

**Louisville Metro Housing Authority**

# **Moving to Work Annual Report**

**Fiscal Year 2017**

**July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017**

First Submission to HUD: April 10, 2018  
Second Submission to HUD: November 5, 2018



**Louisville Metro Housing Authority**  
**MTW Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2017**  
**Table of Contents**

---

I. Introduction and Overview .....	1
A. Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration Program Overview .....	1
B. MTW Activity Overview .....	2
C. MTW Short and Long Term Goals and Objectives .....	6
II. General Housing Authority Operating Information .....	12
A. Housing Stock Information.....	12
B. Leasing Information.....	15
C. Wait List Information.....	18
III. Proposed MTW Activities .....	20
IV. Approved MTW Activities .....	22
A. Implemented MTW Activities .....	22
A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments.....	22
A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration).....	24
A.3 HUD/MDRC HVC Rent Reform Demonstration .....	38
A.4 Public Housing Development .....	48
A.5 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities .....	52
A.6 Local Leased Housing Program .....	58
A.7 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs.....	71
B. Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities .....	75
C. MTW Activities On-Hold .....	76
D. Closed Out MTW Activities .....	77
V. Sources and Uses of Funds .....	82
A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	82
B. Local Asset Management Plan.....	83
C. Commitment of Unspent Funds .....	83
VI. Administrative .....	84
A. HUD Reviews, Audits, and Physical Inspection Issues .....	84
B. PHA-Directed Evaluations.....	84
C. Certification of Conformance with MTW Statutory Requirements.....	84

# **I. Introduction and Overview**

---

The Louisville Metro Housing Authority, formerly known as the Housing Authority of Louisville, is a nonprofit agency responsible for the development and management of federally assisted housing in the Louisville Metro area. In 2003, Louisville Metro Mayor Jerry Abramson and the Louisville Metro Council approved the merger of the Housing Authority of Louisville and Housing Authority of Jefferson County, thereby creating the Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA). A nine-member Board of Commissioners, appointed by the Metro Mayor, serves as the policy making body of the agency. LMHA administers rent assistance for approximately 4,000 families through its Public Housing Program and more than 9,000 families through its Section 8 programs.

## **A. Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration Program Overview**

LMHA, then the Housing Authority of Louisville, became one of a small group of public housing agencies designated to participate in the Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration Program in 1999. The MTW Program, authorized by Congress and signed into law as part of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996, provides public housing agencies (PHAs) with the flexibility to design and test innovative, locally-designed housing and self-sufficiency strategies for low-income families. The program allows waivers of certain existing low-income public housing (Section 9) and Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) regulations and statutory provisions, and permits LMHA to combine public housing operating and capital funds, along with Housing Choice Voucher rental assistance funds, into a single agency-wide MTW Block Grant.

The terms and conditions of LMHA's participation in the MTW Program are defined in the MTW Agreement between LMHA and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The current MTW Agreement extends through 2028.

Under the MTW Program, LMHA creates and adopts an MTW Annual Plan that describes new and ongoing activities that utilize authority granted to LMHA under its MTW Agreement with HUD. Following a public comment period, a public hearing and approval by LMHA's Board, HUD approved LMHA's MTW Annual Plan for Fiscal Year 2017, which covers the period from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017, on October 6, 2016.

At the close of each Fiscal Year, LMHA is required to prepare and submit to HUD an MTW Annual Report that provides an update on the status and outcomes of those activities included in the MTW Annual Plan. This document is LMHA's MTW Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2017.

### **MTW Statutory Objectives**

Under the MTW demonstration, LMHA's MTW activities must support at least one of the following three MTW statutory objectives:

- Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures;

- Give incentives to residents, especially families with children, to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient; and
- Increase housing choices for low-income families.

As part of the Annual Plan and Report processes, LMHA is required to specify and report on HUD-determined baseline and benchmark metrics for each MTW activity.

## **Long Term MTW Plan**

LMHA believes that MTW designation provides an important set of tools that can be utilized to support the agency's mission, which is to provide quality, affordable housing for those in need, to assist residents in their efforts to achieve financial independence, and to work with the community to strengthen neighborhoods.

At the inception of LMHA's designation as an MTW agency, LMHA carefully evaluated its own goals and objectives, comparing them to those of the demonstration. The outcome of this process was the development of six long-term goals for LMHA's participation in the MTW program. These goals, as outlined in the FY 1999 Annual MTW Plan, are locally-determined refinements of HUD's statutory objectives:

1. Increase the share of residents moving toward self-sufficiency;
2. Achieve a greater income mix at LMHA properties;
3. Expand the spatial dispersal of assisted housing;
4. Improve the quality of the assisted housing stock;
5. Reduce and/or reallocate administrative, operational and/or maintenance costs; and
6. Enhance the Housing Authority's capacity to plan and deliver effective programs.

Over the course of its participation in MTW, LMHA has recognized a growing number of populations with specific needs that often go unmet by existing housing and support service infrastructure. The agency has revised and updated its goals to reflect changes in the local community and the evolution of the MTW demonstration into a performance-driven program. In addition to the goals above, LMHA has added a seventh goal to develop programs and housing stock targeted to populations with special needs, especially those families not adequately served elsewhere in the community.

## **B. MTW Activity Overview**

An MTW activity is defined as any activity LMHA engages in that requires MTW flexibility to waive statutory or regulatory requirements.

During FY 2017, LMHA proposed, HUD approved and LMHA implemented two new MTW activities:

- Activity #46-2017: MTW Special Referral Program – Riverport Scholar House

- Activity #47-2017: MTW Special Referral Program – ChooseWell Communities

A complete list of LMHA’s MTW activities (along with their current status) is shown on Table 1.

**Table 1: Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix**

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
47	2017	MTW Special Referral Program – ChooseWell Communities	Implemented: FY2017
46	2017	MTW Special Referral Program – Riverport Scholar House	Implemented: FY2017
45	2016	MTW Special Referral Program – Coalition for the Homeless “Move Up” Initiative	Implemented: FY2016 (Closed out in FY 2018)
44	2015	MTW Special Referral Programs (Umbrella Activity Used to Track Metrics for All MTW Special Referral Programs)	Implemented: FY2015
43	2015	HCV Program - HUD/MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration	Implemented: FY2015
42	2015	MTW Special Referral Program – Centerstone (Formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.)	Implemented: FY2015
41	2014	Public Housing - Special Occupancy Requirements for Floors 1-9 of Building C at Dosker Manor	Not Approved
40	2014	HCV Program - Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP	Implemented: FY2016
39	2014	HCV Program - Rent Increase Limit	Implemented: FY2014
38	2013	MTW Special Referral Program – Parkland Scholar House	Implemented: FY2013
37	2014	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Frazier Spinal Cord Rehab Institute	Proposed / Not Approved: FY2013 Re-Proposed / Approved: FY2014 Implemented: FY2014
36	2013	MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Bashford Manor/Newburg	Implemented: FY2013
35	2012	MTW Special Referral Programs – Allocation of MTW Housing Choice Vouchers	Implemented: FY2012
34	2012	MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Youngland Avenue	Implemented: FY2012
33	2012	Public Housing - Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income	Not Implemented Closed Out: FY2014
32	2012	HCV Program & Public Housing - Elimination of the Earned Income Disregard	Implemented: • HCV Program: FY2012 • Public Housing: FY2014
31	2012	MTW Special Referral Program - Stoddard Johnston Scholar House	Implemented: FY2012
30	2012	MTW Special Referral Program – 100,000 Homes Initiative	Implemented: FY2012
29	2015	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville	Proposed / Not Approved: FY2011 Re-Proposed / Approved: FY2015 Implemented: FY2015
28	2011	Public Housing - Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance, & Modernization	Not Yet Implemented
27	2011	HCV Program & Public Housing - Amend Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility	Implemented: FY2011
26	2011	Public Housing - Acquisition of Mixed-Income Sites	Implemented: FY2011
25	2010	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities	Implemented: FY2011 Suspended: FY2012 On Hold
24	2010	Public Housing - Increased Flat Rents for New Scattered Sites	Not Implemented Closed Out: FY2011
23	2010	Public Housing - Lease-up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor	Implemented: FY2010
22	2010	Public Housing - CFL Trade-in Pilot Program for Avenue Plaza Residents	Single Budget Authority Only Implemented: FY2010 Closed Out: FY2010
21	2010	Public Housing - Occupancy Criteria Changes for New Scattered Sites - Mandatory Case Management	Implemented: FY2010 Closed Out: FY2016
20	2010	MTW Special Referral Program - Downtown Family Scholar House	Implemented: FY2011
19	2010	HCV Homeownership Program - Weatherization and Energy Efficiency Pilot	Single Budget Authority Only

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
			Implemented: FY2010 Closed Out: FY2012
18	2009	Public Housing - Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal	Implemented: FY2009
17	2009	HCV Program & Public Housing - Multicultural Family Assistance Program	Single Budget Authority Only Implemented: FY2012
16	2009	Public Housing - Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies	Not Implemented Closed Out: FY2014
15	2009	MTW Special Referral Program - Louisville Scholar House	Implemented: FY2009
14	2009	Center for Women and Families at the Villager - Determinations for Program Eligibility	Non-MTW
13	2009	HCV Homeownership Program – Exception Payment Standards	Implemented: FY2009 Amended: FY2016
12	2009	HCV Program - Maintenance Specialist	Single Budget Authority Only Approved: FY2009 Not Yet Implemented
11	2009	HCV Homeownership Program - Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications	Implemented: FY2009 (Portion of activity Closed Out: FY2014)
10	2008	Locally Defined Definition of Elderly	Implemented: FY2008
9	2007	Public Housing - Employment/Educational Work Requirements for New Single-Family Scattered Site Homes	Implemented: FY2007 Amended: FY2014, FY2016 Closed Out: FY2017
8	2008	HCV Program & Public Housing - Standard Medical Deduction	Implemented: FY2008
7	2008	MTW Special Referral Program - Day Spring	Implemented : FY2012
6	2008	HCV Program - Earned Income Disregard for Elderly Families	Implemented: FY2008
5	2007	HCV Program - Spatial Deconcentration of HCV Assisted Units	Not Implemented Closed Out: FY2009
4	2007	HCV Program & Public Housing - Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families	Implemented: FY2008 Amended: FY2012, FY2014
3	2006	HCV Homeownership Program - Amount and Distribution of Homeownership Assistance	Implemented: FY2006
2	1999	MTW Inspections Protocol	Implemented: FY2009
1	2005	MTW Special Referral Program - Center for Women and Families	Implemented: FY2005

## C. MTW Short and Long Term Goals and Objectives

The mission of the Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA) is to provide quality, affordable housing for those in need, to assist residents in their efforts to achieve financial independence, and to work with the community to strengthen neighborhoods. As described in the “Introduction” to this MTW Annual Report, the Housing Authority has seven **long-term** goals for its MTW Program:

The following is a description of progress made during FY 2017 toward these goals.

### ***Housing Choice Vouchers and Public Housing***

During FY 2017, LMHA provided rental assistance and related services to 9,064 HCV households and 3,957 Public Housing households.

### ***Russell Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI Vision Russell)***

As noted in prior MTW plans and reports, Louisville has received all three types of CNI funding for the Russell Choice Neighborhoods Initiative:

- *Planning*  
In January 2015, LMHA was awarded a \$425,000 CNI Planning grant, which allowed LMHA to complete a Transformation Plan for the Russell neighborhood, including the Beecher Terrace Public Housing development. The Transformation Plan was submitted to HUD in January 2017.
- *Planning Grant for Action Activities*  
In June 2016, LMHA was awarded \$1 million in CNI Planning funds, which together with \$375,000 in leverage from Louisville Metro Government (LMG), is being used to complete “Action Activities” that enhance and accelerate the transformation of the Russell neighborhood including: improvements at Sheppard Park; construction of SmART Stop bus shelters; redevelopment of vacant lots; and creation of neighborhood “gateways”.

