption from the MEI. All adults in the household must be exempt in order for the household to be exempt from the minimum earned income requirements. LHA has eight categories of hardship exemptions such as illness, elderly or disabled, students, caretakers, and participants in approved self-sufficiency programs. These exemptions serve as the hardship policy for the MEI requirement.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

LHA views the Minimum Earned Income (MEI) as one of the flagship initiatives of our MTW program. MEI promotes and encourages employment by implementing a work requirement. The requirement lays out the basic expectation that a work-able adult should work at least 25 hours per week at minimum wage. The beauty of MEI is that it allows the family the flexibility

of figuring out how to meet the rent generated by MEI, rather than a strict requirement to work a certain number of hours at a job. In that sense, MEI acts similar to a minimum rent. It is not strictly a minimum rent, because families can have other sources of income besides MEI that are included in the rent calculation with MEI, or can be exempt from MEI. In addition, because the rent calculation is based on an expected level of earned income, each income review with a family involves a conversation about work and the expectation to work. This was a major change in focus from our previous communication with tenants - from just calculating the numbers to discussing work as a basic expectation.

Since implementing the MEI policy in 1999, it has gradually changed due to increases in minimum wage. The original MEI was based on a federal and state minimum wage of \$5.15 per hour. The following chart shows the changes in MEI over time. The federal minimum wage has not changed since 2009. However, due to a state voter initiative, the state minimum wage increased to \$8.00 in 2015 and to \$9.00 in 2016. The MEI will continue to be adjusted in accordance with changes in the federal or state minimum wage.

Effective Date	Minimum Wage	MEI for 1 person	MEI for 2 persons
July 1, 1999 (start of MTW)	\$5.15	\$6,698	\$10,712
July 24, 2007	\$5.85	\$7,605	\$12,168
July 24, 2008	\$6.55	\$8,515	\$13,624
July 24, 2009	\$7.25	\$9,425	\$15,080
January 1, 2015	\$8.00	\$10,400	\$16,640
January 1, 2016	\$9.00	\$11,700	\$18,720

The maximum amount of MEI for a household is shown above. Actual MEI is reduced by the amount of earned income for the household. Where the chart shows 1 or 2 persons, it is referring to the number of adults who are “eligible to work” or “work-able” meaning they do not have one of the hardship exemptions from MEI. If there is a household with 2 adults but one is exempt, then the column labeled “MEI for 1 person” is used.

Data for the MEI initiative shows that at the end of FY 2019-2020, there were 22 households who had MEI in Public Housing and 306 in the Housing Choice Voucher program. Note, however, that the amount of income added to each of these MEI households may be anywhere from \$1.00 to the maximum \$18,720 for a household with two adults and no exemptions and no earned income. The Total Tenant Payment for a household with two adults at the maximum MEI

would be \$421.

MEI is shown to promote and encourage employment through the outcomes for households ending the MEI requirement. Along with employment, we also see education or participation in a self-sufficiency program as positive steps toward future employment. During this fiscal year, 208 households ended their MEI requirement and 56% of those households ended their MEI requirement through employment or participation in education or a self-sufficiency program. Of this group, the average time spent subject to the MEI requirement was 1.5 years and the median time was 1 year. This outcome is a good indicator that the MEI requirement encourages people toward employment or toward education and training leading to employment.

Further data on the positive effect of the MEI requirement is the total number of households with wages. The data in the tables for Rent Reform Initiative #1 clearly show a high percentage of households with wages, another indication that our program emphasis on work expectations is successful. Both programs were above benchmark. The unemployment rate in Lincoln has remained relatively low at 3.7% (March 2020) but rose to 9.3% in April of 2020.

COVID-19. During the course of March 2020, the final month of our FY19-2020 fiscal year, the country underwent a monumental economic shutdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. On March 26, 2020 LHA submitted a Technical Amendment to the FY 2020-21 Annual Plan to discontinue applying MEI through the remainder of calendar year 2020. Because our fiscal year ended March 31, 2020, the employment and MEI data in this report do not reflect these changes. Next year's FY2020-21 Annual Report should include data that reflects the 2020 economic disruption.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

SS #1 Increase in Household Income				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
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 averaged 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 after implementation (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #2 Minimum Earned Income				
The data for this initiative is the average earned income of households that have earned income.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (April 2014)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average earned income of households with earned income	PH : \$22,643 HCV: \$14,127	PH: \$22,000 HCV: \$14,000	PH \$29,291 HCV \$18,534	Yes

SS #3 Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following three rows.

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in a Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other	Head(s) of household in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

Rent Reform #2 Minimum Earned Income

For this metric, we are measuring the households who end the Minimum Earned Income (MEI) requirement because of education, job training (self-sufficiency) program, and employment. The denominator for the percentages is the number of households who ended MEI during the year.

We are using the following from the standard units of measurement:

Category 3 Education

Category 4 Job Training

Category 6 Other—Employed at more than Minimum Earned Income

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (1999—Pre-MTW)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
(3) Number of MEI Households Enrolled in an Educational Program	0	PH: 1 HCV: 14 TOTAL = 15 out of 500	PH: 0 HCV: 8 Total = 8 out of 208	
(3) Percentage of MEI Households Enrolled in an Educational Program	0%	3%	4%	Yes
(3) Number of MEI Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program	0	PH: 1 HCV: 14 TOTAL = 15 out of 500	PH: 0 HCV: 11 Total =11 out of 208	
(3) Percentage of MEI Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program	0%	3%	5%	Yes
(6) Other: Number of MEI Households employed at more than Minimum Earned Income	0	PH: 5 HCV: 70 TOTAL = 75 out of 500	PH: 8 HCV: 90 Total = 98 out of 208	
(6) Other: Percentage of MEI Households employed at more than Minimum Earned Income	0%	15%	47%	Yes

SS #4 Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Decrease)	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #2 Minimum Earned Income				
TANF households are not affected by the Minimum Earned Income (MEI) policy. As a result, the data is zero (0).				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of MEI Households who receive TANF	0	0	0	Yes

SS #5 Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase)	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #2 Minimum Earned Income				
Minimum Earned Income (MEI) households, by definition, are households who are work-able and not participating in self-sufficiency activities. If participating in self-sufficiency activities, these households would be exempt from the MEI requirement. Data will continue to be zero (0).				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
MEI Households who receive self-sufficiency services	0 Households	0 Households	0 Households	Yes

SS #6 Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease)	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #2 Minimum Earned Income				
The baseline data for this initiative is the average Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) of households subject to the Minimum Earned Income (MEI) policy if the MEI policy were not implemented. The Outcome is the current average HAP of families subject to MEI.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (November 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average amount of subsidy per MEI Households	\$533	\$490	\$449	YES - HAP costs are lower due to MEI, but are increasing relative to baseline over time due to increasing rental costs.

Another measure of HAP savings not dependent on rental costs might be to compare average TTP of MEI households (\$436) compared to the average TTP of the same households if MEI was not included (\$292), a difference of \$144 per household per month.

SS #7 Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	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
Rent Reform #2 Minimum Earned Income				
This change to the interim re-examination policy was not intended and will not have significant effect on rental revenue. However, we expect total revenue to go up moderately over time due to inflation				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	HCV: \$7,331,316 PH: \$ 997,006 TOTAL REVENUE: \$8,328,322	HCV: \$8,701,100 PH: \$1,276,866 TOTAL REVENUE: \$9,977,966	HCV: \$10,855,174 PH: \$1,268,021 TOTAL REVENUE: \$12,123,195	Yes

SS #8 Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency

HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
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.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #2 Minimum Earned Income

PHA Definition of Self-Sufficiency: For this metric, LHA is defining self-sufficiency as families who voluntarily end participation in the voucher or public housing program.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency	HCV: 320 Households PH: <u>17 Households</u> TOTAL: 337 Households	HCV: 320 Households PH: <u>17 Households</u> TOTAL: 337 Households	HCV: 331 Households PH: <u>37 Households</u> TOTAL: 368 Households	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD's Standard metrics.

As an additional metric, we looked at MEI households who terminated from either public housing or housing choice voucher programs. Our data below shows that three public housing MEI households and 35 Voucher MEI households terminated their assistance during the fiscal year. This was 5.4% of all public housing terminations and 7.6% of all voucher terminations. MEI households made up 11.1% of public housing households and 10.2% of total voucher households at the end of the fiscal year. This data shows there is not a disproportionate number of households with MEI who terminate assistance compared to other households who terminate assistance.

METRIC	BASELINE (Revised)*	BENCHMARK	OUTCOME
Comparison of MEI households terminated from public housing and housing choice vouchers in proportion to non-MEI households	April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011	MEI households will have an equal or lower percentage of terminations relative to the proportion of MEI households to total households	April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020
Number\Percent of MEI households (year-end)	HCV: 466 out of 2,918 16.0% PH: 28 out of 320 8.8%		HCV: 306 out of 2,994 10.2% PH: 22 out of 199 11.1%
Number\Percent of MEI households terminating (FY14)	HCV: 90 MEI households out of 500 terminations 18.0% PH: 1 MEI household out of 54 terminations 2%		HCV: 35 MEI households out of 463 terminations 7.6% PH: 3 MEI households out of 56 terminations 5.4%
MEI households terminate at a lower rate than their overall percentage of public housing units or vouchers	HCV: 18.0% PH: 2%	HCV: Less than 10.2% PH: Less than 11.1%	HCV: 7.6% PH: 5.4%

For MEI households who terminated their public housing lease or ended voucher participation, the following table shows the reasons for termination during the period of April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020. There were only 2 MEI households who were evicted for non-payment of rent out of 463 (HCV) households who terminated during the year. This is only .4% of all HCV terminations. In Public Housing, 0 MEI households out of 56 total terminations (0%) were for non-payment of rent.

METRIC	HCV BASELINE	PH BASELINE	HCV OUTCOME	PH OUTCOME
PH and HCV: Number of terminated MEI households & Reason for Termination	April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011 Revised Baseline*		April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020	
Criminal Activity	4	0	0	0
Deceased	0	0	1	0
Drug Activity	5	0	1	0
Vacate Owing	0	0	0	0
Fraud	5	0	2	0
Owner HQS Defect	0	0	0	0
Tenant HQS Defect	1	0	0	0
Other Program Violation	12	0	3	0
Moved out of town	1	0	3	1
Portable Absorbed by HA	1	0	0	0
Moved in with Relative/Friend	0	0	0	0
No Reply to Annual Re-exam	4	0	6	0
No longer Requires Assistance	15	0	9	0
Reason Unknown	0	1	0	1
Moved to Nursing Home	0	0	0	0
Vacate without Notice	21	0	3	0
Transfer to Other LHA Unit	0	0	0	0
Buying a House	2	0	1	0
Eviction—Non Payment of Rent	14	0	2	0
Eviction—Other Lease Violation	0	0	1	1
Voucher Expired	5	0	3	0
Moved to Other Assisted Housing	0	0	0	0
TOTAL MEI TERMINATIONS	HCV: 90	PH: 1	HCV: 35	PH: 3
TOTAL TERMINATIONS	HCV: 500	PH: 54	HCV: 463	PH: 56

*Note: In the report for 2010-2011, we noted improved data collection which showed a higher number of MEI terminations. After further consideration, we determined the data for 2010-2011 was more appropriate to use as the baseline level for comparison in future years.