During FY 2017, construction on the Sheppard Park improvements project began and a total of \$75,136 of the Louisville Metro Government’s leverage contributions were expended. However, due to the large number of locations and extensive group of partners involved in the other Action Activities, it took longer than originally anticipated to review and approve, hence delaying several start dates. As a result, none of the FY 2015/2016 CNI Planning grant funds for Action Activities were expended by FYE 2017. In November 2017, LMHA submitted a request to HUD to extend the deadline for fund expenditure from 12/30/2017 to 5/31/2018. The Authority applied and received a second extension to 12/31/2018. The following activities were completed during the fiscal year:

- Four (4) artists groups were selected to paint large-scale murals on designated railroad overpasses and have been assigned project sites. Louisville Metro Government (LMG) staff are currently finalizing a right of access agreement with the railroad company and a general contractor will start prepping the overpasses surfaces once that agreement is in place. Artists will begin their work immediately after.
- Five (5) SmART Stop bus shelter locations were selected and three contractors have been hired to design and install the shelters. Designs are finalized and three (3) of the shelters are currently in fabrication.
- The redevelopment of the following vacant lots is being addressed:



- LMG staff hired a contractor to clear 533 S. 18<sup>th</sup> Street of overgrowth. The lot is being landbanked for future use. Foreclosure is underway on two adjacent lots, which will be packaged together with the property.
- Louisville Grows and the Canaan Community Development Corporation are finalizing plans for “Opportunity Corner” at 634 and 636 S. 18<sup>th</sup> Street. This co-venture project will feature a marketplace based in a shipping container that will provide a neighborhood economic and education empowerment engine, and a community garden, orchard and gathering space.
- LMG is finalizing a contract with a design firm to finalize plans for an outdoor community kitchen and seating area at 510 S. 18<sup>th</sup> Street. The firm will work with Sweet Peaches, a popular neighborhood café directly adjacent to the lot, which plans to hold community events on the lot, including move nights and cooking classes.

- *Implementation*

In December 2016, LMHA and its co-applicant, LMG, were awarded a \$29,575,000 CNI Implementation Grant to revitalize Beecher Terrace and the surrounding Russell neighborhood. The grant project has three primary focus areas: housing, people, and neighborhood. During FY 2017, LMHA was fully dedicated to the implementation grant and completed the following activities:

- *Housing:* The developer, McCormack Baron Salazar (MBS) and members of the CNI team completed a 4% tax credit application, which will be combined with tax exempt bond financing for the first phase of on-site replacement housing at Beecher – a 117-unit “Life Long Wellness Building” targeted to residents ages 55+. The building will include management and amenity space for seniors only (fitness room, community kitchenette and room, game rooms, hair salon, visiting doctor). The family management offices and amenity spaces for the whole redeveloped Beecher community will also be located in the building or the Phase I site, including a plaza, fitness room, community room and a bike repair station. Construction documents are expected to be completed by June 2018 with demolition commencing soon after. Phase I closing and construction start is anticipated for August 2018, with a completion date in late 2019.

MBS prepared the capacity review and technical submission for a 9% tax credit application to develop an additional 108 units on-site in Housing Phase II. Site planning is underway for Phase II, along with conceptual building design. The anticipated closing date for this phase is early 2019.

No PBV contracts were awarded during FY 2017 for Beecher Terrace replacement units. An RFQ and RFP for PBVs is currently being developed by LMHA staff and contractors. To help facilitate the relocation process for Beecher Terrace households, LMHA requested and received approval from HUD for three phases of relocation. Relocation of Phase I households began in FY 2017. LMHA was awarded Section 8 Tenant Protection Vouchers (TPVs) for the relocation of Phase I households on June 26, 2017. All of these vouchers were utilized by the end of Calendar Year 2017, as required by HUD. LMHA staff submitted an application for additional TPVs for Relocation Phase II on January 18 and was awarded these vouchers on March 5, 2018.

- *People:* Urban Strategies, the lead partner for the People component of the CNI Implementation grant is providing case management services to Beecher Terrace residents. As of end of FY 2017, more than 1,000 Beecher residents had been enrolled in case management services and over 500 had completed their initial assessment and started to develop IDPs and FDPs. Case managers have made significant referrals to job training programs, educational resources, financial literacy programs and linked residents to physical and mental health services. The

case management team established a system with Beecher's management staff to better assist residents with issues that may impact their lease compliance, and to identify residents who are chronically “at risk” for eviction. Once identified, residents receive intensive case management that may include referrals to budgeting or financial literacy, emergency financial assistance and other necessary resources. Beecher residents will continue to receive supportive services for the duration of the CNI Implementation grant period, which runs through September 30, 2023.

During FY 2017, Urban Strategies held monthly meetings for Beecher residents as a means to share timely information on relocation, employment and training opportunities, and other resources. The team also hosted or co-hosted monthly community engagement events for Beecher residents with CNI grant partners, and convened monthly Resident Leadership Council meetings. Additionally, quarterly meetings were held with the Supportive Services Network.

- *Neighborhood:* LMG will soon implement a set of neighborhood improvements to capitalize on Russell’s rich cultural history and generate economic opportunities for Russell residents. The City and its partners also plan to improve access to multimodal transportation, strengthen community networks and associations, and increase public safety through environmental design. These investments will be enhanced by planned streetscape improvements and art amenities on 9th Street, Muhammad Ali Boulevard, and other key corridors. Park improvements and the adaptive reuse of vacant properties are also other high priority projects. Meanwhile, CNI partner Louisville Central Community Centers will facilitate the development of an arts, cultural, and innovation corridor along Muhammad Ali Blvd. between 5<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> streets.

#### ***Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization***

LMHA received a \$22 million HOPE VI grant to revitalize the Sheppard Square public housing development in FY 2010. During FY 2017, LMHA completed the following activities regarding the Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization:

- The adaptive rehabilitation of 760 Hancock Street (formerly the Presbyterian Community Center) was completed and occupied (32 units). As part of the revitalization initiative, a pediatric clinic and wellness center is slated to be fully operational by April 2018. Located in the lower level of the historic Presbyterian Community Center building at 760 Hancock Street building, this community resource will benefit both LMHA residents and the community at large.
- LMHA issued an RFP for the development of 23 homeownership units; however, no units were constructed during the fiscal year.
- Off-site acquisition of replacement housing continued and the remainder of the Sheppard Square replacement housing was completed.

#### ***Liberty Green (Clarksdale) HOPE VI Revitalization***

In redeveloping the Clarksdale public housing development, LMHA has to date received a total of \$40 million in Federal HUD HOPE VI Revitalization grant funds, obtained over \$200 million in physical development leverage, and partnered with several for-profit and non-profit developers to create more than 1,900 public housing, low-income tax credit, market rate rental, and homeownership units. All the rental units included in the original Revitalization Plan are complete. Following the economic downturn, the site plan was revamped to respond to evolving market conditions, and the unit mix was shifted toward market rate rental. During FY 2017, a HOME2 Suites by Hilton Hotel was built by a local developer.

- *Redevelopment of the Friary:* During FY 2017, LMHA continued holding 24 units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA used as public housing until a few years ago when the site was emptied in preparation for comprehensive rehabilitation. During FY 2015, LMHA procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and during FY 2016, LMHA received HUD approval to sell the site to the private developer. The developer was awarded low-income housing tax credits during FY 2017, and rehab will begin in FY 2018. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing. An additional six replacement public housing units will be acquired in non-impacted areas.
- *First Link Discount Foods Acquisition:* During FY 2017, LMHA acquired a critical vacant parcel located at 431 East Liberty Street, less than ½-block from Liberty Green and the Friary to the east and directly across the street from the Dosker Manor elderly/disabled public housing development to the south. The site previously housed First Link Discount Foods, a locally-owned supermarket that closed in early 2015. The Housing Authority plans to secure and maintain the property until a use that supports the neighborhood's revitalization and benefits LMHA residents can be found. During FY 2017, several entities toured the property; however, no development offers were received.

#### ***Park DuValle Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Conversion***

LMHA examined the feasibility of converting the 59 public housing units located in Park DuValle Phase I (The Oaks) to Project-Based Vouchers (PBV) or Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA) through HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program during FY 2017; however, LMHA did not initiate action for RAD conversion.

#### ***Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Homeownership Program***

Homeownership is an important housing option for many low-income families, and it is an affordable and secure way for qualified LMHA families to achieve self-sufficiency. LMHA's Homeownership Program offers a comprehensive route to self-sufficiency for low-income families through mortgage assistance, counseling, and maintenance support. The HCV Homeownership option has helped LMHA families make the transition from renting to owning by allowing them to utilize their voucher to pay a portion of their mortgage for up to 15 years (note disability exemption from 15 year limit).

During FY 2017, LMHA expanded the number of HCV Homeownership Program exception payment standard areas. Setting the payment standard to 120% of Fair Market Rent (as opposed to the standard 110%) in additional non-impacted census tracts encourages program participants to purchase homes in areas of opportunity. During FY 2017, five (5) HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home in an exception payment standard area that was added during the fiscal year.

#### ***Green / Healthy Homes Initiatives***

LMHA's strategy for improving the living environment of public housing families includes efforts to "be green." During FY 2017, LMHA continued to explore ways to further enhance energy efficiency and site recycling initiatives, including the following:

- *Sheppard Square:* LMHA's greenest construction project to date, the Sheppard Square revitalization features mandatory recycling and composting; rain water retention, bio swales, and pervious pavers in the parking lots; photovoltaics; electric vehicle charging stations; a green roof; and four energy efficient/storm resistant houses. LMHA has obtained Enterprise Green Community certification for Blocks A-F and during FY 2017 LMHA was in the process of pursuing LEED Neighborhood certification.

Through a Place-Based Strategies Grant from Ohio Capital Impact Corporation, LMHA planned to construct a splash pad on the St. Peter Claver site, located behind the Sheppard Square Management

Office; however, due to financial and other constraints, the project was modified to be a playground expansion project and was completed in FY 2017.

- *Parkway Place:* In FY 2016, LMHA secured a \$38,750 grant from the Humana Foundation grant to construct a walking path with fitness stations; create a soccer field; and make improvements to the on-site community garden. During FY 2017, LMHA advertised and opened bids on the project; however, the bids were over-budget and therefore the project was not awarded.
- *Beecher Terrace:* During FY 2017, LMHA was notified of a grant from U.S. Green Building Council grant USGBC to pursue LEED ND certification for the new community. The project team is working on developing plans for the project that will include a series of sustainable elements that will allow LMHA to achieve LEED ND, Enterprise Green Communities and Energy Star certifications.
- *Smoke-Free Housing:* In December 2016, HUD published a Final Rule in the Federal Register entitled, *Instituting Smoke-Free Public Housing*. The rule requires that smoking be prohibited in all public housing units by July 30, 2018, and that smoking be prohibited within 25 feet of all buildings on public housing property. In January 2016, LMHA began to phase in a no-smoking requirement across all of its public housing stock and during FY 2017, LMHA continued to work towards making its housing stock smoke-free.

### ***Community and Resident Safety***

Promoting the safety and security of public housing residents is of the utmost concern to LMHA. During FY 2017, using funds received through HUD's Capital Fund Emergency Safety and Security Program, LMHA implemented additional safety improvements at Dosker Manor Building A, a high-rise tower serving elderly and/or disabled households, including: installation of new lobby, stairwell and exterior lighting; relocation and upgrading of the lobby security station; and updating and upgrading the elevator control access system for the site.

### ***Special Referral Programs***

Through LMHA's Special Referral MTW HCV Programs, LMHA partners with local, non-profit social services organizations to provide housing support to vulnerable populations whose needs are not adequately met elsewhere in the community.

During FY 2017, LMHA continued to provide housing subsidy to families through partnerships with supportive services agencies. LMHA allocated an additional 60 vouchers to ChooseWell Communities to assist families that include a pregnant or post-partum mother who has successfully completed residential and/or intensive outpatient treatment for addiction, and up to 10 vouchers to the Family & Children's Place to assist individuals who are leaving an institution and are at risk of homelessness.

### ***Self-Sufficiency and Development Programs***

Financial literacy, adult education, employment and training are among the supportive service programs that LMHA and a network of partners continued to provide in FY 2017. Credit Building, Homeownership, Special Referral and the Family Self-Sufficiency programs are vehicles for LMHA participants to assist them in achieving economic self-sufficiency. These initiatives all leverage MTW Block Grant funding to secure additional public and private funding.

### ***Elderly/Disabled Housing***

During FY 2017, LMHA continued to use MTW flexibility to maximize leasing at elderly/disabled developments. These efforts include defining elderly as 55 and above and providing lease-up incentives. It is anticipated that these initiatives will continue to increase occupancy rates at these developments.

### ***Rent Policies***

In FY 2017, LMHA continued to apply policies related to alternate year reexaminations, application of a standard medical deduction, earned income disregard for elderly HCV families and elimination of the mandatory earned income disregard. These rent policies address both participant self-sufficiency and LMHA administrative efficiency.

### ***Owner Rent Increase Limit***

In FY 2017, LMHA continued to implement its MTW policy on owner rent increases, which place a 2% cap on annual contract rent increases for units where the tenant is already receiving HCV rental assistance. At contract renewal, LMHA limits the landlord's requested rent to the lesser of the following: 102% of the previous contract rent for the same tenant, the payment standard, or the rent as determined through a rent reasonableness analysis.

### ***HUD Rent Reform Demonstration***

LMHA is participating in the HUD/MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration for HCV Households. The Study provides alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies that have been implemented at several public housing authorities across the country. In FY 2017, the Alternate Rent Group consisted of 671 households and the Control Group consisted of 874 households. The study is scheduled to end in 2021.

### ***Public Housing Development***

LMHA developed and implemented two MTW Public Housing (PH) development activities in an effort to transform aging portions of LMHA's physical housing stock while providing replacement units. These activities are designed to streamline the development process and reduce the time spent on development submittals. Although LMHA has not used the regulatory flexibility provided through the Simplified PH Development Submittal and Acquisition of Mixed-Income Sites activities to date, LMHA may use these flexibilities in the future.

### ***Accessible Units***

Under its MTW Activity with Frazier Rehab Institute, LMHA provided fully accessible transitional housing to individuals with disabilities. Frazier Rehab sub-lessees are also referred to area service providers to provide assistance to leave the program and obtain stable housing.

### ***YouthBuild***

LMHA subleases public housing units to YouthBuild Louisville (YBL) to provide temporary housing for low-income YBL participants who are experiencing homelessness. In FY 2017, LMHA provided temporary housing for six low-income YBL participants who experienced homelessness.

## II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

### A. Housing Stock Information

**Table 2: New Housing Choice Vouchers Project-Based During the Fiscal Year**

Property Name	Anticipated # of New Vouchers to be Project-Based	Actual # of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A

Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project- Based	Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project- Based	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Year
		0	0
0	0	Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
		0	0

Note: LMHA does not currently have any project-based vouchers under lease.

**Table 3: Other Changes to Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year**

**Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization:** In FY 2010, LMHA received a \$22 million HOPE VI grant to raze and revitalize the severely distressed Sheppard Square public housing development in FY 2010. As with Liberty Green and all subsequent revitalization plans that require demolition of existing public housing units, LMHA committed to one-for-one replacement of the 326 public housing units formerly on the Sheppard Square site. During FY 2017:

- All replacement housing was completed. All replacements were in non-impacted areas or in the target Smoketown neighborhood.
- The adaptive rehabilitation of 760 South Hancock Street (formerly the Presbyterian Community Center) was completed and occupied (32 units).
- LMHA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the development of 23 on-site homeownership units.

**The Friary:** During FY 2017, LMHA continued holding 24 units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA used as public housing until a few years ago when the site was emptied in preparation for comprehensive rehabilitation. During FY 2015, LMHA procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and during FY 2016, LMHA received HUD approval to sell the site to the private developer. The developer was awarded low-income housing tax credits during FY 2017, and rehab will begin in FY 2018. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing. An additional six replacement public housing units will be acquired in non-impacted areas.

**First Link Discount Food Acquisition:** During FY 2017, LMHA acquired a critical vacant parcel located at 431 East Liberty Street, less than ½-block from Liberty Green and the Friary to the east and directly across the street from the Dosker Manor elderly/disabled public housing development to the south. The Housing Authority plans to secure and maintain the property until a use that supports the neighborhood's revitalization and benefits LMHA residents can be found. During FY 2017, several entities toured the property; however, no development offers were received.

**Disposition of Units Under Abatement:** LMHA held 21 scattered site units in KY001000017 (Fegenbush-Whipps Mill) offline, pursuant to the disposition application approved by HUD on August 4, 2016. While the units underwent extensive lead and mold abatement, more work would have been required to put them back into productive use at a cost that LMHA determined was not feasible. During FY 2017, thirteen (13) of the units were sold via a closed bidding process with proceeds to be used to purchase replacement units in non-impacted census tracts. LMHA plans to put the remaining eight (8) units out to bid.

**Disposition of Kentucky Street Units:** LMHA held twenty-three (23) units located on Kentucky Street (13 units in KY001000017 and 10 units in KY001000034) off-line pending disposition to Simmons College, a pre-eminent, non-profit, historically black college located in Louisville. Disposition approval was received from HUD on December 7, 2015. Sales proceeds will be used to purchase replacement units in non-impacted census tracts. During FY 2017, six (6) units were purchased by Simmons College and the remaining seventeen (17) units may be put back into the housing inventory.

**Park DuValle:** In 2013, LMHA acquired full ownership of the 100 units built through Phase I of the Park DuValle HOPE VI project (59 public housing units, 21 tax credit units, and 20 market rate units). During FY 2017, LMHA acquired full ownership of all 213 units built through Park DuValle Phase II (92 public housing units, 56 tax credit units, and 54 market rate units).

**Table 4: General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Fiscal Year**

Site Name	Description	Amount
Beecher Terrace – 002	Beecher CHOICE Implementation	43,475
Beecher Terrace – 002	Beecher Relocation	44,707
Beecher Terrace – 002	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators	5,854
Beecher Terrace – 002	Tree Trimming	9,725
Beecher Terrace – 002	Eviction Prevention Program	20,958
Beecher Terrace – 002	HALO Community Policing	32,730
Beecher Terrace – 002	HVAC	1,855
Beecher Terrace – 002	Resident Stipends	1,055
Parkway Place – 003	Comm Ctr/ Maint bldg Sprinklers	7,941
Parkway Place – 003	Relocation	3,713
Parkway Place – 003	Roof on Maintenance Shop	20,307
Parkway Place – 003	Maintenance Shop, Office Sprinkler System	26,736
Parkway Place – 003	Basement Window Replacement	172,265
Parkway Place – 003	Comm Ctr/Garden/Fitness Park	1,325
Parkway Place – 003	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators	58,276
Parkway Place – 003	Tree Trimming	4,950
Parkway Place – 003	Eviction Prevention Program	16,588
Parkway Place – 003	HALO Community Policing	23,750
Parkway Place – 003	Resident Stipends	1,800
Sheppard Square – 004	Sheppard Revitalization Comp Mod	332,827
Dosker Manor – 012	Replace PTAC as needed FORCE ACCOUNT	222,411
Dosker Manor – 012	Eviction Prevention Program	5,839
Dosker Manor – 012	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators	43,211
Dosker Manor – 012	Resident Stipends	22,031
Dosker Manor – 012	High Rise Security Guards	637,864

Site Name	Description	Amount
St Catherine Court – 013	Eviction Prevention Program	4,251
St Catherine Court – 013	Resident Stipends	6,025
St Catherine Court - 013	Tree Trimming	200
St Catherine Court - 013	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators	6,931
St Catherine Court - 013	High Rise Security Guards	79,097
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	Domestic Hot Water/Sanitation 550	5,885
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	Repave Parking Lot Ave	1,081
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	New Windows 2nd Floor Laundry, Lobby and Office	34,142
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	Relocation	1,590
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	Tree Trimming	1,700
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	Eviction Prevention Program	9,053
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators	14,690
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	Resident Stipends	4,820
Avenue Plaza/550 Apt - 014	High Rise Security Guards	109,189
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Replace PTAC as necessary	760
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Fire Damage 1141 S 6th	18,135
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	New siding, etc 1638 W Kentucky	49,295
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	New Siding, etc 1521 W Magazine	49,295
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Tuckpointing 2400 Chestnut	1,050
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Abatement Repairs 1131 S 6th St	3,949
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Relocation	1,100
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Roof Replacement Six Mile, Landside, Ormsby, Tville	99,872
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Intercom Repairs at St Martins	5,146
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Eviction Prevention Program 1-17	848
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Tree Trimming 1-17	7,825
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Resident Stipends 1-17	1,840
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators 1-17	15,859
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Eviction Prevention Program 1-34	6,187
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Tree Trimming 1-34	30,100
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators 1-34	34,172
Scattered Site – 017 and 034	Security Temple Spears emergency	3,552
Lourdes Hall - 018	Kitchen Renovations	23,355
Lourdes Hall - 018	Eviction Prevention Program	3,284
Lourdes Hall - 018	Dwelling Equip - Ranges and Refrigerators	6,634
Lourdes Hall - 018	Resident Stipends	5,780
Lourdes Hall - 018	High Rise Security Guards	269,964
Will E Seay Plaza	Reinsulate Heat/Chill Pipes	2,309
Mixed Finance Capital Contributions	Phase II - Park DuValle – 030, Phase III - Park DuValle- 031, Phase IV - Park DuValle - 032	122,501
Annual Capital Purchase/ Services Contract	Annual Asbestos and Lead Removal Contract	65,051
Annual Capital Purchase/ Services Contract	Annual A/E Contract	285,120
Administrative Costs	Construction Administration 10% transfer	855,738
Administrative Costs	General Fund for Operations	1,496,309
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 5,505,877</b>

**Table 5: Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End**

Housing Program	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Tax-Credit	77	In 2013, LMHA acquired full ownership of all rental units constructed through Phase I of the Park DuValle HOPE IV Revitalization, including 59 public housing units, 21 tax credit units and 20 market rate units. During FY 2017, LMHA acquired full ownership of all 213 units built through Park DuValle Phase II (92 public housing units, 56 tax credit units, and 65 market rate units).
Market Rate	85	Same as above



Housing Program	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Other	83	The Louisville Metro Housing Authority (formerly Louisville Housing Services) developed affordable condominium homeownership, providing construction, financing and property management expertise. LMHADC (using LMHA staff) continues to manage the condominium regime for each of the following sites: HPP I (36 units); HPP II (15 units); HPP III (20 units); and Parkland Place (12 units).
<b>Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed</b>	245	

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

If Other, please describe:

Most of the funding for the developments was through debt with local banks. The developments were also partially funded by City HOME Fund loans at a reduced 3% rate, more than 20 years ago.

## B. Leasing Information

As required by HUD, Tables 6 and 7 provide information on households served through “local non-traditional” housing programs and administered port-in vouchers, thus, does not include public housing or HCV residents served.

**Table 6: Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year**

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs	3	5
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	3	5
Housing Program:	Unit Months Occupied/Leased	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property Based Assistance Programs	36	51
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
Total Projected and Annual Units Months Occupied/Leased	36	51

LMHA served more families than anticipated through LMHA’s local, non-traditional MTW partnerships.

	Average Number of Households Served Per Month	Total Number of Households Served During the Year
Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only	0	0

**Table 7: Local Non-Traditional Households and Income Levels**

<b>Fiscal Year:</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017*</b>	<b>2018</b>
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	0	0	0	1.21	1.74	1.59	4.25	
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% AMI	0	0	0	1.21	1.74	1.59	4.25	
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% AMI	0	0	0	100	100	100	100	

\*During FY 2017, for Frazier Rehab, 1 unit was occupied for 10 months and 1 unit was occupied for 8 months for a total of 18 months. For YouthBuild Louisville, 2 units were occupied for 12 months and 1 unit was occupied for 9 months for a total of 33 months. There were 51 units months occupied, which equates to 4.75 households

**Table 8: Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served**

<b>Family Size</b>	<b>Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA entered MTW</b>	<b>Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW</b>	<b>Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes</b>	<b>Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained</b>	<b>Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained</b>
1 Person	2496	54	0	2550	54.89
2 People	555	33	0	588	12.66
3 People	689	32	0	721	15.52
4 People	436	22	0	458	9.86
5 People	158	20	0	178	3.83
6+ People	137	14	0	151	3.25
Totals	4471	175	0	4646	100

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized

“Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household size when PHA Entered MTW” and “Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW” come from the Housing Authority of Louisville’s (HAL) MTW application, which was prepared in 1997. The application reported household size data in the following categories: 1-2 people, 3-4 people, and 5+ people. For purposes of this report, the historic data was prorated, in order to conform with the categories above, based on the characteristics of the 2014 population of households served.

In 2003, HAL merged with the Housing Authority of Jefferson County (HAJC) to form LMHA. Though the original agencies’ Public Housing and Section 8 programs were merged that year, demographic information (by household size) is not available for families who were then served by HAJC, and is not represented above.