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Rent Reform 3

ACTIVITY: RENT CALCULATIONS

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

<u>Programs Affected:</u>	HCV & PH Programs
<u>For Items A - D:</u>	
<u>Plan Year Proposed:</u>	April 1, 2008
<u>Plan Year Approved:</u>	FY 2009
<u>Plan Year Implemented:</u>	April 1, 2008 (new admissions and transfers) July 1, 2008 (annual reexaminations)
<u>For Item E:</u>	
<u>Plan Year Proposed:</u>	April 1, 1999
<u>Plan Year Approved:</u>	FY 2000
<u>Plan Year Implemented:</u>	July 1, 1999
<u>Plan Year Amended:</u>	FY 2016

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

A. Total Tenant Payment: Total Tenant Payment (TTP) is determined on 27% of gross income with no allowable deductions.

B. Minimum Rent: All subsidized households are responsible to pay the owner a minimum of \$25.00 for tenant rent. The higher of the TTP minus the utility allowance or \$25.00 is used to determine the tenant rent to the owner. This requirement is waived if the head of household is disabled and has a current Social Security application pending.

C. Calculation of Asset Income: For households with total assets for which the face value is equal to or greater than \$5,000, asset income will be based on a 2% rate multiplied by the face value. Verification requirements are modified to allow as first level of acceptable verification the household provided documents such as quarterly or end of year statements.

For assets under \$5,000 in face value, first acceptable verification level is self-certification of

face value and income. The income will be excluded if total assets are under \$5,000.

Special Needs Trusts are an excluded asset. In 2016, the Nebraska legislature passed the Achieving a Better Life Experience (ABLE) law which authorized ENABLE accounts to allow children and adults with qualifying disabilities in Nebraska to save money without jeopardizing their eligibility for government benefits. In our 2017-2018 Plan, we excluded these types of accounts as an asset as we do the special needs trusts.

Rental properties are considered personal assets and held as investments rather than business assets. Under MTW policy, asset income from rental properties held by applicants/tenants will be calculated using either 1) the actual annual generated income from the asset, or 2) the imputed asset income by using the face value of the property multiplied by 2%, whichever is greater.

D. Verifications: LHA will utilize Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) as the first level of acceptable verification. In lieu of third party verifications, tenant provided documents would be second level of acceptable verifications for the following situations:

Earned Income: three months' pay statements (pay stubs)

Social Security Income: the last Social Security Statement issued to the household by the Social Security Administration.

E: Other: LHA will not implement regulatory provisions related to Earned Income Disregard, public housing flat rents, imputed welfare income, and student earned income exclusions for adults 22 and older. Also, LHA will not implement regulatory provisions to include Special Needs Trusts as an asset or income even if the Special Needs Trust is making regular payments on the behalf of the beneficiary. Beginning with the plan year 2019-2020, LHA will exclude income received for participation in grant-funded research on the impact that income has on the development of children in low-income families, if the income has also been excluded by the State of Nebraska for use in determining eligibility for Aid to Dependent Children. The exclusion shall not exceed \$4,000 per year for four years. The research income known as 4MyBaby gift qualifies under this exemption.

For the FSS program, escrow will be calculated using 90% of gross income as the current adjusted income

In implementing the above, a hardship policy was created for tenants who were adversely affected. Details for the hardship policies are found in the Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan and Section 8 Administrative Plan which were included in the MTW Plan.

The hardship policy applies to existing tenants or voucher participants as of specified implementation dates. At the next annual re-certification on or after the implementation date, if

it is determined that calculating TTP based on 27% of monthly gross income with no deductions will increase the tenants TTP by more than \$25, then LHA will limit the increase by utilizing the Hardship TTP.

To calculate the Hardship TTP, LHA calculates the Monthly Adjusted Income using the household's current Annual Income minus the amount of pre-existing deductions that were utilized at the last re-examination prior to the implementation date. The Hardship TTP is calculated based on 30% of this Monthly Adjusted Income, plus an additional \$25 for each successive annual re-examination. If a tenant qualifies for the initial Hardship TTP, then LHA will calculate successive Hardship TTPs by adding an additional \$25 at each annual re-examination until the Hardship TTP equals or exceeds the TTP calculated based on 27% of monthly gross income. Each year a tenant must self-certify that the previous deductions are reasonably the same or have increased. If the amount of deductions have decreased for a tenant (for example a family no longer pays day care), then a tenant will no longer qualify for the Hardship TTP. In no case shall the Hardship TTP be less than \$50 or the Tenant Rent be less than the \$25 minimum rent.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

These revised methods of calculating housing assistance for households are much simpler and less prone to errors. Tenants, participants, landlords, and advocates have appreciated the greater simplicity and ease of understanding compared to traditional methods for calculating housing assistance. Our data shows staff continues to save a significant amount of processing time and improved rent calculation accuracy because of these initiatives. Our data collection process compares processing time for MTW participants versus non-MTW participants. The results of this initiative indicate approximately 33.2% administrative time savings per new move-in and 52.1% administrative time savings per annual re-examination compared to non-MTW administrative time.

The savings in administrative time over the years has allowed us to add more vouchers (Mainstream, VASH, and Tenant Protection Vouchers), do more auditing without adding staff, and conduct more effective client interviews while still saving time compared to non-MTW client interviews. In previous years, we modified the Housing Specialist job expectations by increasing the expected time for an eligibility interview from 20-30 minutes to 45-60 minutes. This extra time allows the Housing Specialist to gather more accurate information and reduce fraud through effective interviewing. Even with this increased interview time, we are still saving significant time over baselines.

Improved Program Accuracy

In January 2004 at a Public Housing Rental Integrity Summit, asset values and asset income verifications were reported to be problem areas in rent calculations as identified by HUD’s Office of Policy Development and Research (PD &R). In the past, our non- MTW Section 8 New Construction program received notice of “finding” on an asset income calculation error after an audit was conducted by a third party Contract Administrator. Lincoln Housing Authority spent a significant amount of staff time attempting to resolve the difference in asset income as perceived by the auditor and LHA. The auditor required LHA to burden the tenant with obtaining six months of bank statements. The end result of resolving the discrepancy was a significant amount of administrative time used and the tenant was stressed and inconvenienced over an asset discrepancy that had absolutely no impact on the final tenant rent calculation.

Based on this fiscal year’s internal audits, our *simplified* MTW asset verification and calculation policy continues to demonstrate a high degree of accuracy. It is also a significant factor in our administrative time savings reported elsewhere in this report.

Several of the HUD standard metrics are included at HUD request but there is no direct relationship between some of these metrics and the initiatives. Any changes are most likely related to other factors. Further impact is illustrated and discussed under Additional Local Metrics.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations				
These costs are based on the time savings in CE #2 (below) times average staff cost per hour of \$27.14.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time for New Admissions	Total time: 3,858.2 hours	Time to complete the task: 3,301 hours	Total time: 1,995 hours	Yes
Total time for Annual Re-examinations	Total time: 4,126.2 hours	Time to complete the task: 3,087 hours	Total time: 3,196 hours	No due to more annuals re-exams than anticipated
Total time for New Admissions and Annual	Total time: 7,984.4 hours	Total time: 6,388 hours	Total time: 5,191 hours	Yes

Re-examinations:				
Total Costs for New Admissions and Annual Re-examinations	Total time @ \$27.145 per hour = \$216,697	Total time @ \$27.14 per hour = \$173,370	Total time @ \$27.14 per hour = \$140,887	Yes

CE #2 Staff Time Savings

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations

This data reflects the time for completion of new admissions and annual re-examinations.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2013)	Benchmark 20% time Savings	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Time to complete New Admissions	382 minutes per new admission 606 new admissions Total time: 231,492 minutes or 3,858.2 hours	Total time to complete the task: 3,087 hours	173.21 minutes per new admission 642 new voucher admissions 49 new admissions for PH 691 total admissions Total time 119,688 minutes or 1,995 hours	Yes
Time to complete Annual Re-examinations	117 minutes per re-exam 2,116 re-exams per year Total time: 247,572 minutes or 4,126.2 hours	Total time to complete the task: 3,301 hours	97.3 minutes per re-exam (PH) 179 + (HCV) 1,792 = 1,971 re-exams per year Total time: 191,778 minutes or 3,196 hours	Yes
Total time to complete New Admissions and Annual Re-examinations	Total time to complete task: 7,984.4 hours	Total time to complete task: 6,388 hours	Total time to complete task: 5,191 hours	Yes

CE #3 Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

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

Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations

For this metric, we are measuring the error rate on assets and deductions. Baseline is from FY 2010 non-MTW file audits.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average Error Rate for Assets and Deductions	10.7%	3.0% or less	1.34%	Yes

SS #1 Increase in Household Income

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
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 averaged 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 after implementation (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations

The data for this initiative is the average earned income of households with earned income.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (April 2014)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
	PH \$22,643 HCV \$14,127	\$22,000 \$14,000	PH \$29,291 HCV \$18,534	Yes

SS #3 Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following three rows.

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in a Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other	Head(s) of household in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>>after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations

For this metric, we are measuring two of the units from the standard units of measurement. Note that (6) Other is used with two definitions. The first "Other" Category is Work-Able Households employed full or part-time. This is a combination of (1) Employed Full-time and (2) Employed Part-time from the HUD instructions above. This was a necessary modification by LHA. Category (6) Other was also used to specifically show the outcome that this specific initiative has on the households affected by Rent Reform #1.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline April 2010	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
(3) Number of work-able households enrolled in an Educational Program as measured by reported educational benefit income	PH 29 out of 168 HCV 137 out of 1473 Total 166 out of 1641	166 out of 1641	PH 1 out of 146 HCV 37 out of 1,052 Total 38 out of 1,198	-
(3) Percent of work-able households enrolled in education program as measured by reported educational benefit income	PH 17% HCV 9% Total 10%	10%	PH 1% HCV 4% Total 3%	No---the percentage of households in education decreased, however, the percentage of employed households increased
(5) Unemployed-Number of Work-Able households	PH 34 out of 168 HCV 601 out of 1473 Total 635 out of 1641	656 out of 1641	PH 15 out of 146 HCV 170 out of 1,052 Total 185 out of 1,198	-
(5) Unemployed—Percent of Work-Able households	PH 20% HCV 41% Total 39%	40%	PH 10% HCV 16% Total 15%	Yes
(6) Other: Number of Work-Able Households who are employed full or part-time	PH 134 out of 168 HCV 872 out of 1473 Total 1006 out of 1641	985 out of 1641	PH 131 out of 146 HCV 882 out of 1,052 Total 1,013 out of 1,198	-
(6) Other: Percentage of Work-Able Households who are employed full or part-time	PH 80% HCV 59% Total 61%	60%	PH 90% HCV 84% Total 85%	Yes

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

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Decrease)	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations

HUD has requested this standard metric to be included with this initiative. This initiative has no effect on a family's participation in, use of, or eligibility for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Families will not be removed from or added to TANF as a result of this initiative. LHA gave a voucher admission preference for TANF families through January 31, 2015. New admissions as well as changes in current households receiving TANF will cause the numbers to vary over time but this variance is attributed to factors other than this initiative.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (April 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving TANF Assistance (decrease)	PH: 25 HCV: 461 TOTAL = 486	PH: 25 HCV: 460 TOTAL = 485	PH: 13 HCV: 359 TOTAL = 372	Yes

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

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase)	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations

For this measurement, we are counting the number of households participating in the Family Self-Sufficiency Program. This initiative was not designed to affect the number of households who receive self-sufficiency services.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Households who receive self-sufficiency services through the FSS program	120	120	121	Yes

SS #6 Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease)	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations

This policy was designed to be revenue neutral; however, subsidy costs are expected to increase over time with rising rents and payment standards.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (November 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome (FY)	Benchmark Achieved
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy	\$341	\$415	\$ 400	Yes

SS #7 Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
PHA Rental Revenue in dollars (increase)	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations				
This policy was designed to be revenue neutral and will not have significant effect on rental revenue---expect total revenue to go up moderately over time due to inflation.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	HCV: \$7,331,316 PH: \$ 997,006 TOTAL REVENUE: \$8,328,322	HCV: \$8,701,100 PH: \$1,276,866 TOTAL REVENUE: \$9,977,966	HCV: \$10,855,174 PH: \$1,268,021 TOTAL REVENUE: \$12,123,195	Yes

SS #8 Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #3 Rent Calculations				
PHA Definition of Self-Sufficiency: For this metric, LHA is defining self-sufficiency as families who voluntarily end participation in the voucher or public housing program.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved

Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency	HCV: 320 Households	HCV: 320 Households	HCV: 331 Households	Yes
	PH: <u>17 Households</u>	PH: <u>17 Households</u>	PH: <u>37 Households</u>	
	TOTAL: 337 Households	TOTAL: 337 Households	TOTAL: 368 Households	

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

A. Total Tenant Payment at 27%

This initiative provides a much simpler method of calculating housing assistance for households served by LHA. The result is a savings in staff time, reduced calculation errors, and a rent calculation system that is easier for tenants to understand. The decision to use 27% of gross income for the TTP was based on our goal to continue to serve the same number of households. The minimum rent (\$25.00) is intended to create a minimum level of tenant financial responsibility and obligation to the landlord.