**Table 9: Mix of Family Sizes Served- MTW Only Households**

	<b>1 Person</b>	<b>2 People</b>	<b>3 People</b>	<b>4 People</b>	<b>5 People</b>	<b>6+ People</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained	54.89%	12.66%	15.52%	9.86%	3.83%	3.25%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year	5,499	2,468	2,237	1,530	772	515	13,021
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year	42.23%	18.95%	17.18%	11.75%	5.93%	3.96%	100%
Percentage Change	-12.66%	6.29%	1.66%	1.89%	2.10%	0.71%	

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

Table 9 indicates that there is a greater than 5% variance in both the 1 and 2-person households served by LMHA in FY 2017 compared to the MTW baseline percentages. Overall, the size of households currently served by LMHA has skewed towards larger families, compared to the baseline period. The variances are related to two primary factors: 1) The baseline percentages reflect 1997 data from the Housing Authority of Louisville (HAL) only. In 2003, HAL merged with the Housing Authority of Jefferson County (HAJC) to form LMHA; however, the baseline does not reflect the addition of HAJC's public housing and voucher households. As noted above, HAJC family size data from 2003 is not available. 2) The actual number of households served by LMHA has increased by 8,375, or 280% since 1997. For every family size category, LMHA has more than doubled the actual number of households served since the baseline period. Most of the increase is attributed to increases in the Housing Choice Voucher program. An increase of such magnitude can be expected to result in variances to family sizes, given that LMHA does not control who applies for housing, nor does it limit access to the voucher program based on family size. In sum, LMHA believes that the percentage variations in households served are justifiable in light of the significant increases to the actual number of households served, and the fact that LMHA does not limit participation in the voucher program based on family size.

**Table 10: Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End**

Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
<b>Public Housing (scattered sites)</b>	<p>LMHA experienced vacancies in Public Housing scattered sites, in particular in AMP KY001000034, which includes units at the Friary. LMHA used the historic structure as public housing. However, this site was vacated several years ago because the structure is in need of comprehensive rehabilitation. During FY 2015, LMHA procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and during FY 2016, LMHA received HUD approval to sell the site to the private developer. The developer was awarded low-income housing tax credits during FY 2017, and rehab will begin in FY 2018. During FY 2017, LMHA continued holding 24 units off-line at the Friary. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing. An additional six replacement public housing units will be acquired in non-impacted areas.</p> <p>LMHA has also had difficulty fully leasing term-limited scattered site units. Activity #9-2007, (Employment / Education Requirements in New Scattered Site Units), which was implemented in FY 2007, revised the occupancy criteria for detached, single family, scattered site units to include 5-year residency term limits and employment/education requirements for admission and ongoing occupancy. Due to continued low occupancy rates at these sites, the activity was revised in FY 2016 to remove the 5-year residency term limit; however, this change did not increase occupancy rates to levels LMHA deemed acceptable. During FY 2017, LMHA eliminated the employment/education requirements associated with these units and as a result occupancy rates have increased.</p>

Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
<b>Public Housing (Dosker Manor)</b>	<p>LMHA had been experiencing decreased occupancy rates at its elderly and/or disabled high-rises prior to adopting a local definition of elderly for these communities. The MTW age criteria are used to determine eligibility for residency at Dosker Manor, Avenue Plaza, Will E. Seay Plaza (formerly Bishop Lane Plaza), and Lourdes Hall. Opening up these sites to non-disabled households between ages 55 and 61 has raised occupancy rates and increased the pool of one-bedroom and efficiency units available to these applicants.</p> <p>To encourage leasing, Emergency Safety and Security Grants funds for Dosker Manor were utilized to relocate and upgrade the lobby security station; install new lighting in the lobby, stairwell and building exterior; and provide elevator control access.</p>
<b>MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program</b>	LMHA strategies to increase leasing were successful during FY 2017: LMHA served approximately 99% of the number of households that were planned to be served. LMHA will continue to implement strategies to maximize leasing, including absorbing incoming ports, accepting new families off the wait list, accepting special referrals, hiring new staff for vacant positions and creating new positions to meet leasing demands.

**Table 11: Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End**

Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
#29-2015	4	The ability of a non-disabled/ non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment. "Suitable employment" provides an annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).
#43-2015	140	The ability of a non-disabled/ non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment. "Suitable employment" provides an annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).
#44-2015	23	The ability of a non-disabled/ non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment. "Suitable employment" provides an annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).
Households Duplicated Across Activities	0	
Annual Total Number of Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency	167	

## C. Wait List Information

**Table 12: Waitlist Information at Fiscal Year End**

Housing Program(s)	Wait List Type	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide	13,927	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community-Wide	3,592	Open	No

Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site-Based	5,621	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units/ Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Merged/ Program Specific	883	Open	No
Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program	Program Specific	9	Open	No

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

N/A
-----

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

LMHA has two local, non-traditional MTW activities. One subleases two units at the Liberty Green Community Center to low-income, Frazier Rehab spinal cord injury out-patients. The other subleases up to three public housing units to Youthbuild Louisville for homeless program participants. At FYE, there were 3 households on the Frazier Rehab waitlist and 6 households on the YouthBuild Louisville wait list.

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A

If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, please provide a narrative.

**Public Housing:** During FY 2017, LMHA removed the employment/education requirements for admission and ongoing occupancy at detached, single family, scattered site units. These requirements were previously implemented pursuant to Activity #9-2007, Employment / Education Requirements in New Scattered Site Units.

**HCV Program:** During FY 2017, LMHA implemented a limited admission preference for up to 200 households assisted through a homeless services voucher at the time of application. Since FY 2016, LMHA has provided expedited admission to the HCV Program for homeless services voucher holders using MTW authority through an MTW Special Referral Program in partnership with the Coalition for the Homeless. This change was made to streamline the admissions process.

### **III. Proposed MTW Activities**

---

All activities proposed in the FY 2017 Plan that were granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as “Approved Activities.”

## IV. Approved MTW Activities

---

### A. Implemented MTW Activities

#### A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments

LMHA had experienced decreasing occupancy rates at several of its elderly/disabled sites for many years, with an average occupancy rate of 90.8% in FY 2008. Through a combination of MTW initiatives implemented beginning that year, LMHA has increased occupancy across these sites to an average of 92.3% at the end of FY 2017. Higher occupancy rates improve LMHA's operating revenues (which achieves greater cost effectiveness federal expenditures), and increase housing choices for 0- and 1-bedroom qualified applicants age 55 to 61.

#### ACTIVITY #10-2008: Local Definition of Elderly

##### Description

This activity allows LMHA to use the following local definition of elderly: any family whose head of household, co-head, or spouse is age 55 or above. LMHA had been experiencing decreased occupancy rates at its elderly/disabled high-rises prior to adopting a local definition of elderly for these communities. The MTW age criterion is used to determine eligibility for residency at Avenue Plaza, Dosker Manor, Lourdes Hall, and Will E. Seay Plaza (formerly Bishop Lane Plaza).

##### Approval and Implementation

Activity #10-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

##### Impact

Opening up these sites to non-disabled persons between ages 55 and 61 has helped raise occupancy rates and increased the pool of 1-bedroom and efficiency units available to these applicants. While these sites had an average occupancy rate of 90.8% when this activity was implemented in FY 2008, at the end of FY 2017, the average occupancy rate was 92.3%. Higher occupancy rates improve the agency's operating revenues and maximize the cost effectiveness of federal funding.

##### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Housing Choice #4: Displacement Prevention</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) of households (HHs) at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).	HHs losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (#).	Expected HHs losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual HHs losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2007: 0	0	0	Yes



This activity affects families whose Head, Cohead or Spouse is age 55+.	Annual # of HHs at each site losing assistance/moving prior to implementation.	Expected # of HHs at each site losing assistance/moving annually.	Actual # of HHs at each site losing assistance/moving annually.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

<i><b>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b></i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number (#) of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit <sup>1</sup> &/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2007: 0</b>	100	132	Yes
	Prior to implementation, # of non-disabled HHs where head, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61.	Expected # of non-disabled HHs where head, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 living at an affected site at FYE.	Actual # of non-disabled HHs where head, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 living at an affected site at FYE.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

<sup>1</sup>Better unit is defined as a unit at one of the sites affected by the activity.

## **ACTIVITY #23-2010: Lease-Up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor**

### **Description**

This activity provides lease-up incentives to new residents at Dosker Manor, an elderly/disabled high-rise located in downtown Louisville. New residents receive a waiver of the initial deposit and the first month's rent free.

### **Approval and Implementation**

Activity #23-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010.

### **Impact**

Before the initiative's implementation in FY 2010, occupancy at Dosker Manor had consistently averaged below 90% for some time. At the end of FY 2017, occupancy at this site was 92.5%.

### **Changes to Metrics**

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i><b>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b></i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2013:</b> <sup>1</sup> \$1,212,767	\$1,250,000	\$1,385,100	Yes
	Annual Dosker Manor rental revenue prior to implementation	Expected gross annual Dosker Manor rental revenue	Actual gross annual Dosker Manor rental revenue	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2013 is the earliest year for which data is available.

## A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)

The MTW Demonstration also allows LMHA to revise other policies to encourage families to work towards financial self-sufficiency. Alternate rent structures also ease the burden on residents and the agency. As part of LMHA's rent reform goals, the Authority will continue to use HUD's Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) System in its day-to-day operations.

### ACTIVITY #40-2014: Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP – HCV Program

#### Description

When calculating an HCV participant's Total Tenant Payment (which is based on their annual income), this activity allows LMHA to disregard financial aid exceeding amounts received for tuition and fees for all adult full time students.

#### Approval and Implementation

Activity #40-2014 was proposed and approved in FY 2012. The activity was implemented in FY 2016.

#### Hardship

Excluding income does not create a hardship.

#### Impact

This activity was implemented in January 2016. During FY 2017, LMHA was unable to track the affected households; however, LMHA is working on establishing a tracking mechanism for this activity. Housing Specialists will continue to screen student heads of household for eligibility at admission and recertification.

#### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

	<b>As of FY2015:</b> \$25.07/ household (HH) (\$25.07/staff hour * 1.0 hr)	\$26.90/ HH (\$26.90/staff hour * 1.0 hr) <sup>1</sup>	Not tracked	N/A
	Average cost per household of calculating TTP annually for households (HHs) receiving financial aid disregard where HOH is under the age of 24 or does not have dependent children prior to implementation	Anticipated average cost of calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children during FY	Actual average cost of calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children during FY	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records

<sup>1</sup> This activity is not expected to affect agency cost. LMHA estimates the average cost will continue to be (average staff cost per hour) \* (1.0 hours) with the benchmark adjusted each year to account for variations in staff cost.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY2015:</b> 1.0 hr/HH	1 hr (1 HH * 1.0 hr)	Not tracked	N/A
	Average amount of staff time spent prior to implementation calculating TTP annually per student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children	Anticipated amount of staff time spent during FY calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children	Actual amount of staff time spent during FY calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records

<b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY2015:</b> Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked
	Average error rate, as a %, of tracking/calculating HH TTP for affected HHs prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a %, of tracking/calculating HH TTP for affected HHs during FY	Actual error rate, as a %, of tracking/calculating HH TTP for affected HHs during FY	Explanation to be provided.

Data Source(s): Staff logs; Emphasys

<i>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	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.
	N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	Gross annual rent revenue from activity-eligible HHs prior to activity implementation	Expected annual rent revenue from activity-eligible HHs during FY	Actual annual rent revenue from activity-eligible HHs during FY	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

## ACTIVITY #32-2012: Elimination of the Mandatory Earned Income Disregard

### Description

This activity eliminates the Earned Income Disregard (EID), which allows tenants who have been out of work to accept a job without having their rent increase right away. During the first year of employment, all earnings are excluded from the calculation of the tenant's rent. During the second year of employment, only half of the tenant's earnings are excluded from this calculation. A tenant may only benefit from the EID for a maximum of 48 months during their lifetime.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #32-2012 was proposed and approved in FY 2012. It was implemented in the HCV Program in FY 2012 and in the Public Housing Program in FY 2014.

### Hardship

No hardship requests were received during FY 2017.

### Impact

*HCV Program:* By the end of FY 2014, there were no longer any HCV Program households who received the EID. Savings continued through FY 2017.

*Public Housing Program:* By FYE 2017, only seven (7) Public Housing Program families were receiving the EID, saving the Housing Authority \$1,886 in administrative costs, and increasing annual rent revenue by \$45,751 when compared to benchmark.

The benchmarks for this activity reflect full implementation, at which point zero households will receive the EID. While this activity has been fully implemented in the HCV Program (and all benchmarks have been achieved), seven (7) Public Housing families continue to benefit from this disregard. Once the EID eligibility window for these families has expired, LMHA expects the benchmarks will be fully met.

### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>
---------------------------------------------------

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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2011:</b> \$447 (15 households (HHs) * \$29.80)	\$0 (0 HHs * \$0)	\$0 (0 HHs * \$0)	Yes
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2014:</b> <sup>1</sup> \$2,154 (62 HHs * \$34.74)	\$0 (0 HHs * \$0)	\$268 (7 HHs * \$38.33 (1.05 hr * \$36.50/hr))	No
	# of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average cost per HH to track/calculate annually prior to implementation	Anticipated # of HHs that will receive EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average anticipated cost per HH to track/calculate annually	Actual # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the actual average cost per HH to calculate/track annually	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
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.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2011:</b> 20.1 hrs (15 households (HHs) * 1.34 hrs)	0 hrs (0 HHs * 0 hrs)	0 hrs (0 HHs * 0 hrs)	Yes
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2014:</b> <sup>1</sup> 65.1 hrs (62 HHs * 1.05 hrs)	0 hrs (0 HHs * 0 hrs)	7 hrs (7 HHs * 1.05 hrs)	No
	# of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually prior to implementation	Expected # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually	Actual HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). The task is tracking/calculating a household's (HH's) TTP according to the mandatory EID rules.	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2011:</b> Not tracked	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2014:<sup>1</sup></b> Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked
	Average error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules annually	Actual error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP annually	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Staff logs; Emphasys				

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2014:<sup>1</sup></b> \$93,300	\$93,300	\$45,731	No
	Gross annual rent revenue foregone from HHs receiving EID prior to implementation	Expected increase in annual rent revenue increase due to elimination of EID	Actual increase in annual rent revenue during FY due to elimination of EID	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

## ACTIVITY #8-2008: Standard Medical Deduction

### Description

Under this activity, disabled and elderly (age 62+) families in both the Public Housing and HCV programs are eligible to receive a \$1,600 standard medical deduction. Families electing the deduction do not have to furnish documentation of medical expenses, such as bills, receipts, records of payment, dates of trips, mileage log, or receipts for fares and tolls. The standard medical deduction is flexible in that if the families' health care costs exceed the \$1,600 exemption, the family can choose to have their expenses itemized.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #8-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

## Hardship

No hardship requests were made during FY 2017.

## Impact

This activity continued to result in administrative cost savings during FY 2017. Foregoing the verification of medical expenses for the 5,186 households that took the standard medical deduction resulted in savings of \$52,352.

## Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of verifying household (HH) medical expenses & calculating HH medical deductions in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> \$29,714 (3,529 HHs * \$8.42)	\$2,158 (243 HHs * \$8.88 (0.33 hrs * \$26.90/hr))	\$214 (23 HHs * \$9.29 (0.33 hrs * \$28.16/hr))	Yes
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> \$5,246 (623 HHs * \$8.42)	\$141 (12 HHs * \$11.73 (0.33 hrs * \$35.55/hr))	\$169 (14 HHs * \$12.05 (0.33 hrs * \$36.50/hr))	No
	<b>Agency-Wide</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> \$34,960	\$2,299	\$383	Yes
	# of elderly/disabled HHs receiving the itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per HH to calculate/verify medical expenses annually prior to implementation	Anticipated # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving the itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per HH	Actual # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving the itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per HH during FY	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available. Staff cost averages hourly rate with benefits for HCV Specialist and Public Housing Service Specialist (\$25.25 / hour).

<sup>2</sup> Benchmarks will be adjusted annually to account for variations in staff cost.

<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete verifications of medical expenses &	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.



calculations of medical deduction in staff hours (decrease).	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 1,176 hrs (3,529 households (HHs) * 0.33 hrs)	80 hrs (243 HHs * 0.33 hrs)	8 hrs (23 HHs * 0.33 hrs)	Yes
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 208 hrs (623 HHs * 0.33 hrs)	4 hrs (12 HHs * 0.33 hrs)	5 hrs (14 HHs * 0.33 hrs)	No
	<b>Agency-Wide</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 1,384 hrs	84 hrs	13 hrs	Yes
	# of elderly/disabled HHs receiving itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to calculate/ verify medical expenses annually before implementation	Anticipated # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time per HH	Actual # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time per HH	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing the calculation of a household's (HH's) medical deduction, as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2009:</b> Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2009:</b> Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked
	<b>Agency-Wide</b>			
	<b>As of FY2009:</b> Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked
	Average error rate, as a %, of calculating a HH's medical deduction prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a %, of calculating a HH's medical deduction	Actual error rate, as a %, of calculating a HH's medical deduction	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

<b>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2009:</b> Not tracked	\$4,265,448	\$3,689,304	No



	Sum of gross annual rent revenue from elderly/disabled HHs prior to implementation	Expected sum of gross annual rent revenue from elderly/disabled HHs	Actual sum of gross annual rent revenue from elderly/disabled HHs	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

## ACTIVITY #4-2007: Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families

### Description

This activity allows LMHA to conduct a re-certification of elderly and disabled families in the Public Housing and HCV programs once every two years instead of annually.

In the HCV program, applicable households receive a full reexamination every odd numbered fiscal year. In even numbered years, families are required to complete a mini-recertification packet, which they return to the agency by mail. In the Public Housing program, each year 50% of eligible families receive a full reexamination of eligibility on the anniversary of their lease-up date.

- Initially, only households eligible for biennial reexaminations were elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+. The activity was amended in FY 2012 to include all disabled families; however, the HCV Program did not implement this change. LMHA is clarifying the description of this activity for the HCV Program: the biennial reexamination frequency applies to HCV households where the head, co-head or spouse is elderly or over age 55 and disabled and the only source of income for the household is SS or SSI. For these households, LMHA will complete biennial reexaminations and a mini-reexamination on the years between biennial reexaminations during which payment standards and contract rents will be updated.
- In the Public Housing Program, biennial reexaminations for all elderly and/or disabled families began in FY 2016.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #4-2007 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008. This activity was amended in FY 2012.

### Hardship

Hardship is not required as elderly and/or disabled families that experience a loss of income or an increase in expenses between biennial recertifications may request an interim reexamination at any time.

### Impact

As FY 2017 was an odd numbered fiscal year, LMHA conducted full recertifications for all applicable families in the HCV Program; thus, no administrative savings were realized.

In the Public Housing program during FY 2017, the agency spent \$28,853 to conduct full reexaminations of the families that were either elderly (age 62+) or disabled. Had LMHA done a full reexamination of all Public Housing families, the cost would have been \$84,616. Thus, this activity produced \$55,763 in administrative cost savings in the Public Housing program during the fiscal year.

### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan. Due to the requirements in the HCV Program that applicable households are on a fixed income, i.e. receiving Social Security or SSI,

there are fewer than anticipated HCV participants that are eligible for biennial reexaminations under this MTW activity.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2008:<sup>1</sup></b> \$5,799 (919 mini-recertifications * 0.25 staff hours * \$25.24/hour)	<b>Even FYs:</b> \$28,043 (4,170 mini-recerts * 0.25 staff hrs * \$26.90/hr) <b>Odd FYs:</b> \$112,173 (4,170 full recerts * 1.0 staff hrs * \$26.90/hr)	\$16,079 (571 full recerts * 1.0 staff hrs * \$28.16/hr)	Yes
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2008:<sup>2</sup></b> \$16,695 (894 full recertifications * 0.75 staff hours * \$24.90/hour)	\$25,383 (952 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs * \$35.55/hr)	\$28,853 (1,054 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs * \$36.50/hr)	No
	<b>Agency-Wide</b>			
	<b>As of FY2008:</b> \$22,494	<b>Even FY:</b> \$53,426 <b>Odd FY:</b> \$137,556	\$44,932	Yes
	# of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost to conduct a recert prior to implementation	Expected # of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per recert	Actual # of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per recert	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs.				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 919 mini-recertifications were conducted that year. Please note that in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification.

<sup>2</sup> FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 894 full reexaminations were conducted that year. Please note that: 1) biennial recertifications had already been implemented at that time, and 2) in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2016 to include all disabled families.

<sup>3</sup> Benchmarks will be indexed annually to account for variations in staff cost.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			

	<b>As of 2008:</b> 578 hrs (2,312 mini-recerts * 0.25 hrs)	<b>Even FYs:</b> 1,043 hrs (4,170 mini-recerts * 0.25 staff hrs) <b>Odd FYs:</b> 4,170 hrs (4,170 full recerts * 1.0 staff hrs)	571 hrs (571 full recerts * 1.0 staff hrs)	Yes
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY2008:</b> 671 hrs (894 full recerts * 0.75 hrs)	714 hrs (952 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs)	791 hrs (1,054 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs)	No
	<b>Agency-Wide</b>			
	<b>As of FY2008:</b> 1,249	<b>Even FYs:</b> 1,757 hrs <b>Odd FYs:</b> 4,884 hrs	1,362 hrs	Yes
	# of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per recert before activity implementation	Expected # of recerts of eligible HHs during FY <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per recert	Actual # of recerts of eligible HHs during FY <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per recert	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<b>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>HCV Program</b>			
	N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	<b>Public Housing Program</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> Not tracked	\$4,750,000	\$2,795,232	No
	Gross annual rent revenue from eligible HHs prior to implementation	Expected gross annual rent revenue from eligible HHs	Actual gross annual rent revenue from eligible HHs	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

## ACTIVITY #6-2008: Earned Income Disregard for Elderly HCV Families

### Description

This activity provides a \$7,500 earned income disregard to elderly families in the HCV Program who's only other sources of income (in addition to earnings from employment) are Social Security entitlements.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #6-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

### Hardship

Hardship is not applicable as the earned income disregard would not result in a financial hardship.

### Impact

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008. Baseline data for the year prior to implementation (FY 2007) is not available. Baseline data is as of the earliest year for which data is available, FY 2009. Six (6) households qualified for the EID in FY 2017.

### Changes to Metrics

LMHA modified the baselines for metrics CE #1: Agency Cost Savings and CE #2: Staff Time Savings since there is no times savings associated with this activity.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of households (HHs) affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>FY 2009:</b> \$5,651	\$5,500	\$12,252	Yes
	Average gross annual earned income of eligible HCV HHs before implementation	Expected average gross annual earned income of eligible HCV HHs	Actual average gross annual earned income of eligible HCV HHs	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1&amp;2</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Outcome<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	Yes
(2) Employed Part-Time	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	Yes
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	Yes
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	Yes
(5) Unemployed	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	Yes
(6) Other	<b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)	Yes

	Percentage of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (%). This # may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (%).	Actual percentage of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (%).	Explanation to be provided.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<sup>2</sup> HUD's instructions indicate that baseline, benchmark, and outcome numbers should include the "percentage of total work-able households" in each category. LMHA does not consider elderly families to be "work-able" households.

<b>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households (HHs) receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#).	Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY2009: 0</b>	0	0	Yes
	# of HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity	Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services as of FYE	Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services as of FYE	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>				
<i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."</i> <sup>1</sup>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>2</sup>	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households (HHs) 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.	HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2009: 0</b>	0	0	Yes
	# of HHs transitioned to self sufficiency annually prior to implementation	Anticipated # of HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY	Actual # of HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY 2016	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> Employment" means the household is receiving earned income. "Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

<sup>2</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY2009:</b> \$100.96 (16 HHs * .25 staff hours * \$25.24/hr)	\$0 (10 HHs * 0 staff hours * \$26.90/hr)	\$0 (6 HHs * 0 staff hours * \$28.16/hr)	Yes
	# of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per HH to track/calculate annually prior to implementation	Anticipated # of HHs that will receive EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average anticipated cost per HH to track/calculate annually	Actual # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the actual average cost per HH to calculate/track annually	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	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.
	<b>As of FY2009:</b> 4 hours (16 HHs * 0.25 hrs)	0 hrs (10 HHs * 0 hrs)	0 hrs (6 HHs * 0 hrs)	Yes
	# of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually prior to implementation	Expected # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually	Actual # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	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 (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>FY 2009:</b> Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	N/A
	Average error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules	Actual error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP	Explanation to be provided.