Savings in staff time is measured primarily through comparison of a control group (regular HUD rent calculations) and an MTW group. The control group is made up of tenants in two Section 8 New Construction Projects (Burke Plaza and New 32) and one special voucher program (Mainstream vouchers). VASH had been a control group and has now been included in most MTW initiatives. The control groups are compared to a random sample of MTW participants in public housing and housing choice voucher programs. Staff time is tracked by the number of direct and indirect contacts and the amount of time for each contact. Direct contact involves a face to face client contact; indirect is client specific activities outside of face to face contact.

Annual Re-Examinations and New Admissions

The tables below show the aggregate results of seven staff tracking their administrative time for new admissions and annual re-examinations. The table compares administrative time in MTW and non-MTW programs. Over the years, there continues to be administrative time savings from this initiative.

New Admissions	MTW	Non-MTW
Average time for Activity:	173.21 Minutes	259.35 Minutes
	Time Saved: 33%	
Annual Reviews	MTW	Non-MTW
Average time for Activity:	97.3 Minutes	203.27 Minutes
	Time Saved: 52.1%	

There are a number of other variables that impact the time savings results. For example, we found that variation in experience and skill levels of staff had a significant impact on time savings. We isolated the data for individual staff persons who had both MTW and non-MTW caseloads. By looking at staff that had both MTW and non-MTW assignments, the data confirms the time savings achieved through MTW initiatives. When analyzing data in this way, we can see even more clearly the significant time savings in program administration for the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs using our MTW rent structure. The following table illustrates this analysis for housing specialists who had both MTW and non-MTW caseloads.

METRIC	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	OUTCOME
Comparison of MTW and Non-MTW Administrative Time	April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010 Average Minutes for Activity and Percent of Time Saved under MTW	Average Percent of Administrative Time Saved under MTW	April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020 Average Minutes for Activity and Percent of Time Saved under MTW
<u>New Admissions</u> MTW compared to Non-MTW	Average Time Saved under MTW: 26.5% (the staff in the baseline are not the same staff for the outcome)	20%	Time Saved under MTW: Staff 1: 27.2% Staff 2: 21.3% <u>Staff 3: 7.1%</u> Average: 18.53%
<u>Annual Reexams</u> MTW compared to Non-MTW	Average Time Saved under MTW: 21.0% (the staff in the baseline are not the same staff for the outcome)	20%	Time Saved under MTW: Staff 4: 37.7% <u>Staff 5: 59.8%</u> Average: 48.8%

Hardship Households

In implementing the rent calculation based on 27% of gross income, the housing authority implemented a hardship provision which stated that a household's maximum increase in total tenant payment would not exceed \$25.00 per annual reexamination as a result of this policy. However, rent increases due to increased income do apply. Following is the number of households for whom this hardship provision applied.

Project	4-2009	3-2010	3-2011	3-2012	3-2013	3-2014	3-2015	3-2016	3-2017	3-2018	3-2019	3-2020
Public Housing	70	41	20	14	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Housing Choice Voucher	162	88	32	19	8	6	4	4	3	2	1	1

A minimal number of households were adversely impacted from the MTW rent policy changes

that eliminated program deductions and implemented a lower standard percentage on gross income to determine the TTP. The data collected above indicates that the number of households under the hardship provision for the policy has steadily declined and only a handful of households remain under the hardship policy. The hardship provision was set to expire in 2014 but after reviewing the remaining hardship cases, we decided to continue the hardship policy without expiration.

In addition to monitoring the number of households utilizing the hardship policy provision, we monitored the number of households who were under this provision that ended program participation. There were 0 public housing tenants or voucher participants under the hardship provision who were terminated for non-payment of rent.

B. Minimum Rent

The impact of the \$25.00 minimum rent is determined from data in our housing software. Data showing households with a \$25.00 rent are the households affected by this requirement.

	Number of Households			Number of Households			Number of Households			
	3/31/2011	3/31/2012	3/31/2013	3/31/2014	3/31/2015	3/31/2016	3/31/2017	3/31/2018	3/31/19	
Households Responsible for \$25 Minimum Rent										
Public Housing	11	15	9	10	6	6	2	3	5	8
Housing Choice Voucher	237	175	187	113	137	117	106	76	45	72
Combined	248	190	196	123	143	123	108	79	50	80

For hardship purposes, households in which the head is disabled and has a current Social Security application pending are excluded from the requirement. Following is the data to show the number of households excluded from this requirement and whose rent was less than the \$25.00 minimum rent.

	Number of Households			Number of Households			Number of Households			
	3/31/2011	3/31/2012	3/31/2013	3/31/2014	3/31/2015	3/31/2016	3/31/2017	3/31/2018	3/31/19	
Households Excluded from \$25 Minimum Rent										
Public Housing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Housing Choice Voucher	21	41	64	46	55	47	59	57	53	53
Combined	21	42	64	46	55	47	59	58	54	55

LHA monitored the impact of the \$25.00 minimum rent by looking at the reasons participants ended their participation in the Housing Choice Voucher program or moved out of a Public Housing unit. Data shows the minimum rent of \$25.00 does not create an undue hardship in as much as there were one HCV or PH rent-related evictions out of 80 households with minimum \$25 rent. Households with minimum rent are evicted less frequently for non-payment of rent compared to all other households.

METRIC	BASELINE	BENCHMARK	OUTCOME
Households Terminated due to non-payment of rent	April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010 Number of Households	Termination Rate for non-payment of rent will be same or less for Minimum rent households compared to Other MTW households	April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020 Number of Households
Minimum Rent Households terminated due to non-payment of rent	HCV: 0 PH: 0		HCV: 1 PH: 0
Total Number of Households terminated due to non-payment of rent	HCV: 21 PH: 1		HCV: 21 PH: 0

Termination Rate for Non Payment of Rent: MTW households at \$25 Minimum Rent compared with All Other MTW households	HCV: <u>Minimum Rent households:</u> 0 out of 467 terminations = 0% <u>Other MTW households</u> 21 out of 467 terminations = 4.5% Public Housing: <u>Min Rent households:</u> 0 out of 62 terminations = 0% <u>Other MTW households</u> 1 Out of 62 terminations = 1.6%	Rate less than or equal to Other MTW	HCV: <u>Minimum Rent households:</u> 1 out of 463 terminations = .2% <u>Other MTW households</u> 21 out of 463 terminations = 4.54% % Public Housing: <u>Min Rent households:</u> 0 out of 56 terminations = 0 % <u>Other MTW households</u> 0 out of 56terminations = 0%

C. Calculation of Asset Income

Part C of this activity is concerned with calculation of asset income. Our data is based on a snapshot taken at the end of the fiscal year. Households that were part of the RAD conversion during FY20 are included in both the Public Housing and HCV data sets.

MTW Households with Zero Assets declared		
	Households	Units/Vouchers
Public Housing	7	2.2%
Housing Choice Voucher	165	5.6%

MTW Households with Assets between \$1 and \$4,999:		
Public Housing	254	80.9%
Housing Choice Voucher	2,585	88.3%
MTW Households with Assets equal to or above \$5,000:		
Public Housing	53	16.9%
Housing Choice Voucher	178	6.1%

E. Other

Student Income for dependents 22 years of age or older

For Part E of this activity, we collected data on the number of students age 22 and older whose income under the non-MTW policy would have been excluded from the rent calculation. The following table shows the number of students age 22 and older whose income was counted.

Number of dependent full-time students age 22 and older whose Income was included
1 - Public Housing
5 - Housing Choice Voucher

\$ 1,686	Public Housing total earned income counted
<u>\$ 75,071</u>	Housing Choice Voucher total earned income counted
\$ 76,757	Total Earned Income used in rent calculations for PH and HCV

This activity was chosen because of a public perception that earned income of all dependent adults should be used to offset housing subsidy costs. This MTW activity continues to have an insignificant impact on rent subsidy since a total of only 6 dependent, full-time students, age 22 or older are participating in the MTW Public Housing or the Housing Choice Voucher program with earned income. The total earned income used in rent calculations for these households was \$76,757. However, this MTW activity and data collection helps improve the public perception on providing housing subsidy to households with adult dependent students.

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Rent Reform 4

ACTIVITY: RENT CHOICE

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

<u>Program Affected:</u>	HCV Program
<u>Plan Year Proposed:</u>	November, 2007
<u>Plan Year Approved:</u>	FY 2008
<u>Plan Year Implemented:</u>	February 1, 2008
<u>Plan Year Amended:</u>	FY 2009

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

The maximum initial rent for a family shall not exceed 50% of their monthly gross income at the time of approving tenancy and executing a HAP contract.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

This initiative was revised in 2008 from LHA's original MTW plan in which we did not have any cap on the amount of tenant payment for rent and utilities. LHA's original plan was strongly endorsed by residents during our original MTW planning process. Over the years, we collected experience and anecdotal information through which we determined that a number of households were overextending themselves on housing costs to the point of being unable to pay rent and thereby losing their housing. This initiative, revised in 2008, put a cap on the initial tenant rent portion at no more than 50% of monthly gross income. Utility costs are not included in the 50%. The regular voucher program limits the tenant rent plus utilities to no more than 40% of adjusted income.

The table below shows number of households at new admission or transfer whose initial tenant share of rent and utilities is greater than 40% of their monthly gross income and, at the same time, their maximum initial tenant rent is less than 50% of monthly gross income.

2009-2010	144
2010-2011	166
2011-2012	183
2012-2013	244
2013-2014	107
2014-2015	499
2015-2016	232
2016-2017	115
2017-2018	83
2018-2019	64
2019-2020	85

The revised policy establishing a cap on tenant rent being no more than 50% of the tenant's monthly income eased our concerns about program participants leasing unaffordable housing. The revised policy simply sets an absolute threshold while providing greater flexibility and housing choices to participants than the regular program rules.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

HC #5 Increase in Resident Mobility				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #4 Rent Burden (Rent Choice)				
For this initiative, data shows the number of households who moved to a better unit or neighborhood while using the flexibility of this initiative.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (1999 Pre-MTW)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households able to move to a better unit/or neighborhood	0	100	85	No-Increased Payment Standards have reduced the number of new admissions and transfers paying more than 40% of income.