Data Source(s): Staff logs
----------------------------

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	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.
	N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	Gross annual rent revenue from HHs receiving EID prior to implementation	Gross annual rental revenue from HHs no longer receiving EID	Gross annual rental revenue from HHs no longer receiving EID	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

### **A.3 HUD/MDRC HVC Rent Reform Demonstration**

LMHA was selected to participate in a HUD-commissioned six year study to evaluate an alternative HCV rent reform policy (the “Study”). MDRC, a nonprofit and nonpartisan education and social policy research organization, is conducting the Study on behalf of HUD. The Study sets forth alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies that have been implemented at several Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) across the country in order to fully test the policies nationally.

#### **ACTIVITY #43-2015: HUD / MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration for HCV Households**

##### **Description**

The goals of this alternative rent policy are to:

- Create a stronger financial incentive for tenants to work and advance toward self-sufficiency;
- Simplify the administration of the HCV Program;
- Reduce housing agency administrative burden and costs;
- Improve accuracy and compliance of program administration;
- Remain cost neutral or generate savings in HAP expenditures relative to expenditures under current rules; and
- Improve transparency of the program requirements.

The Control Group vouchers are being managed using the LMHA’s standard policies. The Alternate Rent Group rent policy includes the following features:

- A revised formula to calculate tenant share of rent and utilities at 28% of gross annual income
- A minimum rent payment from tenants to owners of \$50
- A revised method for determining gross annual income
- Elimination of deductions and allowances
- A disregard of income from assets valued below \$25,000
- A triennial reexamination procedure
- A limited number of interim re-certifications per household per year
- A revised methodology for determining tenant rent to owner
- A simplified utility allowance schedule
- A hardship policy to protect tenants from excessive rent burden

Only vouchers administered under the MTW Program are eligible for the Study; however households receiving a biennial certification are also excluded. The Study is focused on work-able populations, and does not include Elderly Households, Disabled Households, or households headed by people older than 56 years of age (who will become seniors during the course of this long-term study). Households utilizing the childcare expense deduction for purposes of determining adjusted annual income, as well as households participating in Family Self Sufficiency and Homeownership programs, were not eligible for Study selection. In addition, households that contain a mix of members: 1) with an immigration status that is eligible for housing assistance, and 2) with an immigration status that is non-eligible for housing assistance, are not included in the Study. Finally, households receiving case management or supportive services through one of the Housing Authority’s MTW Special Referral Programs are also excluded from the Study.

Households selected for the Alternate Rent Group met with an LMHA Housing Specialist to review the Study and their specific calculation of Total Tenant Payments under both the traditional and Study policies.



They then had a period of 30 days to consider whether to select to be excluded from the Study. Study enrollment was completed in December 2015. The study is scheduled to end in 2021.

### **Approval and Implementation**

Activity #43-2015 was proposed, approved, and implemented in FY 2015.

### **Hardship**

Under this activity, LMHA conducts triennial income recertification rather than annual recertification with provisions for interim recertification and hardship remedies if income decreases. Additionally, the Study offers appropriate hardship protections to prevent any Alternate Rent Group member from being unduly impacted.

Five hardship requests were received during FY 2017. In three cases the request was denied and in two cases the family's Total Tenant Payment was re-calculated.

### **Impact**

Study enrollment was completed during FY 2016. In all, 767 families were enrolled in the Alternate Rent Group; 1,038 were enrolled in the Control Group; and 227 opted to be excluded from the study altogether.

As of FYE 2017, 656 of the Alternate Rent Group households and 834 Control Group families (83% of original enrollees) were participants in the Housing Authority's HCV Program.

The HUD Standard Metrics for this activity follow. Please note that MDRC does not track HUD Standard Metrics. LMHA independently established the baselines and benchmarks below, and is responsible for tracking outcomes. LMHA and MDRC may make different assumptions or use different calculations when reporting similar metrics.

According to LMHA's FYE 2017 data 490 (75%) head of households in the Alternate Rent Group and 322 (39%) head of households in the Control Group reported earned income at their most recent certification. In addition, at the end of the fiscal year, 140 Alternate Rent Group and 225 Control Group non-elderly/non-disabled households, were self-sufficient, i.e. receiving annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500.

### **Changes to Metrics**

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

Staff has not consistently used the "Employment Status" field available in Emphasys to track positive outcomes in employment. The Housing Authority will continue to work with staff during FY 2018 to ensure this data field is used in a more consistent manner. LMHA does not currently have sufficient data available regarding the baseline employment status of Rent Reform participants to establish benchmarks.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<b>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars	Cost of task prior to implementation (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>Cost per Annual Certification (Cert)</b>			
	<b>As of FY2015:</b>  <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$54,920 (1 annual cert * 1,000 households (HHs) * \$54.92/cert) <b>Control Group:</b> \$54,920 (1 annual cert * 1,000 HHs * \$54.92/cert)  <u>Per annual cert cost:</u> \$54.92 (\$50.14 staff cost (2 hrs * \$25.07/hr) + \$4.78 (mail & reproduction costs))	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$0 (0 certs * \$0 per cert) <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$54,920 (1,000 certs * \$54.92) <b>Control Group (All Years):</b> \$54,920 (1,000 certs * \$54.92)  <u>Cost per annual cert:</u> \$54.92 (\$50.14 staff cost (2 hrs * \$25.07/ hr) + \$4.78 (mail & repro costs))	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$1,953 (32 certs * \$61.02/cert) <b>Control Group:</b> \$42,775 (701 certs * \$61.02/cert)  <u>Cost per annual cert:</u> \$61.02 (\$61.02 staff cost (2 hrs * \$28.12/ hr) + \$4.78 (mail & repro costs))	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group <sup>3</sup>
	Average # of annual certs received by study-eligible HHs multiplied by # of expected Alt Rent Group / Control Group HHs multiplied by average cost to complete a cert prior to implementation	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group annual certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group annual certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert	Explanation to be provided.
	<b>Cost per Full Interim Certification (Cert)</b>			
	<b>As of FY2015:</b>  <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$75,220 (2 interim certs * 1,000 HHs * \$37.61/cert) <b>Control Group:</b> \$75,220 (2 interim certs * 1,000 HHs * \$37.61/cert)  <u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.5 hrs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$18,805 (500 certs * \$37.61/cert) <b>Control Group:</b> \$75,220 (2,000 certs * \$37.61/cert)  <u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.5 hrs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:<sup>4</sup></b> \$35,946 (851 certs * \$42.24/cert) <b>Control Group:</b> \$25,597 (606 certs * \$42.24/cert)  <u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$42.24 (staff cost of \$28.16/hr * 1.5 hrs)	No (Alt Rent Group) Yes (Control Group)
	Average # of interim certs received by study-eligible HHs <sup>1</sup> multiplied by # of expected Alt Rent / Control Group HHs multiplied by average cost to complete a cert prior to implementation	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert	Explanation to be provided.

Cost per Streamlined Interim Certification (Cert)			
<b>As of FY2015:</b>  <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$75,220 (2 traditional interim certs per HH * 1,000 HHs * \$37.61/cert)  <u>Per traditional interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.5 hrs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$25,070 (1,000 certs * \$25.07/cert)  <u>Per streamlined interim cert cost:</u> \$25.07 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.0 hrs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> <sup>2</sup> Not tracked	N/A
Average # of traditional interim certs received by study-eligible HHs <sup>1</sup> multiplied by # of expected Alt Rent Group HHs multiplied by average cost to complete a cert prior to implementation	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group streamlined interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group streamlined interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert	Explanation to be provided.
Cost of Rent Calculation			
<b>As of FY2015:</b>  <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$25,070 (1,000 HHs * \$25.07 per rent calculation) <b>Control Group:</b> \$25,070 (1,000 HHs * \$25.07 per rent calculation)  <u>Per rent calculation cost:</u> \$25.07 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.0 hrs)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$0 (0 rent calculations * \$25.07 per cert) <b>(Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$25,070 (1,000 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$25.07/hr) <b>Control Group (All Years):</b> \$25,070 (1,000 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$25.07/hr)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$901 (32 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$28.16/hr) <b>Control Group:</b> \$19,740 (701 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$28.16/hr)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group <sup>3</sup>
Average cost to complete rent calculation multiplied by expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs during FY multiplied by average cost to complete rent calculation	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs during FY multiplied by average cost to complete rent calculation	Explanation to be provided.
Cost to Determine Income from Assets			
<b>As of FY 2015:</b>  <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$13 (2 HHs (0.22% * 1,000 HHs) * \$6.27 per asset income determination) <b>Control Group:</b> \$13 (2 HHs (0.22% * 1,000 HHs) * \$6.27 per asset income determination)  <u>Per asset income determination cost:</u> \$6.27 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 0.25 hrs)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$6 (1 HH * \$25.07 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs) <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$13 (2 HHs * \$25.07 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs) <b>Control Group (All Years):</b> \$13 (2 HHs * \$25.07 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$0 (0 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> \$42 (6 actions for 3 HHs * \$28.16 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs)	Yes (Alt Rent Group) No (Control Group)

	% of study-eligible HHs with income from assets multiplied by expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs multiplied by average cost to determine income from assets prior to implementation	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having income from assets determined during FY multiplied by average cost to determine asset income	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having income from assets determined during FY multiplied by average cost to determine asset income	Explanation to be provided.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

<sup>1</sup> Includes all households receiving MTW vouchers except households that are 1) disabled; 2) elderly; 3) headed by individuals over age 56; 4) currently using the childcare expense deduction for purposes of determining adjusted income; 5) enrolled in the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program; 6) participating in the HCV Homeownership Program; 7) participating in a Special Referral Program; and/or 8) of mixed immigration status.

<sup>2</sup> Benchmarks will be indexed annually to account for variations in staff costs.

<sup>3</sup> Includes regular recertifications; interim recertifications and hardship requests are excluded. As a result of a processing error, annual recertifications were completed for 32 households in the Alternate Rent Group.

<sup>4</sup> LMHA is not currently tracking traditional and streamlined interim certifications separately. All interim certifications have been reported as traditional certifications.

<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>Time to Complete Annual Certification</b>			
	<b>As of FY 2015:</b> <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs per annual cert) <b>Control Group:</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs per annual cert)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years):</b> 0 hrs (0 certs * 2 hrs/cert) <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs/cert) <b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs/cert)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> 64 hrs (32 certs * 2.0 hrs/cert) <b>Control Group:</b> 1,402 hrs (701 certs * 2.0 hrs/cert)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group <sup>3</sup>
	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving an annual cert multiplied by average time to complete an annual cert prior to implementation	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving an annual cert during FY multiplied by average time to complete an annual cert	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving an annual cert during FY multiplied by average time to complete an annual cert	Explanation to be provided

Time to Determine Tenant Rent				
	<b>As of FY 2015:</b>  <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 1.0 hrs per tenant rent determination) <b>Control Group:</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 1.0 hrs per tenant rent determination)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$0 (0 rent calculations * 1 hr/determination) <b>(Triennial Cert Years):</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 determinations * 1.0 hr/determination) <b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 determinations * 1.0 hr/determination)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> 32 hrs (32 rent determinations * 1.0 hr/determination) <b>Control Group:</b> 701 hrs (701 determinations * 1.0 hr/determination)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group <sup>1</sup>
	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine tenant rent prior to implementation	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine tenant rent	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine tenant rent	Explanation to be provided
	Time to Determine Utility Allowance (UA)			
	<b>As of FY 2015:</b>  <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 250 hrs (1,000 HHs * 0.25 hrs per UA determination) <b>Control Group:</b> 250 hrs (1,000 HHs * 0.25 hrs per UA determination)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$0 (0 rent calculations * .08 hr/determination) <b>(Triennial Cert Years):</b> 80 hrs (1,000 determinations * 0.08 hrs per determination) <b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 250 hrs (1,000 determinations * 0.25 determination)	<b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years):</b> 2 hrs (30 determinations * 0.08 hrs per determination) <b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 169 hrs (676 determinations * 0.25 determination)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group <sup>1</sup>
	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine UA prior to implementation	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine UA	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine UA	Explanation to be provided

<sup>1</sup> Includes regular recertifications; interim recertifications and hardship requests are excluded. As a result of a processing error, annual recertifications were completed for 32 households in the Alternate Rent Group.