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

During the 2010 -2011 reporting period, LHA began collecting data on the census tracts for MTW voucher families who were new admissions or transfers and who chose to incur rent burdens that exceed 40% of their adjusted income. Because we put the “choice” back into the housing choice voucher program, we refer to these households as “MTW Rent Choice” families for the sake of simplicity. We collected this information to determine if these families are choosing to expand their housing opportunities when incurring the higher rent burdens.

Census Tract Type	Number of Census Tracts with New Admission or Transfer Vouchers with Rent Choice	Number of New Admission or Transfer Vouchers With Rent Choice	Percent of New Admission or Transfer Vouchers with Rent Choice
Low Income	4	11	12.94%
Moderate Income	8	23	27.06%
Middle Income	16	38	44.71%
Upper Income	3	13	15.29%
	31	85	100.00%

The data shows that our MTW Rent Choice rule allows families greater housing choices relative to the standard voucher program rules. The MTW Rent Choice families were dispersed in a wide range of census tracks, including 19 middle- and upper-income tracts while less than 13% of the families moved into 4 low income census tract areas.

Again this year, the data showed that the MTW policy allowed families access to several apartment complexes, including several LIHTC properties that would otherwise be unavailable to them due to their rent structures. It is clear that, by allowing families to choose a greater share of the rent burden, the MTW Rent Choice rule is important to making these properties available to more voucher families than would otherwise be possible. It is also clear that a critical variable for HCV families to move into “opportunity areas” is the availability of LIHTC properties in those areas.

This MTW initiative offers participating households more housing options within the city of Lincoln, Nebraska compared with non-MTW vouchers. Households are able to make a choice of housing in accordance with their individual financial circumstances. Voucher participants have a choice to exceed the federal rent burden limit of 40% of their adjusted income. The initiative does not impose a hardship but allows households to make a choice.

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Rent Reform 5

ACTIVITY: AVERAGE UTILITY ALLOWANCES

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program

Plan Year Proposed: April 1, 1999

Plan Year Approved: FY 2000

Plan Year Implemented: July 1, 1999

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

LHA uses one standard utility allowance per bedroom size and will not issue utility reimbursement checks or payments. The utility allowances were established using the average utility cost per number of bedrooms per unit. The utility allowances are reviewed annually and adjusted based on rate changes.

The following chart shows the current Fair Market Rents (October 1, 2019) and the payment standards and target rents which are effective beginning October 18, 2019:

Bedroom Size	Fair Market Rent	Payment Standard	Payment Standard as a Percent of FMR	Target Rent	Utility Allowance
SRO	\$466	\$450	96.6%	\$450	\$0
0	\$621	\$587	94.5%	\$550	\$37
1	\$667	\$679	101.8%	\$600	\$79
2	\$865	\$878	101.5%	\$760	\$118
3	\$1,216	\$1,216	100%	\$1,045	\$171
4	\$1,483	\$1,482	99.9%	\$1,255	\$227
5	\$1,705	\$1,703	99.9%	\$1,435	\$268
6	\$1,928	\$1,927	99.9%	\$1,625	\$302

Tenant Protection Vouchers (TPVs) are meant to ensure there is no displacement of low-income residents as a result of various actions resulting in a loss of HUD subsidy assistance that is attached to a specific unit. HUD identifies and allocates Tenant Protection Vouchers as the special circumstances arise.

Enhanced Vouchers (EVs) are a form of TPV that, in certain circumstances, allows the gross rent to exceed the local voucher payment standard to allow existing families to remain in their units even if the owner increases the rents. Enhanced vouchers are generally issued to provide continued assistance for a family at the termination of project-based rental assistance program. If the family stays in the same project, the voucher payment standard covers the full market rent. Enhanced vouchers have several special requirements, but in all other respects are subject to rules of the tenant-based voucher program. Some of the differences include a special statutory minimum rent requirement and a special payment standard, applicable to a family receiving enhanced voucher assistance who elects to stay in the same unit. A hardship for the Moving to Work Utility Allowance was created for Enhanced Voucher households. Their existing utility allowance was “grand-fathered” as of March 1, 2017 for Enhanced Voucher households leasing in place. If the family moves, all normal voucher rules apply.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

This activity has made the voucher program much easier to understand for landlords, tenants, human service agency workers, and the general public. No specific measures were designed to measure that aspect of the activity although anecdotal data over the years has proven this to be true. Human service workers whose clients have vouchers have commented that the MTW voucher program is much easier to understand versus the non-MTW voucher programs. This is one of the reasons the VA agreed to convert VASH to MTW rules. In the past, LHA hosted workshops for community human service workers. The 3 ½ hour workshops provided detailed information on the LHA programs and how tenant payments were determined. The more simplified approach to utilities was overwhelmingly supported by human service workers who attended the workshops and who provide advocacy and service coordination for their clients receiving housing assistance. LHA has continued to do outreach to individual human service agencies and has conducted numerous programs to educate human services staff about LHA’s programs.

The concept of the Target Rent is fundamental to the success of our voucher program. Tenants know to search for units at or below the Target Rent amount. They know that if they go above the Target Rent they will pay the difference in rent without additional subsidy. It is simple to understand and very customer friendly. It also provides an incentive for the tenant to seek

energy efficient units or units with utilities paid by landlords. It provides an easy benchmark for tenants, human service workers and landlords to judge if a unit will be affordable for a voucher tenant.

In the traditional HUD program, as implemented by LHA using VASH (until 10-2011) and Mainstream Vouchers, a tenant does not know exactly what rent amount they might pay, if a unit is above or below the payment standard, or if a unit will be over the 40% rent burden rule until they turn in a Request for Tenancy Approval form to LHA. They are asked to search for a unit with a complicated utility worksheet, and, for most clients, an incomplete understanding of how all the calculations fit together. It is frustrating for the tenants, human service workers, and landlords.

This activity has significantly reduced utility allowance errors each month. National statistics in the past have shown utility allowance errors to be in the top 5 of RIM errors. Data for this year shows no errors in MTW out of over 1,420 audits (new admission and annual).

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Rent Reform #5 Average Utility Allowances				
This metric is the savings from not issuing utility reimbursement checks and staff time savings during client interviews and calculations.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 1999)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task.	\$54,246 Cost of Utility Reimbursements 303.17 hours @ \$27.14 per hour = \$8,228 TOTAL COST = \$62,474	\$0 Cost of Utility Reimbursements 78.12 hours @ \$27.14 per hour = \$2,120 TOTAL COST = \$2,120	\$0 Cost of Utility Reimbursements 83.37 hours @ \$27.14 per hour = \$2,263 TOTAL COST = \$2,263	No New Admissions increased 77% in FY20.

CE #2 Staff Time Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Rent Reform #5 Average Utility Allowances				
This metric is the amount of time to explain and calculate standard utility allowances (baseline) and then compared to a benchmark using standard utility allowances which are much easier for staff to explain and calculate and for tenants to understand.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2013)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete utility allowances in staff hours	HCV 558 new admissions @15 minutes explanation of utility allowance to new tenants and 4 minutes calculation = 10,602 minutes HCV: 1,897 annual reviews @4 minutes calculation of utility allowances = 7,588 minutes Total minutes = 18,190 Total hours = 303.17	HCV 558 new admissions @ 4 minutes explanation of utility allowances to new tenants and 1 minute calculation = 2,790 minutes HCV: 1,897 annual reviews @ 1 minute calculation of utility allowances = 1,897 minutes Total minutes = 4,687 Total hours = 78.12	HCV 642 new admissions @ 4 minutes explanation of utility allowances to new tenants and 1 minute calculation = 3,216 minutes HCV: 1,792 annual reviews @ 1 minute calculation of utility allowances = 1,792 minutes Total minutes = 5,002 Total hours = 83.37	No An above average number of new admission appointments were held in the fiscal year.

CE #3 Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
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
Rent Reform #5 Average Utility Allowances				
Error rates are determined from random file audits.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease)	15%	3% or less	0%	Yes

CE #5 Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	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
Rent Reform #5 Average Utility Allowances				
This change to the interim re-examination policy was not intended and will not have significant effect on rental revenue. However, we expect total revenue to go up moderately over time due to inflation				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	HCV: \$7,331,316 PH: \$ 997,006 TOTAL REVENUE: \$8,328,322	HCV: \$8,701,100 PH: \$1,276,866 TOTAL REVENUE: \$9,977,966	HCV: \$10,855,174 PH: \$1,268,021 TOTAL REVENUE: \$12,123,195	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

For this activity, no additional local metrics are provided.

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Rent Reform 6

ACTIVITY: BIENNIAL RE-EXAMINATIONS

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Programs Affected: HCV and PH
Plan Year Proposed: November, 2008
Plan Year Approved: FY 2009 and FY 2010

Plan Year Implemented:

Public Housing:

Effective March 15, 2009 for new move-ins

Effective July 1, 2009 for current tenants

Housing Choice Voucher

Effective April 1, 2009 for new admissions

Effective July 1, 2009 for some current program participants (see transition plan)

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

LHA will conduct a reexamination of an elderly or disabled household at least every two years. An elderly or disabled household is any family where the head, spouse, co-head or sole member is at least 62 years of age or a person with a disability.

All households will continue to have interim reexaminations according to administrative policy.

All other household compositions will continue with an annual reexamination.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

Tenants and voucher participants affected by this policy appreciate the reduced burden associated with the review process. In addition, they could have increased income between biennial reexaminations without a corresponding increase in their rent payment. Households continue to be eligible for rent decreases by means of interim reexaminations if they experience decreased income.

The data in our local metrics shows that we have significantly reduced the number of elderly and disabled reviews conducted per year. The two year average number of reviews in the combined programs is 804 reviews per year compared to the baseline number of 1,249 reviews representing 445 fewer reviews. The number of elderly and disabled households has increased over time so the number of reviews relative to baseline also has been increasing. We adjusted our Benchmarks the HUD Standard Metrics in the FY2020-21 Annual Plan to better account for the increasing number of elderly and disabled households.

This time savings allowed us to expand our programs and serve more families without increasing staff. It should be noted that the MTW data collection requires a significant amount extra work time, somewhat reducing the benefit of the time savings. The time savings also has allowed us to serve more families by facilitating and offering our applicants, in addition to our program participants, a 12 hour tenant educational series called Nebraska RentWise. The time savings has also allowed our staff more quality interviewing time with our participants.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #3 Biennial Re-examinations				

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (8-1-07 to 7-31-08)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost to complete re-examinations for Elderly or Disabled Households (decrease)	PH: 191.6 hours (see CE #2) @ \$27.14 per hour = \$5,200 HCV: 1,785.6 hours (see CE #2) @ \$27.14 per hour = \$48,461 TOTAL = \$53,661	PH = 115 hours @ \$27.14 per hour = \$3,121 HCV = 1,072 hours @ \$27.14 per hour = \$29,094 TOTAL = \$32,215	PH: 87.1 hours (see CE #2) @ \$27.14 per hour = \$ 2,364 HCV: 1,188.8 hours (see CE #2) @ \$27.14 per hour = \$32,264 TOTAL = \$34,628	No—number of elderly and disabled households have increased over time. Benchmark has been updated in the FY20-21 Annual Plan.

CE #2 Staff Time Savings

HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Other Initiatives #3 Biennial Re-examinations

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (8-1-07 to 7-31-08)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete re-examinations for Elderly or Disabled Households	PH: 121 Re-exams for Elderly or Disabled Households @ 1.583 Hours per Re-Exam = 191.6 hours HCV: 1,128 Re-exams for Elderly or Disabled Households @ 1.583 = 1,785.6 hours TOTAL = 1,977.2 hours	PH = 115 hours HCV = 1,072 hours TOTAL = 1,187 hours	PH: 55 Re-exams for Elderly or Disabled Households @ 1.583 Hours per Re-Exam = 87.1 hours HCV: 751 Re-exams for Elderly or Disabled Households @1.583 = 1,188.8 hours TOTAL = 1,275.9 hours	No—number of elderly and disabled households have increased over time. Benchmark has been updated in the FY20-21 Annual Plan.

CE #5 Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

HUD Instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	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

Other Initiatives #3 Biennial Re-examinations

This change to the interim re-examination policy was not intended and will not have significant effect on rental revenue. However, we expect total revenue to go up moderately over time due to inflation

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	HCV: \$7,331,316 PH: \$ 997,006 TOTAL REVENUE: \$8,328,322	HCV: \$8,801,100 PH: \$1,276,866 TOTAL REVENUE: \$9,977,966	HCV: \$10,855,174 PH: \$1,268,021 TOTAL REVENUE: \$12,123,195	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD's Standard metrics.

Baseline data in the table below came from the PIC system. The benchmark for annual reexaminations was based on a 50% reduction from the baseline for elderly and disabled households.

Public Housing

For any elderly or disabled family whose annual re-examinations were scheduled to be conducted from July 1, 2009 to June 1, 2010, LHA delayed the annual re-examination to the following year and will conduct it every two years thereafter. Interim re-examinations continue to be done in accordance with policy, and elderly and disabled families are not exempt from reporting changes in household composition or other changes.

For any elderly or disabled tenants who were new move-ins on March 15, 2009 or after, LHA now schedules the next re-examination on the first of the same month two years after the move-in month. Due to the RAD conversion of Mahoney Manor to Project-based Vouchers in October

2019, the Mahoney Manor biennial re-examinations effective through October 2019 were counted in Public Housing, and thereafter as Housing Choice Vouchers.

Housing Choice Voucher

Beginning April 1, 2009, LHA is conducting re-examinations every two years for elderly and disabled households.

For households issued vouchers prior to April 1, 2009, LHA established a transition policy for biennial re-examinations. This transition policy was effective for current elderly or disabled households with annual re-examinations effective July 1, 2009 to June 1, 2010. In order to manage workloads during the transition to a biennial schedule, LHA randomly assigned households to one of two groups based on the last digit of the head's social security number. During implementation, group one had their next reexamination in one year and group two in two years and continuing every two years thereafter for both groups. Any elderly or disabled households designated as "hardship" households under the 27% MTW policy were immediately placed in group two. This biennial initiative further reduced the impact of the 27% MTW policy and created an additional benefit for the hardship group.

Due to the RAD conversion of Mahoney Manor to Project-based Vouchers in October 2019, the Mahoney Manor biennial re-examinations effective through October 2019 were counted in Public Housing, and thereafter as Housing Choice Vouchers.

In the following table, Baseline data was taken from PIC system whereas subsequent data was taken from housing software reports. Baseline data is, in fact, under-reported because PIC data showed only the last action in PIC.

The total number of elderly and disabled has increased since baseline, which has caused the number of reviews to steadily increase relative to baseline.

METRIC	BASELINE*	BENCHMARK		OUTCOME		OUTCOME	
Annual Re-Examinations in a 12 month period	August 1, 2007 to July 31, 2008	50% reduction for elderly and disabled households		April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019		April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020	
		Number of Reviews & Percent of Baseline		Number of Reviews & Percent of Baseline		Number of Reviews & Percent of Baseline	
Public Housing							
Elderly Households	61	31	50%	54	88.5%	36	59.0%
Disabled Households	60	30	50%	20	33.3%	19	31.7%
TOTAL	121	61	50.4%	74	61.2%	55	45.5%
		Average over 2 years:				(74 + 55) / 2 = 64.5 reviews	
						53.3%	
Housing Choice Voucher							
Elderly Households	360	180	50%	247	68.6%	302	83.8%
Disabled Households	768	384	50%	481	62.6%	449	58.5%
TOTAL	1,128	564	50.0%	728	64.5%	751	66.6%
		Average over 2 years:				(728 + 751)/2= 739.5 reviews	
						65.6%	

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Other Initiatives 1

ACTIVITY: INCOME ELIGIBILITY

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Programs Affected: HCV & PH Programs

Plan Year Proposed: April 1, 1999

Plan Year Approved: FY 2000

Plan Year Implemented: July 1, 1999

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

All applicants for HUD subsidized units must provide adequate evidence that the household's anticipated annual income for the ensuing twelve month period does not exceed the following income limits based on area median income adjusted for family size:

Public Housing: 50% of median income

Housing Choice Voucher: 50% of median income.

Income targeting will not be used.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

Lincoln Housing Authority is using its MTW authority to waive income targeting standards. Rather than use national income targeting standards, LHA has designed its preference system to fit local needs and local program goals. The preferences LHA selected in public housing, i.e.

working preference, tend to pull average income for new admissions to a higher level than might otherwise occur. Elderly and disabled households also qualify for a “working” preference which can mitigate that affect. On the other hand, the preferences used in the housing choice voucher program tend to bring the overall average income for new admissions to a lower level.

LHA does not measure income targeting on an on-going basis, nor do we alter the order of the waiting list to meet income targeting goals. We did review the admissions for the fiscal year for this report. In the Public Housing and Voucher Programs, 89% of public housing and 100% of voucher new admissions were very low income or extremely low income.

It is reasonable to expect that the voucher program will continue to meet federal targeting standards, given the nature of the preference system. The Public Housing program is smaller and could be prone to yearly changes in income levels due to small variations in the number of vacancies in elderly units vs. family units or the number of disabled families vs. working families.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #1 Income Eligibility				
Baseline agency cost is calculated from the baseline hours in CE#2 Staff Time Savings multiplied by \$27.14 per hour.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	55 hours @ \$27.14 \$1,493	\$0	\$0	Yes, no time spent on income targeting

CE #2 Staff Time Savings

HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Other Initiatives #1 Income Eligibility

Time savings is determined from the extra amount of time to follow income targeting rules when offering a unit.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2014)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task---unit offers for public housing, extra time spent when utilizing income targeting requirements	.82 hours times 67 public housing move-ins. 55 hours	0 hours	0 hours	Yes, no time spent on income targeting.

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

Other Initiatives #1 Income Eligibility				
This metric shows the percentage of households at 3 income levels at the time of admission. A benchmark is established only for extremely low income households.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2014)	Benchmark	Outcome (FY 2020)	Benchmark Achieved
Public Housing Income levels at time of admission				
Extremely Low Income	46.27%	40%	60.71%	Yes
Very Low Income	40.30%		28.57%	
Low Income	13.43%		10.71%	
Housing Choice Voucher Income levels at time of admission (excludes VASH participants)				
Extremely Low Income	86.9%	75%	78.9%	Yes
Very Low Income	13%		21.1%	
Low Income	0%		0%	

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Initiative 2

ACTIVITY: RESPONSIBLE PORTABILITY

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program

Plan Year Proposed: April 1, 1999

Plan Year Approved: FY 2000

Plan Year Implemented: July 1, 1999

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

Voucher participants will be allowed to port out upon request only as a reasonable accommodation for employment, education, safety or medical/disability need.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

The purpose of responsible portability in our MTW program is to reduce costs and prevent families from porting out with their voucher because of our MTW policies. It was anticipated that some families would choose to port out just to avoid the work requirements and other expectations of the MTW program. Portability was allowed for specific reasons as listed above.

Our policy represents a successful implementation of a responsible policy that could be adapted on nationwide basis. Portability represents a difficult and time consuming administrative issue in the voucher program across the country. Allowing HA's to adopt policies that limit ports to verifiable, good cause reasons would improve efficiency in voucher program administration nationwide.

LHA has seen an increase in recent years of waiting list shopping – applicants from other parts of the country applying for a voucher in Lincoln to take back to their home state. Most of the increase in our portability is a result of this practice. Often applicants are working in their home

state, come to Lincoln for a voucher and port back home under the employment exception, in some cases to the same job they had prior to moving.

Note that for the 2019-2020 Plan Year, LHA modified its Administrative Plan and does not permit voucher participants to port-out to housing authorities who's Fair Market Rents exceed the LHA Fair Market Rents unless the receiving PHA will absorb the LHA voucher. This restriction is not applicable in cases of Emergency Transfer outlined in Section XXVIII of the Administrative Plan.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #2 Responsible Portability				
For this metric, we compare the average HAP cost for a port voucher with a local voucher. To determine the baseline, we used a national averaged number of ports to estimate the number of ports we would potentially have if we did not have responsible portability. 11% is the national portability rate and 3% is the national portability billed rate.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome (time tracking and as reported in VMS)	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars	1.422 hours (from CE#2) @ \$27.14= \$38,593 2,916 authorized vouchers at 3% billed portability rate = 88 average per month billed port vouchers at \$901.40 per voucher for 12 months = \$951,878 TOTAL = \$990,471	377 hours @ \$27.14 = \$10,232 60 billed port vouchers at \$1,200.00 per voucher for 12 months = \$864,000 TOTAL = \$874,232	274.66 hours @ \$27.14 = \$7,454 23.58 average per month billed port vouchers at \$1,020 per voucher per month for 12 months = \$288,619 TOTAL = \$296,073	Yes

CE #2 Staff Time Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #2 Responsible Portability				
We conducted a study of the time for administering individual ports multiplied by the estimated number of potential ports if we did not have responsible portability. The PIC Mobility and Portability Report (7/31/13) shows 11% portability in the United States.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Time to complete the task in hours	1,422 hours based on 11% portability rate or 321 per year at 4.43 hours per voucher	377 hours based on 85 ports per year at 4.43 hours per voucher	274.66 hours for 62 port-outs in FY19-20 at 4.43 hours per voucher	Yes

In FY 2014, we did a time study on the amount of administrative time it takes per portable voucher and found the amount of time at 4.43 hours per voucher.

CE #5 Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental revenue in dollars	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
Other Initiatives #2 Responsible Portability				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Rental HCV revenue in dollars—PH Revenue is Not Applicable to this initiative	TOTAL HCV REVENUE: \$7,331,316	TOTAL HCV REVENUE: \$8,701,100	HCV: \$10,855,174 PH: \$1,268,021 TOTAL REVENUE: \$12,123,195	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

Our data below shows the number of formal requests to port out and the number approved. Families are given information about our responsible portability policy, and it is recognized that once people are aware of the policy, fewer formal requests are made.

Other Initiatives #2 Responsible Portability				
The total number of requests will not always match the total number of completed port-outs in a given year. We don’t count the port-out until the family is housed in a new community.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2008)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Percentage of Requests Approved to Port with Voucher---Medical or Disability Requests	9 Approved out of 9 Requests 100%	100%	16 Approved out of 22 Requests 73%	No Unable to verify necessity of denied requests
Percentage of Requests Approved to Port with Voucher---Safety Requests	5 Approved out of 5 Requests 100%	100%	4 Approved out of 6 Requests 67%	No Unable to verify necessity of denied requests
Percentage of Requests Approved to Port with Voucher---Education Requests	1 Approved out of 1 Requests 100%	100%	0 Approved out of 0 Requests 100%	Yes
Percentage of Requests Approved to Port with Voucher---Employment Requests	5 Approved out of 5 Requests 100%	100%	34 Approved out of 34 Requests 100%	Yes
Percentage of Requests Approved to Port with Voucher---Other Requests	0 Approved out of 3 Requests 0%	0%	0 Approved out of 0 Requests 0%	Yes

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Initiative 4

ACTIVITY: HQS INSPECTIONS WAIVER

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program

Plan Year Proposed: November, 2008

Plan Year Approved: FY 2009

Plan Year Implemented: April 1, 2009

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

To encourage participating landlords and tenants to maintain their units in compliance with Housing Quality Standards (HQS), the required annual inspection will be waived for one year if the annual inspection meets 100% HQS upon first inspection at initial or annual inspection. All units will be inspected at least every other year. This initiative will also allow inspections to coincide with the next annual reexamination date rather than HUD's interpretation that inspections be conducted within 365 days of the previous inspection. HUD's interpretation resulted with a schedule of re-inspections every 10 months to ensure compliance with the interpretation of "every 365 days." Special inspections will continue to occur as determined by LHA.