<b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>Average Error Rate in Determining TTP</b>			
	<b>As of FY2015:</b> Not tracked	Not determined	Not tracked	Not tracked
	Average error rate, as a %, of determining HH TTP prior to implementation	For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, expected average error rate, as a %, of determining HH TTP during the FY	For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, actual average error rate, as a %, of determining HH TTP during the FY	Explanation to be provided.
	<b>Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance (UA)</b>			
	<b>As of FY2015:</b> Not tracked	Not determined	Not tracked	Not tracked
	Average error rate, as a %, of determining HH UA prior to implementation	For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, expected average error rate, as a %, of determining HH UA during the FY	For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, actual average error rate, as a %, of determining HH UA during the FY	Explanation to be provided.

<b>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY2016:</b> \$7,195	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$8,285 <b>Control Group:</b> \$6,335	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$8,104 <b>Control Group:</b> \$8,185	Yes (Control Group) No (Alt Rent Group)
	Average annual gross earned income of Alt Rent & Control Group HHs at FYE	Expected average annual gross earned income of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs at FYE	Actual average annual gross earned income of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs at FYE	Explanation to be provided

<b>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

(1) Employed Full- Time	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Insufficient data available to establish benchmark	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 490 <b>Control Group:</b> 322	Insufficient data available to determine whether benchmarks were achieved. LMHA staff has not consistently tracked "Employment Status" in Emphasys. Data is missing for 313 control HHs and 288 alt rent group HHs.
(2) Employed Part- Time	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Insufficient data available to establish benchmark		
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Insufficient data available to establish benchmark	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 2 <b>Control Group:</b> 0	
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Insufficient data available to establish benchmark	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 1 <b>Control Group:</b> 0	
(5) Unemployed	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 154 (21% of 722 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 549 (60% of 915 HHs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 166 (25% of 656 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 512 (61% of 834 HHs)	
(6) Other	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 0 <b>Control Group:</b> 0	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 15 (2% of 656 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 4 (.5% of 834 HHs)	No
	# of total study-eligible HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (#).	Expected # of total Alt Rent / Control Group HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).	Actual # of total Alt Rent / Control Group HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).	Explanation to be provided.

<sup>1</sup> Full-time vs. part-time employment status was not consistently tracked for either Alternate Rent Group or Control Group households. According to LMHA's computer systems, 490 Alternate Rent Group and 322 Control Group heads of households reported earned income at their most recent certification. Of the 490 Alternate Rent Group heads of households with earned income, LMHA records show only 138 as employed full-time and 64 as employed part-time. Of the 322 Control Group heads of households with earned income, LMHA records show only 5 as employed full-time and 4 as employed part-time. "Unemployed" equals number of households that did not report earnings at their most recent certification. This method likely significantly underrepresents the number of unemployed as even those households earning as little as \$20 per year are excluded from the unemployed count. In addition, the option "Other" was selected as employment status by Housing Specialists for 19 households. No further detail is available via LMHA's computer systems.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households (HHs) Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
# of HHs receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	HHs receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (#).	Expected # of HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2016:</b> 69 (4% of 1,637 HHs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 36 (5% of 722 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 33 (4% of 915 HHs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 33 (5% of 656 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 25 (3% of 834 HHs)	Yes
	% of Alt Rent & Control Group HHs receiving TANF at FYE	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs	Explanation to be provided



		receiving TANF as of FYE	receiving TANF as of FYE	
--	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	--

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# of HHs receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#).	Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2015:</b> <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 0 (0% * 1,000 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 0 (0% * 1,000 HHs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 8 (1% of 722 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 15 (2% of 915 HHs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 5 (1% of 656 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 20 (2% of 834 HHs)	Yes based on percentage No based on numbers for Alt Rent Group
	% of study-eligible HHs receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation multiplied by expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE	Explanation to be provided

<sup>1</sup> Metric captures households enrolled in the Housing Authority's FSS Program.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)<sup>1</sup></i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 &/or 9 subsidies per HH affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2015:</b> \$634/month	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$608/month <b>Control Group:</b> \$628/month	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$711/month <b>Control Group:</b> \$664/month	No
	Average HAP to owner per study-eligible HH prior to implementation of activity	Expected HAP to owner per Alt Rent / Control Group HH as of FYE	Actual HAP to owner per Alt Rent / Control Group HH as of FYE	Explanation to be provided

<sup>1</sup> Per unit subsidy equals average HAP to Owner.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (\$).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.



	N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	Average annual rent revenue per study-eligible HH	Expected total annual rent revenue from Alt Rent / Control Group HHs as of FYE	Actual total annual rent revenue from Alt Rent / Control Group HHs as of FYE	Explanation to be provided

<b>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households (HHs) Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>				
<i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain suitable employment."</i> <sup>1</sup>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# of HHs 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" # should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2016:</b> <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 161 (22% of 722 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 188 (21% of 915 HHs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 161 (22% of 722 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 188 (21% of 915 HHs)	<b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 140 (21% of 656 HHs) <b>Control Group:</b> 225 (28% of 802 HHs)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group
	% of Alt Rent & Control Group households meeting definition of self-sufficiency at FYE	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY	Explanation to be provided

<sup>1</sup> "Employment" means the household is receiving earned income. "Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

#### Data Sources for Metrics Tables Above

LMHA uses several sources to obtain the data necessary to evaluate this activity:

- 1) *Emphasys LIB*. Information related to household income, assets, household composition, and unit information; and
- 2) *Human Resources personnel data*. Determination of the average hourly cost per job title.

## A.4 Public Housing Development

LMHA's goal is to transform the physical stock of the original family developments owned and managed by the agency in the coming years, replacing the current public housing developments with mixed income communities, while at the same time providing replacement units so that the overall number of families served will not decrease. LMHA has implemented the following MTW initiatives designed to expedite the redevelopment process and ensure that all new and newly acquired properties are energy-efficient and cost effective.

### ACTIVITY #18-2009: Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal

#### Description

This activity simplifies the public housing development submittal process for each acquired or developed public housing property. Twice yearly, LMHA also submits a six month report summarizing the Agency's acquisition and development activities to the HUD Louisville Field Office. The activity has reduced the amount of time staff spends preparing development submittals and reduced the average length of time to close on a property.

#### Approval and Implementation

Activity #18-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

#### Impact

LMHA did not use the regulatory flexibility provided through this MTW activity during FY 2017; however, it may be used in the future.

#### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> \$12,249 (9 submittals * 25 hrs * \$54.44/hr)	\$930 (2 submittals * 7.5 hrs * \$62.00/hr)	\$0 (0 submittals * 0 hrs)	No
	Total annual cost to prepare development submittals prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected total annual cost to prepare development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual total annual cost to prepare development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available. Staff hourly rate for FY 2008 is not available. FY 2009 hourly rate of \$54.44 (including benefits) was used instead.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	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.
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> 225 hrs (9 submittals *25 hrs)	15 hrs (2 submittals * 7.5 hrs)	0 hrs (0 submittals * 0 hrs)	No
	Total annual staff time spent preparing development submittals prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected total annual staff time spent preparing development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual total annual staff time spent preparing development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<b><i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i></b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# of new housing units made available for HHs at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of HH, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of 2008:</b> Not tracked	10	0	No
	Public housing units acquired/developed prior to implementation of the activity	Expected public housing units acquired/developed after implementation of the activity	Actual public housing units acquired/developed after implementation of the activity	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

## **ACTIVITY #26-2011: Public Housing – Acquisition of Mixed Income Sites**

### **Description**

This activity authorizes LMHA to acquire units for public housing or vacant land for developing public housing without prior HUD authorization if HUD does not respond to LMHA's request for authorization within 10 days of the submittal date. All acquired properties must meet HUD's site selection requirements, and LMHA will request approval of the HUD Field Office when a pending acquisition deviates from the selection requirements and/or at the discretion of the Executive Director. Copies of all required forms and appraisals will be maintained in the project file.

### **Approval and Implementation**

Activity #26-2011 was proposed and implemented in FY 2011.

### **Impact**

Although this activity was proposed and implemented in FY 2011, it has not yet been used to acquire property at mixed-income sites. HUD has approved all property acquisitions. This regulatory flexibility

would be used in the event that HUD has not responded to LMHA's request for authorization within 10 days of the submittal date.

### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2010:</b> N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total annual cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected total annual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual total annual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff, as an acquisition package is still prepared and submitted to HUD.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	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.
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total annual staff time spent on task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected total annual staff time spent on task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual total annual staff time spent on task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the amount of staff time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff, as an acquisition package is still prepared and submitted to HUD.

<i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) of new housing units made available for HHs at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of HH, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of 2008:</b> 0	0 <sup>1</sup>	0	Yes
	Public housing units acquired/developed prior to implementation of the activity	Expected public housing units acquired/developed after	Actual public housing units acquired/developed after	Explanation to be provided

		implementation of the activity	implementation of the activity	
Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs				

<sup>1</sup> LMHA anticipates this activity will be invoked only rarely. In most years, we anticipate this flexibility will not be used at all.

## A.5 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities

### ACTIVITY #3-2006: Amount and Distribution of HCV Homeownership Assistance

#### Description

This activity allows LMHA to offer a two-bedroom payment standard for all one-bedroom-eligible HCV Homeownership households. It does not otherwise affect the calculation of the payment standard.

#### Approval and Implementation

Activity #3-2006 was proposed and implemented in FY 2006.

#### Impact

During FY 2017, twenty-one (21) HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home. The average home sales price was \$108,709, with an average mortgage interest rate of 2.649%. Twelve (12) of the buyers were elderly and/or disabled. Six (6) of the buyers together received a total of \$61,652 in HOME down payment assistance through Louisville Metro Government.

This activity permitted ten (10) one-bedroom-eligible families to purchase a unit using the two-bedroom payment standard. Two (2) of the ten (10) purchased a home in an exception payment standard area.

#### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
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.
	As of FY 2005: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	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).	Explanation to be provided
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

Data Source(s): N/A

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<b><i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
# of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2005: 0</b>	2	10	Yes
	1-BR HHs able to purchase a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected 1-BR HHs able to purchase a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual 1-BR HHs able to purchase a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs

<sup>1</sup> Benchmark based on FY 2015 outcome.

<b><i>Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
# of households (HHs) that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	# of HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2005: 0</b>	2	10	Yes
	# of 1-BR HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected # of 1-BR HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual # of 1-BR HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs

<sup>1</sup> Benchmark based on FY 2015 outcome.

## **ACTIVITY #13-2009: Exception Payment Standards for HCV Homeownership**

### **Description**

Beginning in July 2016, LMHA expanded the number of homeownership-specific payment standard areas; payment standards are now set to 120% of FMR in those census tracts where, according to the most recently available 5-year American Community Survey estimates, *Owner Occupied Median Value* for the census tract is greater than 80% of the *Owner Occupied Median Value* for the Louisville Metropolitan Statistical



Area (MSA). Before this significant change, the *Owner Occupied Median Value* for the census tract had to be greater than 100% of the same value for the MSA as a whole.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #13-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009. The number of homeownership-specific exception payment standard areas was increased via a change to this activity in FY 2016. LMHA re-proposed this activity in FY17.

### Impact

Since FY 2009, this activity has allowed a total of seventeen (17) families to buy homes in areas of opportunity. Five (5) HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home in an exception payment standard area during FY 2017. All five (5) of these participants purchased a home in an exception area added in FY 2017.

LMHA conducted an analysis and confirmed that this rent reform initiative does not unintentionally increase the rent burden of households purchasing homes in exception areas. In addition, the analysis confirmed that there is no disparate impact on the rent burden faced by protected classes of households by race, ethnicity, disability, age, or gender.

### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
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.
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after	Explanation to be provided



	implementation of the activity (in hours).	implementation of the activity (in hours).	implementation of the activity (in hours).	
Data Source(s): N/A				

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<b><i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
# of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2008: 0</b>	2	5	Yes
	HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<b><i>Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
# of households (HHs) that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	# of HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2008: 0</b>	2	5	Yes
	# of HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

## ACTIVITY #11-2009: Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications for HCV Homeownership

### Description

Once approved for the HCV Homeownership Program, families have eight months to execute and close on a proposed sales agreement. Under this activity the income verification completed during the program application process is valid for eight months, staff no longer has to re-verify income for families who take more than 60 days to close on a sale.

In FY 2014, LMHA discontinued the portion of this activity that allowed LMHA to accept tenant provided documents for verification. MTW authority was no longer needed for this portion of the activity. LMHA has removed this change from the closed-out activities matrix as it should just be reflected as a change to this existing activity.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #11-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

### Hardship

Not applicable. This activity does not include rent reform.