HUD's Request for Tenancy Approval (RFTA) form was modified to satisfactorily implement this inspection incentive initiative. LHA developed a local form, the Request for Inspections and Unit Information form, which is used in lieu of HUD's RFTA form HUD 52517 to make it easier for tenants and landlords to understand and to reflect a city ordinance change that required all landlords to provide all trash services. This local form was created with our Landlord Advisory Committee. The local form can be found in Appendix C.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

This initiative is ongoing since April 1, 2009. LHA is monitoring the impact of this policy through a variety of measurements such as; 1) number of annual voucher program inspections completed, 2) the percentage of annual HQS inspections passing at the first inspection and 3) the number of complaint inspections. Our biggest challenge is to ensure the proper implementation and monitoring of this policy. The reports and data-gathering are cumbersome and time consuming. It is complicated to create a monthly annual inspection schedule because inspections that pass the first time must be identified by the inspection date and last passed inspection date then associated with annual eligibility review dates to determine the correct units to inspect. If the policy was to complete biennial inspections for “all” units regardless of the results of the inspection, it would be much simpler to implement and audit. However, to retain the quality of the units, we believe it is necessary to retain an annual inspection cycle for some properties.

The inspection waiver policy no longer needs a Moving to Work waiver as the HCV voucher program rules have changed in a final rule published on March 8, 2016 in the Federal Register number 5743-F-03. However the use of the modified Request for Tenancy Approval form and the ability to coincide annual inspections with recertification dates does require a waiver.

The inspection waiver policy continues to have positive impact on the voucher program by providing administrative cost savings to LHA, and improving our community’s housing stock. This inspection policy allowed LHA to reduce the number of annual inspections performed by 44%. LHA uses this time savings to increase the average time spent on performing an annual inspection by 33%. The increased inspection time allowed inspectors an opportunity to properly educate both the tenant and landlord on maintaining quality units, and allowed for more thorough HQS inspections to be performed. With this initiative, we were able to increase the average annual inspection time from 15 minutes to 20 minutes per unit. Part of the increased time was to implement HUD Notice 2010-10, which required our inspector’s to test electrical outlets for “proper operating condition.” The time savings also allowed our inspectors additional time to assist other local affordable housing projects with unit inspections.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #4 HQS Inspections Waiver				
Agency cost is based on the number of inspection hours at a staff cost per hour of \$28.88.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task	3,042 hours @ \$28.88 per hour = \$87,853	2,000 hours @ \$28.88 per hour = \$57,760	1,801 hours @ \$28.88 per hour = \$52,013	Yes

CE #2 Staff Time Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #4 HQS Inspections Waiver				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete inspections	3,042 annual inspections @ 1 hour per inspection 3,042 hours	2,000 annual inspections @ 1 hour per inspection 2,000 hours	1,801 annual inspections @ 1 hour per inspection 1,801 hours	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

Other Initiatives #4 HQS Inspections Waiver				
For this initiative, we projected a 25% reduction in total inspections from baseline. This initiative has an incentive in the form of a waiver for the next annual inspection if the tenant has remained the same and the unit had 100% HQS compliance for the annual or initial “pick up” inspection. If at any time the unit requires a special inspection, the inspection incentive is revoked and the unit must have an annual inspection completed by the tenant’s next annual re-examination date.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (FY 2010)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of		25% reduction from Baseline		
-Annual Inspections	3,042	2,000	1,801	
-Initial Inspections	825	1,200	1,216	
-Special Inspections	44	44	20	
TOTAL INSPECTIONS (decrease)	3,911	3,244 (667 decrease)	3,037	Yes
Number of units that passed on first inspection	2,034	1,687	1,783	Yes
Percentage of units that passed on first inspection	52%	52%	58.7%	Yes

Previously, we anticipated special inspections would go up significantly as we thought we would have more tenant complaints about the landlord not fixing defects. The result was the opposite; special inspections decreased from baseline by 55% in FY20.

The pass rate was 52% for FY2010 when units were annually inspected in comparison to 58.7% pass rate for FY2020 when a combination of units were inspected annually and biennially. In addition, we gathered data on the pass/fail rate for biennial unit inspections. The chart below indicates that skipping annual inspections does not have a significant impact on the quality of the unit or increase the failure rate at first inspection. Indeed, the results showed that the units inspected biennially are much more likely to be in good condition and pass inspection, while the units inspected annually are much more likely to fail initial inspection. This system has proven to be an objective and reasonable way to target problem properties.

Inspection results comparing biennial inspections to annual inspections

	April 2019 - March 2020 Percent inspections passing at First Inspection	Number of annual/biennial inspections during fiscal year	Number of inspections that passed first time
Biennial (skipped) Inspections	69%	723	498
Annual Inspections (not previously skipped)	43.1%	1,078	465

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

Vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Initiative 5

ACTIVITY: INSPECTIONS & RENT REASONABLENESS

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program

Plan Year Proposed: November, 2010

Plan Year Approved: FY 2012

Plan Year Implemented: April 1, 2011

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

LHA will perform all Inspections and Rent Reasonableness determinations on all tenant and project-based voucher units regardless of ownership of property management status including those that are owned or managed by LHA.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

LHA performs inspections and rent reasonableness determinations on the property owned or managed by LHA. This initiative has eliminated the administrative work and cost of acquiring and maintaining a contract to perform inspections and rent reasonableness determinations. Cutting out an additional step improves administrative efficiencies, eliminates confusion for the voucher participant, and improves the response time for performing inspections. LHA properties are generally in better condition than the average rental units participating in the voucher program. Our most recent report showed 84% of LHA properties passed at first inspection compared to 58.7% for all voucher properties. For 2019-2020, cost savings by not hiring an outside contractor was estimated at \$7,244.

LHA has always inspected LHA-owned or managed properties under Public Housing, Tax Credit and Section 8 New Construction programs. The inspection audits including REAC inspections

resulted in high scores and no significant findings

We did not expect any adverse impacts by implementing this activity. LHA maintains an internal check and balance system to ensure the quality and safety within their managed or owned property. This check and balance has been created through a segregation of duties. LHA has established seven departments and managers for each department. Specifically the Tenant-Based Department is responsible for the voucher program compliance while the Project-Based Department is responsible for maintaining and leasing LHA units. The segregation of duties allows the Tenant-Based department the ability to enforce HQS and rent reasonableness policies at the same level and effectiveness as working with a private landlord.

Eliminating the requirement to contract for these services also eliminated the administrative time in creating, advertising and monitoring outside contractors. In the past, LHA had been unable to find any expert in the community to perform these services or to perform them in a timely manner.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #5 Inspections and Rent Reasonableness				
Baseline cost is the contract cost calculated as a product of the number of inspections on LHA-owned or managed properties at \$50 per inspection. LHA's cost to do the same inspections is based on 1 hour per inspection @28.88 per hour.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline (10-1-09 to 9-30-10)	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task	256 inspections at \$50 per inspection \$12,800	633 inspections @1 hour @ \$28.88 per hour \$18,281	343 inspections @1 hour @ \$28.88 per hour \$9,906	Yes

CE #2 Staff Time Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #5 Inspections and Rent Reasonableness				
This metric is the number of staff hours to complete the inspections of LHA-owned or managed properties. The baseline shows 0 staff hours when inspections are done by contract inspectors on a fee basis per inspection				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total staff hours to complete the task.	0 staff hours for inspections with contract inspectors----fee per inspection	633 inspections @ 1 hour per inspection = 633 hours	343 inspections @ 1 hour per inspection = 343 hours	Yes

CE #3 Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
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
Other Initiatives #5 Inspections and Rent Reasonableness				
Error rates for inspections are neither tracked nor applicable so there is no baseline or benchmark data. This outcome measure will be reported as 0%. The metric does not apply to inspections.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Average error rate in completing inspections	0%	0%	0%	YES

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

Other Initiatives #5 Inspections and Rent Reasonableness				
With this measurement, we are looking to see if LHA owned or managed properties maintain a higher first-time pass rate on inspections compared to non-owned or non-managed properties.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Owned or managed properties will maintain a higher first time pass rate compared to the pass rate of non-owned or non-managed properties	121 out of 186 owned or managed properties pass inspection on the first time 65%	53% (voucher first time pass rate)	287out of 343 owned or managed properties pass inspection on the first time 84%	Yes

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Initiative 6

ACTIVITY: PROJECT-BASED SECTION 8 UNITS

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program

Project-based units through other competitive process:

Plan Year Proposed: FY 2010

Plan Year Implemented: Pending receipt of a viable application

Project-based units LHA owned or managed properties:

Plan Year Proposed: FY 2013

Plan Year Approved: FY 2013

Plan Year Implemented: FY 2013 to FY 2016

Statutory Objective: Increase housing choice for low income families

Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

The Moving to Work waivers being used are: 1) to transition LHA owned or managed units into Section 8 project-based assistance without a competitive bid, 2) allow the project-based sites to maintain a site-based waiting list, 3) allow the 25% unit allocation per project cap be removed, 4) allow unit amendments to the project-based HAP contract beyond the three year limit in order to add units not initially included, 5) eliminate the requirement to furnish a copy of each inspection report to the HUD field office, 6) allow zero HAP participants to occupy a unit indefinitely and the unit will remain designated as a project-based unit under contract, 7) implement the utility allowances in accordance with Rent Reform #5, 8) allow LHA to perform the functions of rent reasonableness determinations, HQS inspections, and enter into agreements to the terms of the HAP contract without the need for an independent entity for LHA-owned units, and 9) Adjust some rent requirements for public housing conversions to project-based vouchers.

For tenants with zero HAP, if the tenant's income decreases, we will reinstate HAP payments. A zero HAP tenant will be eligible to move with a voucher in accordance with Housing Choice Voucher regulations. LHA complies with Housing Quality Standards, subsidy layering requirements, and other federal requirements regarding project-based assistance as set forth in Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Project-based units through other competitive process:

LHA may project-base an additional 20 vouchers to serve the disabled through an "other competitive" process. Under MTW, LHA will allow the selected project-based site to maintain a separate site-based wait list. In a cooperative effort with the local Veterans Administration, LHA was awarded additional VASH Vouchers to be project-based. This project, Victory Park Apartments, was developed and ready for occupancy on December 1, 2017. The HAP contract was signed December 1, 2017. There was a conversion of 25 tenant-based HUD-VASH vouchers to project-based vouchers for this project.

Project-based units LHA owned or managed properties:

LHA will provide project-based Section 8 assistance to property owned or managed by LHA, without a competitive bid. Site selection for LHA owned or managed property will be based on the need to increase, 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.

Public Housing conversion to PBV properties

LHA will operate Public Housing converted PBV developments in accordance with the HUD requirements, the MTW Agreement, and LHA's MTW Plan, including the provision that LHA will conduct inspections and determine rent reasonableness for these vouchers.

LHA will calculate rent in the following way for tenants whose Total Tenant Payment (TTP) equals or exceeds the Gross Rent for the unit (Zero HAP tenants) in RAD developments.

Mahoney Manor. Both existing tenants (pre-RAD conversion) and new tenants (post-RAD conversion) will pay rent based on their TTP up to the Gross Rent for the unit. Zero HAP tenants will continue to pay the Gross Rent for the unit indefinitely until their income decreases or the Gross Rent increases to a point where they qualify for HAP again. A tenant's portion of rent will not increase above the RAD PBV Gross Rent for the unit.

Rent Phase-in/Hardship Policy: We have developed the following phase-in of potential rent increases for households whose TTP exceeded the 2018 public housing ceiling rents at the time of conversion. At the first scheduled annual or biennial recertification following conversion, existing tenants at time of conversion will pay no more than the 2018 ceiling rent plus \$25.00.

At the second scheduled annual or biennial recertification following conversion, existing tenants at time of conversion will pay no more than the 2018 ceiling rent plus \$50.00. At the third scheduled annual or biennial recertification following conversion, existing tenants at time of conversion will pay up to the gross rent at the time of the recertification. This applies to all conversions from public housing to PBV.

Recertification Cycles: Upon conversion from public housing to project-based vouchers, the family's last public housing annual or interim income recertification will serve as the initial certification for the voucher program. The family will remain on the same annual or biennial review cycle and schedule. This applies to all conversions from public housing to PBV.

Utility Allowances. LHA will continue to calculate unit-based utility allowances for converted Public Housing units rather than use the single Voucher utility allowance under Rent Reform Initiative #5. This will minimize disruption in the rent calculation for in-place public housing residents converting to vouchers.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

Project-based units through other competitive process:

LHA will continue to accept applications through an “other competitive process” to project base a maximum of 20 units for persons with disabilities. A previous application submitted on May 25, 2011 was not approved because it failed the environmental review. No applications were received in FY 2020.

LHA accepted a HUD-VASH project based voucher application for a new 70 unit development for homeless veterans on the Lincoln VA campus. The “other competitive process” was the VA’s selection process for an enhanced use lease agreement. LHA executed the Housing Assistance Payment Contract (HAP) for this project on December 1, 2017. All 70 units were ready for occupancy on December 1, 2017 and leasing started the same day. This development is part of the broader redevelopment of the VA campus.

As of July 17, 2015, the HUD Voucher Office has already authorized LHA to use 15 different MTW alternative requirements when administering HUD-VASH vouchers. LHA received additional approval on July 6, 2017 for additional flexibility to allow the HUD-VASH project-based voucher site maintain their site-based waiting list and allow the standard MTW utility allowance be used when calculating the tenant’s rent portion.

Project-based units LHA owned or managed properties

LHA signed a contract effective July 1, 2012 to phase-in the project-based assistance at Crossroads House during a three-year period. The phase-in period allowed the opportunity to maintain 100% leasing without undue hardship on the voucher program budget and leasing requirements and prevented the displacement of any households over the 50% median income limit. The phase-in period has been completed.

Crossroads House Apartments is elderly apartment complex with 58 one-bedroom units located in the heart of Lincoln's downtown, 1000 O Street, Lincoln, Nebraska. Since Crossroads House is a "tax credit" project, the definition of elderly is defined as 55 years or older so residents must meet that age requirement to be eligible. The income eligibility limit for Crossroads House was set at the voucher program limit of 50% of median income rather than the tax credit limit of 60% median income. LHA chose a three-year transition period to complete 100% project-based allocation at the Crossroads House. The three-year transition period, from the original executed HAP contract, prevented the displacement of 60% median income households who were currently residing in the Crossroads House apartments. The transition period also allowed the opportunity to maintain 100% voucher leasing without undue hardship on the voucher program budget and allocation requirements. At the end of the fiscal year, 58 units are project-based units.

Public Housing Conversion to PBV Properties

LHA completed the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program conversion of Mahoney Manor to project-based vouchers as of October 1, 2019. Ownership of the property was transferred to a controlled affiliate non-profit, Lincoln Public Housing, Inc. HUD awarded new voucher funding for all 120 units beginning January 1, 2020. The new RAD vouchers remain under the Moving To Work Program.

LHA continues planning for the conversion of the remaining 200 scattered site public housing units and intends to submit a Section 18 disposition application to HUD. Like Mahoney Manor, ownership of the properties would be transferred to Lincoln Public Housing, Inc and most units will have project-based vouchers. All units will remain available as quality affordable housing in Lincoln.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #1 Agency Cost Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity in (dollars).	Expected cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #6 Project-Based Section 8 Units				
The baseline cost for this initiative is the anticipated cost for issuing a Request for Proposals (FRP) including preparation, advertising, review, and selection.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total cost of task	165 hours @ \$50 per hour = \$8,250	\$0	\$0	Yes

CE #2 Staff Time Savings				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #6 Project-Based Section 8 Units				
The baseline cost for this metric is the anticipated staff time for issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) including preparation, application review, and selection.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Total anticipated time for issuing a Request for Proposals	RFP Development =75 staff hours Application Review = 30 hours times 3 applications = 90 hours Total staff hours = 165	RFP Development = 0 hours Application Review = 0 hours Total staff hours = 0	RFP Development = 0 hours Application Review = 0 hours Total staff hours = 0	Yes

HC #5 Increase in Resident Mobility

HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Other Initiatives #6 Project-Based Section 8 Units

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of Move-ins to Project-based units at Crossroads House	0	8	8	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD's Standard metrics.

Other Initiatives #6 Project-Based Section 8 Units

The plan is to accomplish the transition to 100% project-based units at Crossroads House over a 3 year period. The table below shows our plan (benchmark) and progress (outcome) toward that goal.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Project-Based Units at Crossroads House	0 units	58 units	58 units	Yes

Other Initiatives #6 Project-Based Section 8 Units

This metric shows the impact from project-basing vouchers in an elderly designated complex to create and preserve affordable housing opportunities for elderly households.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of Elderly Households with Voucher Assistance	FY 2011 (point in time) 372 12.9% of total vouchers	390	760 25.4 % of total vouchers	Yes
Number of Disabled Households with Voucher Assistance	FY 2011 (point in time) 964 33.4% of total vouchers	984	1,182 39.5% of total vouchers	Yes

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Initiative 7

ACTIVITY: RENTWISE TENANT EDUCATION

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program

Plan Year Proposed: November, 2010

Plan Year Approved: FY 2012

Plan Year Implemented: October 1, 2011

Statutory Objective: Increase housing choice for low income families
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

Lincoln Housing Authority is using combined MTW funds to support Nebraska RentWise, a tenant education program. This activity serves only households under 80% AMI and is related to the MTW objective of increasing housing choices for low-income families by providing training and education.

RentWise is a structured curriculum to educate renters on responsibilities necessary to become successful tenants with stable housing. Lincoln Housing Authority formed a collaborative group, the Lincoln RentWise Network consisting of representatives from an array of human service agencies in the Lincoln community. Network members identified the need for the program because of the common knowledge that many low income families had great difficulty obtaining rental housing because of past problems. Those problems include rental or credit history, lack of experience (first time renters), stigmas associated with rental assistance programs, or other issues that cause potential landlords to see them as high-risk tenants.

Using the RentWise curriculum, certified trainers teaches the knowledge and skills to be a successful renter and the issues that lead to problems for tenants. The RentWise curriculum teaches participants how to secure and maintain safe and affordable rental housing. The six-module program is offered at no cost to participants and covers topics such as how to take care of and maintain the rental unit; how to improve communication and reduce conflict between tenants and landlords; how to improve the rental experience, manage money, and information on legal

rights and responsibilities. The 12 hour curriculum uses lectures, workbooks, worksheets, demonstrations, and question & answer formats.

The Lincoln RentWise Network offers the six module educational series at least twice per month during both day and evening hours at a central location with city bus service. Lincoln Housing Authority provides coordination for registration, materials, interpreters, scheduling, tracking, and issuing certificates of completion.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

The RentWise program is expected to assist low-income tenants in becoming more successful renters or housing assistance program participants. Their success as a renter will expand their housing opportunities as they improve their credit history and/or rental history. The program also teaches renters the ability make educated decisions about finding and maintaining affordable and suitable housing.

This activity was implemented October 1, 2011. Each twelve hour series is scheduled over three days and each series is scheduled at least two times per month. The program allows for 60 registrants per session and sessions are currently scheduled several months in advance. The number of classes offered is sufficient to meet the registration requests. RentWise is a pre-housing activity and participants are determined as income-eligible for RentWise based on self-declaration of income.

The program has been very well received by tenants and landlords. Some landlords offer incentives to RentWise graduates such as waiver of application fee, reduced deposit, or special consideration in their application. LHA offers a secondary preference for the voucher program for RentWise graduates.

LHA has had increased requests for interpreters for the RentWise program. In order to more efficiently use interpreters and manage costs as well as reduce the distractions of having interpreters in a classroom setting, LHA has obtained local grants for specialized equipment to be used by interpreters and participants.

In the fiscal year ending March 31, 2020, 500 households attended one or more sessions and 376 households completed the RentWise program. Studies in the field of housing and the use of vouchers show that one of the biggest impediments to increasing housing choice, decreasing concentrated poverty and expanding housing opportunities is the knowledge base of the tenant, their understanding of the rental market, and their connections to the community. The RentWise program improves the knowledge base and thereby increases housing choice.

An analysis conducted in 2020 by the City of Lincoln's Urban Development Department of the city's eviction records and LHA's Rentwise and HCV data showed a correlation between

graduation from RentWise and a reduction in the likelihood of being evicted. The city’s four-year eviction rate average for all renters was 2.3%. For individuals who had graduated from RentWise it was 1.0%. For individuals who were both RentWise graduates and a Housing Choice Voucher holder, the four-year average was 0.7%.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

CE #4 Increase in Resources Leveraged				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #7 RentWise Tenant Education				
Leveraged funds are calculated from in-kind contributions of meeting space at \$240 per RentWise session and in-kind contributions of trainers from other human services agencies at \$27.14 per hour and 12 hours per session times the number of sessions. Note that in our plan we had planned to revise the benchmark to \$29.22 per hour. Once into the plan year, we determined that it is better to maintain the hourly rate of \$27.14.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Amount of Funds Leveraged	\$0	In kind meeting space at \$240 per session and in kind trainers @ \$27.14 per hour—12 hours per session and 24 sessions per year \$13,584	In kind meeting space at \$240 per session @ 29 sessions = \$6,960 In kind trainers @ \$27.14 per hour—12 hours= \$325.68 per session @ 29 sessions= \$9,444.72 per year TOTAL = \$16,404.72	Yes

HC #7 Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase)	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

Other Initiatives #7 RentWise Tenant Education				
The data for this metric is the number of RentWise registrants who participate in one or more training sessions.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of Households participating in RentWise	0	500	500	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

Other Initiatives #7 RentWise Tenant Education		
Data for this initiative is number of households who register, attend, and complete RentWise.		
	Registered in RentWise Database	RentWise Graduates
Partial Year 8-2008 to 3-2009)	130	65
FY 2010	988	390
FY 2011	1,272	555
FY 2012	1,393	580
FY 2013	1,178	594
FY 2014	857	423
FY 2015	1,337	675
FY 2016	1,383	758
FY 2017	1,496	691
FY 2018	1,160	707
FY 2019	827	553
FY 2020	961	376
Totals FY 2010 to 2020	12,982	6,302
Average FY 2010 to 2020	1.180	573
RentWise Graduates as a percent of Registrations		48.5%

Other Initiatives #7 RentWise Tenant Education				
MTW funds are used in this initiative to fund certain costs of RentWise---language interpretation, postage, brochures and printing manuals. The benchmark is revised annually through the LHA budget.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline = Budget	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Cost of RentWise Program is within the Budget				
Interpretation	\$8,200	\$9,500	\$8,325	
Brochures	\$400	\$500	\$509	
Postage	\$2,000	\$2,100	\$1,022	
Training Manuals	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$5,200	
TOTAL COST of RENTWISE PROGRAM	\$13,800	\$15,300	\$15,056	Yes

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

There were no changes to the HUD metrics but we revised the Additional Local Metrics to show the RentWise registrations and graduations over the years.

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Initiative 8

ACTIVITY: RESIDENT SERVICES PROGRAM

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program
Plan Year Proposed: November, 2010
Plan Year Approved: FY 2012
Plan Year Implemented: October 1, 2011
Statutory Objectives: Increase housing choice for low income families

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

The resident services program provides outreach, case management, service coordination, and supportive services to tenants who are frail elderly or disabled and residing at Crossroads House apartments. Through an interlocal agreement, the program is operated by the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging (LAAA). This activity serves only households under 80% AMI and is related to the MTW objective of increasing housing choices for low-income families by providing a supportive services program which will allow residents to remain independent and prevent premature or unnecessary placement in assisted living facilities or nursing homes.

The resident services program is modeled after HUD's Congregate Housing Services Program which LAAA (grantee) currently offers at LHA's Burke Plaza (91 units) and Mahoney Manor (120 units). All residents are eligible for outreach, case management and service coordination. Residents who are frail with 3 or more deficits in Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) or who are disabled are eligible for supportive services which include personal care, housekeeping, and transportation subsidy. Participation in services by residents is not mandatory and is at the option of the resident. Individual supportive services under the contract are limited by an amount established annually.

A Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) reviews an assessment of each potential participant in supportive services to ensure each participant is an elderly person deficient in at least three ADLs or is a disabled individual.

A service coordinator provides general case management and referral services to all potential participants in the program and provides referrals to the PAC of those individuals who appear eligible for the program. The service coordinator educates residents about the services available and application procedures, assists in applications, and monitors ongoing services. The service coordinator also coordinates the delivery of third party purchased supportive services for residents who are ineligible for the program supportive services in order to establish a continuum of care and assures access to necessary supportive services.

The LAAA contracts with qualified providers to furnish participants with supportive services including personal care, transportation, and housekeeping services. These three services are provided and funded as part of the program. MTW funds are used to provide reimbursement to LAAA under the interlocal agreement.

Personnel costs for the service coordinator are reimbursed at 100% for .35 FTE to serve Crossroads House. Supportive services are reimbursed at 75% with the remaining 25% billed to the participant receiving services. There is an annual limitation on individual supportive services to the program with an initial cap set at \$2,000 and adjusted annually as needed.

The resident services program is enhanced by the location of the downtown senior center located directly across the street from Crossroads House. This location affords easy access to the programs operated by the LAAA at the senior center which include education, recreation, social activities, health activities, and nutritional programs including a daily noon meal. This location also affords easy access to the service coordinator office and program administration, also located at the senior center site.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

LHA continued this initiative in the past year through an interlocal agreement with Lincoln Area Agency on Aging. Outreach was provided to all residents with 58 residents receiving ongoing service coordination in the program. During the 12 month period, there were 65 tenants living at Crossroads House and 41 who were frail elderly or disabled. There were 21 individuals who were at high risk for a higher level of service but were able to continue in independent living with supportive services. Fifty-eight (58) residents received case management services and sixteen (16) individuals received one or more of the supportive services with MTW funding. This results in substantial savings of Medicaid dollars to remain in independent living versus assisted living or nursing home care.

Through service coordination, 30 residents also received assistance with services not funded under this program. The service coordinator spends considerable time explaining services and benefits to residents and families and communicating and problem solving with service agencies,

physicians, and other health care providers and building managers. New problem situations arise regularly and they are addressed quickly. The service coordinator works with residents who are hospitalized or have temporary nursing home stays that require a plan with supportive services for when they return home.

The services increase housing choice by providing the choice to continue to live in an independent apartment and age in place. Typically, when individuals become more frail or disabled, they require a higher level of care and individuals often have little or no choice but to move to whatever assisted living or nursing home is available. With in-home support services, individuals are able to choose to continue to live independently. Low income applicants are attracted to this type of housing because it gives them the choice to continue to live independently because an array of services will be available as their needs change.

The services are cost effective by helping maintain individuals in their home and prevent unnecessary higher levels of care at substantial additional cost. Generally, the cost of higher levels of care is paid with Medicaid funds as the Crossroads House tenants do not have income, assets or insurance to cover the cost.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

HC #7 Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase)	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
Other Initiatives #8 Resident Services Program				
The Lincoln Housing Authority has an interlocal agreement with the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging (LAAA) to provide frail or disabled tenants. By providing these services, LHA is able to increase housing choice for tenants and prospective tenants.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households receiving services	0	35	58	Yes

ADDITIONAL LOCAL METRICS

Local metrics are provided to give additional view of the impact of the initiative. In most, but not all cases, the local metric follows the format prescribed by HUD’s Standard metrics.

Other Initiatives #8 Resident Services Program				
Through the interlocal agreement, Lincoln Housing Authority established limits on the overall cost of the program. The limit is the benchmark which may be revised annually during contract renewal. The benchmark is revised annually.				
Unit of Measurement	Contract Amount = Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Cost of Resident Services Program	\$41,884	Less than or equal to \$41,884	\$ 34,219	Yes

Other Initiatives #8 Resident Services Program				
Lincoln Area Agency on Aging provides a conservative estimate of the Medicaid cost if services were provided at the next level of care. The estimate is based on Medicaid Waiver Assisted Living costs although some individuals may not be suitable or able to find assisted living and would be forced to a skilled nursing care facility at substantial additional cost. The estimate is individualized and adjusted to the length of time the individual would have been in a higher level of care as well as the residents’ actual incomes which would be used to cover part of the cost in assisted living at the Medicaid rate.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Estimated Medicaid cost savings by avoiding the next higher level of care (assisted living)	\$135,501	>\$135,000	\$269,611	Yes

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

Initiative 9

ACTIVITY: LANDLORD INCENTIVE HAP

i. PLAN YEAR APPROVED, IMPLEMENTED, AMENDED

Program Affected: HCV Program
Plan Year Proposed: FY 2015
Plan Year Approved: FY 2015
Plan Year Implemented: April 1, 2015
Statutory Objective: Increase housing choice for low income families

ii. DESCRIPTION/IMPACT/UPDATE

As an incentive for landlords to participate in the MTW tenant-based voucher program, Lincoln Housing Authority will provide the landlord a one-time additional Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) of \$150 upon the execution of the HAP contract for the new unit and tenant. This HAP payment will be included with all other HAP reported in VMS. The landlord is not eligible for \$150 additional HAP payment if the contract is executed for a transfer in units with the same landlord, or if the contract is executed due to a lease renewal or change. The following properties are also excluded from the additional landlord incentive payment of \$150: 1) properties managed or owned by Lincoln Housing Authority, or 2) properties receiving Low Income Housing Tax Credits.

This initiative came from discussions with our Landlord Advisory Committee who identified some of the following burden factors to participating in the voucher program: 1) the HAP contract creates additional paperwork and time, 2) inspection requirements result in repairs to units not otherwise required for a market-rate tenant, 3) landlords take time out of their business schedule to meet with inspectors for HQS inspections, 4) landlords must wait for their first rental payment until after inspections and contracts are approved rather than on the day the lease is signed, and 5) landlords lose rental revenue while waiting for units to pass inspections. This initiative creates an incentive that recognizes these barriers and compensates the landlords accordingly.

The Landlord Incentive was increased to \$200 with the approval of the FY21 MTW Plan. The impact of this increase will be reflected in the next annual report.

IMPACT AND OUTCOME

A goal of this initiative was to maintain or increase the number of landlords participating in the voucher program. Given the tight rental market in Lincoln, landlord participation has been decreasing which has made it more difficult for voucher holders to obtain affordable housing. Additional goals were to increase the success rate for vouchers issued and shorten the time it takes to lease a voucher. Prior to the implementation of the Landlord HAP Incentive, 60% of the vouchers issued were leased. Current data shows 72.2% of the vouchers issued were leased. Since the implementation of the Landlord incentive, the voucher success rate improved by 12.2 percentage points. The improvements with the voucher leasing success rate are quite impressive considering the Lincoln rental market continues to be a very tight rental market. If this incentive had not been implemented, it is quite possible the success rates would have decreased because many landlords use stricter selection criteria when the rental market experiences low vacancy rates.

Another goal was to improve landlord participation in the voucher program. Lincoln continues to experience a tight rental market and it is difficult to retain current landlords and recruit new landlords. The goal to maintain or increase the number of landlords participating in the voucher program was achieved increasing the number of landlords actively participating in the voucher program from 747 in October 2014 to 766 in March 2020. Given the tight rental market in Lincoln that is a major accomplishment for this program.

Forty-seven (47) new landlords were added to the program from April 2019 to March 2020 and received the landlord incentive. Another 12 landlords who received the landlord incentive reinstated their participation with the program after an absence of participation for over a year. Altogether, 437 landlords received the incentive for a total of 492 units.

HUD STANDARD METRICS

For this initiative, LHA is using the following standard metrics from Form 50900:

HC #5 Increase in Resident Mobility				
HUD instructions for this metric are shown in the following two rows:				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of this activity (increase)	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.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Other Initiatives #9 Landlord Incentive HAP				
The number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity is reflected in the number of times the HAP incentive is paid to a landlord---this incorporates the assumption that transfers and new admissions result in a better unit or neighborhood of opportunity.				
This benchmark was revised in the 2016-2017 plan after considering the number of moves into tax credit and LHA properties which are not eligible for the landlord incentive.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of this activity (increase)	0 units	240 units	492 units	Yes

iii. ACTUAL NON-SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

iv. ACTUAL CHANGES TO METRICS/DATA COLLECTION

None

v. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO ACTIVITY

None

vi. CHALLENGES IN ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES

None

B: NOT YET IMPLEMENTED

All approved activities have been implemented.

C: ON HOLD

All approved activities have been implemented.

D: CLOSED OUT

No approved activities have been closed out.

V. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

A. ACTUAL SOURCE AND USES OF MTW FUNDS

i. Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

The unaudited information will be submitted in the prescribed Financial Data Schedule (FDS) format through the Financial Assessment System. The audited information is due within 9 months of the end of the fiscal year and will be submitted accordingly.

ii. Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

The unaudited information will be submitted in the prescribed Financial Data Schedule (FDS) format through the Financial Assessment System. The audited information is due within 9 months of the end of the fiscal year and will be submitted accordingly.

iii. Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

Activities using the broader uses of funds authority are reported in Section IV: Approved MTW Activities. These include:

Initiative 7 RentWise Tenant Education

Initiative 8 Resident Services Program

B. LOCAL ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

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

YES

ii. Did the MTW PHA implement a local asset management plan 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.

NOT APPLICABLE

VI. Administrative

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

HUD conducted an MTW site visit in September, 2018. There were no actions required following the site visit.

HUD conducted a PBV review in December, 2018 for Victory Park. There were no actions required following the site visit.

B. Evaluation results

None---Not Applicable

C. MTW Statutory Certification Requirement

Appendix A

D. MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data

Not applicable

E. LHA Request and HUD Approval Letters Regarding VASH under MTW

Appendix B

F. Request for Inspection and Unit Information Form

Appendix C