### Impact

Once approved for the HCV Homeownership Program, families have eight months to execute and close on a proposed sales agreement. Since the income verification completed during the program application process is now valid for eight months, staff no longer has to re-verify income for families who take more than 60 days to close on a sale. Thus, the cost of this task (re-verifying income after 60 days) has dropped from \$179 pre-implementation (FY 2008) to \$0.

### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$)	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$)	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> \$179 (12 verifications * 0.5 hrs * \$29.78/hour)	\$0	\$0	Yes
	Cost to re-verify income prior to implementation of the activity (\$)	Expected cost to re-verify income after implementation of the activity (\$)	Actual cost to re-verify income after implementation of the activity (\$)	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs; PHA financial records				

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
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
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> 6 hrs (12 verifications * 0.5 hrs)	0 hrs	0 hrs	Yes
	Staff time spent re-verifying income prior to implementation of the activity (\$)	Expected staff time spent re-verifying income after implementation of the activity (\$)	Actual staff time spent re-verifying income after implementation of the activity (\$)	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs				

<i><b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b></i>				
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 (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2008:</b> Not tracked	N/A (Task no longer conducted)	N/A (Task no longer conducted)	N/A
	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs.				

## A.6 Local Leased Housing Program

### ACTIVITY #44-2015: SPECIAL REFERRAL MTW HCV PROGRAMS

#### Description

MTW allows LMHA to maximize the potential of locally available resources to develop programs for people with specific needs. The goal is to meet needs not met by other agencies and to partner with local organizations that have social services programs that need a housing support element. Some of these needs are transitional; others are for programs that provide more long-term support.

Special referral programs are intended to address the needs of traditionally underserved populations in the community, and provide the voucher as incentive for families to move toward economic self-sufficiency. The programs provide housing subsidy to up to 637 families through partnerships with a number of supportive services agencies. Families with specific needs often face multiple barriers to achieving their self-sufficiency goals. LMHA's special referral MTW HCV programs provide a strong incentive for participation as eligible applicants receive an admissions preference for the agency's HCV program, which has a current waitlist of approximately 14,000 applicants. These programs also increase housing choices for low-income families.

Per HUD's request, LMHA has combined the reporting for these activities under a single, umbrella activity (#44-2015):

#### Activity #1-2005: The Villager - Center for Women and Families

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 22 households for a special referral program with the Center for Women and Families for their long-term transitional housing on their downtown campus. Programs at the Center focus on the elimination of domestic violence, sexual violence and economic hardship.

#### Activity #7-2008: Day Spring

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to four households with members who have a severe mental illness and who live in a Day Spring constructed unit while they participate in the program. Day Spring, a faith-based charitable organization, provides residential and supportive services to adults with developmental disabilities who want the opportunity to live independently in a supportive community setting. Under the initiative, not all of the residential units may be subject to typical HUD Housing Quality Standards and rent reasonableness requirements.

#### Activity #15-2009: Louisville Scholar House / Family Scholar House (formerly Project Women)

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 56 families for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Louisville Scholar House facility. Participants are solo heads of households, who often face multiple barriers to furthering their education and obtaining employment that will provide their families with adequate income to become self-sufficient.

#### Activity #20-2010: Downtown Scholar House - Family Scholar House with Spalding University

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 43 households for a special referral program with Family Scholar House and Spalding University at the Downtown Scholar House.

#### Activity #30-2012: 100,000 Homes Initiative

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 50 vouchers for a Special Referral HCV program with the 100,000 Homes initiative of the Louisville Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services

Administration (SAMHSA) Community Consortium. Participants in this Housing First model program, who are identified and referred by the Louisville SAMHSA, must be chronically homeless.

Activity #31-2012: Stoddard Johnston Scholar House - Family Scholar House

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 57 vouchers for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Stoddard Johnston Scholar House location.

Activity #34-2012: Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to five households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Youngland Avenue facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #35-2012: Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs

LMHA may, without prior HUD approval, allocate (provide a limited admission preference for) up to 10 MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to a Special Referral HCV program for service-enriched affordable housing programs within the agency's jurisdiction. To be eligible, programs must offer housing and supportive services targeted to families whose needs are not adequately served elsewhere in the community. Some allocations are incremental additions to existing special referral programs while others are allocations to newly established programs.

- In 2012, LMHA allocated up to 10 vouchers to Coalition for the Homeless for homeless families with children.
- In 2013, the Agency allocated up to an additional 10 vouchers to the same referral program, as well as up to 10 vouchers to Family Scholar House participants who may choose to live at York Towers. No York Towers vouchers have been issued to date, and LMHA does not anticipate that any will be issued in the future. The York Towers vouchers have been removed from the special referral summary table included at the end of the reporting for activity #44-2015.
- In FY 2014, up to 4 vouchers were allocated to a program operated by Choices, Inc., which serves solo parent families that are both homeless and disabled. During FY 2016, LMHA allocated an additional voucher to Choices, Inc.
- In FY 2016, the Housing Authority allocated vouchers to three partners:
  - Up to 10 vouchers to ChooseWell Communities to assist families that include a pregnant or post-partum mother who has successfully completed residential and/or intensive outpatient treatment for addiction.
  - 
  - Up to 10 vouchers to the Kentucky Housing Corporation for families that include either: 1) a household member with a serious mental illness who is exiting a licensed personal care home or state psychiatric hospital or is at risk of institutionalization, or 2) a household member who is exiting a nursing home or intermediate care facility for individuals with intellectual or other development disabilities;
  - Up to 10 vouchers to Wellspring for families that include a household member with a severe mental illness who is exiting Wellspring's Ardery House facility for permanent housing; and

- In FY 2017, LMHA allocated up to 10 vouchers to the Family & Children's Place to assist individuals who are leaving an institution and are at risk of homelessness.

Activity #36-2013: Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility

This activity established a special referral program and limited admission preference to provide housing assistance to up to eight households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Bashford Manor facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #38-2013: Parkland Scholar House - Family Scholar House

Under this activity, LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 53 vouchers, including five vouchers for participants who reside off-campus, for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Parkland Scholar House Facility. Vouchers become portable upon graduation.

Activity #42-2015: Centerstone (formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.)

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 50 vouchers for a special referral program with Centerstone for households that include a member with a severe mental illness who is currently institutionalized at a personal care home or at risk of being institutionalized because of a lack of adequate community support.

Activity #45-2016: Coalition for the Homeless' "Move Up" Program

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 100 households who are referred by the Coalition for the Homeless through the "Move Up" program. This preference allows chronically homeless families who no longer need intensive case management services to transition from temporary homeless services vouchers to permanent HCV vouchers. (Note that this activity was subsequently closed out in FY 2018.)

Activity #46-2017: Riverport Scholar House

Under this activity, LMHA will allocate up to 64 additional vouchers to the Family Scholar House's new Riverport campus. Participants will receive an admissions preference for the Housing Authority's HCV Program, and must meet HCV eligibility criteria. The amount of housing assistance each family receives will be determined according to traditional HCV Program rules as modified through the Housing Authority's HUD-approved MTW activities. Although participants will initially be required to live on-site at the Riverport campus, their voucher will become fully portable once they successfully graduate from the Scholar House program. As each participant leaves the Scholar House's program, LMHA will issue a voucher to the next eligible applicant on the Scholar House waiting list.

In lieu of a traditional Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection at the time of initial lease-up, LMHA plans to use the Certificate of Occupancy issued by the Louisville Metro Department of Codes and Regulations as evidence of HQS compliance. Subsequently, all units will be inspected once per year concurrently; in addition, individual units will be inspected before each new occupant moves in.

No vouchers were issued during FY 2017 as the building was in the development phase; however, lease-up is expected to be completed by April 2018.

Activity #47-2017: ChooseWell Communities

During FY 2016, LMHA provided an initial allocation of up to 10 vouchers to ChooseWell, using the MTW flexibilities provided through HUD-approved Activity #35-2012. During FY 2017, LMHA

allocated an additional 60 vouchers to assist families that include a pregnant or post-partum mother who has successfully completed residential and/or intensive outpatient treatment for addiction.

As with the Housing Authority's existing Special Referral Programs, families will be referred to LMHA by ChooseWell Communities, and program applicants will receive an admissions preference for the Authority's HCV Program. Households will be required to meet basic HCV eligibility criteria, and the amount of housing assistance each family receives will be determined according to traditional HCV Program rules as modified through LMHA's HUD-approved MTW initiatives. No MTW flexibilities will be used with regard to HQS inspections, which will be performed per HUD regulation.

### **Approval and Implementation**

The following "sub-activities" are reported under umbrella activity #44-2015, "Special Referral MTW HCV Programs," which was proposed and implemented in FY 2015:

- 1) Activity #1-2005 (The Villager / Center for Women and Families) was proposed and implemented in FY 2005.
- 2) Activity #7-2008 (Day Spring) was proposed in FY 2008 and implemented in FY 2012.
- 3) Activity #15-2009 (Louisville / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.
- 4) Activity #20-2010 (Downtown / Family Scholar House with Spalding University) was proposed in FY 2010 and implemented in FY 2011.
- 5) Activity #30-2012 (100,000 Homes Initiative) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 6) Activity #31-2012 (Stoddard Johnston / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 7) Activity #34-2012 (Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 8) Activity #35-2012 (Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 9) Activity #36-2013 (Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 10) Activity #38-2013 (Parkland / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2013.
- 11) Activity #42-2015 (Centerstone (formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.)) was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.
- 12) Activity #45-2016 (Coalition for the Homeless "Move Up" Program) was proposed and implemented in FY 2016 (since closed in FY 2018).
- 13) Activity #46-2017 (Riverport Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2017.
- 14) Activity #47-2017 (ChooseWell Communities) was proposed and implemented in FY 2017.

### **Impact**

During FY 2017, LMHA continued to provide housing subsidy to families through partnerships with supportive services agencies as well as allocating an additional 60 vouchers to ChooseWell Communities to assist families that include a pregnant or post-partum mother who has successfully completed residential and/or intensive outpatient treatment for addiction, and up to 10 vouchers to the Family & Children's Place to assist individuals who are leaving an institution and are at risk of homelessness.

A table summarizing LMHA's Special Referral Programs follows:

**Table 13: LMHA Special Referral MTW Voucher Programs  
Fiscal Year 2017**

Organization	Site	Voucher Allocation	FY Proposed (FY Activity Approved, if different)	FY First Voucher Issued	Portable?	MTW Inspections?
100K Homes Initiative	N/A	50	2012	2012	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Center for Women and Families	Villager	22	2005	2005	Full portability upon program completion.	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
Centerstone (formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.)	N/A	50	2015	2015	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Choices, Inc.	Choices owned units	5	2014	2014	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
ChooseWell Communities	N/A	10 in 2016 and 60 in 2017	2016, 2017	2016	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Coalition for the Homeless	N/A (Rapid Re-housing)	20	2012, 2013	2013	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
	N/A (Move Up)	100	2016	2016		
Day Spring	Day Spring constructed units	4	2009	2009, 2012 <sup>1</sup>	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Family & Children's Place	N/A	10	2017	2017	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Family Scholar House	Louisville	56	2008	2008	Full portability upon program completion.	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
	Downtown	43	2010	2011		
	Stoddard Johnston	57	2012			
	Parkland + 5 off-site	53	2012 Amended	2012		
	Riverport	64	2017	N/A <sup>2</sup>		
Kentucky Housing Corporation	N/A	10	2016	2016	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Wellspring	Youngland Avenue	5	2012	2012	Full portability.	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
	Bashford Manor/Newburg	8	2012	2013		
	Ardery House	10	2016	2016		

<sup>1</sup> Referral program suspended during FY2010 and FY2011.

<sup>2</sup> No vouchers had been issued as of FYE 2017; facility is currently under construction.



## Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following, combined HUD Standard Metrics for these activities. All Self-Sufficiency metrics for this activity exclude elderly and disabled families. While 280 households participated in a Special Referral Program at fiscal-year-end, the Self-Sufficiency outcomes below only include the 218 families that were neither elderly nor disabled.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Yes
	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> Implementation of this activity does not modify any LMHA-completed tasks. Housing Authority staff determines applicant eligibility and performs all certifications.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
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.
	0 hr	0 hr	0 hr	Yes
	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).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> Implementation of this activity does not modify any LMHA-completed tasks. Housing Authority staff determines applicant eligibility and performs all certifications.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged<sup>1</sup></i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (\$). This # may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Yes

	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (\$). This # may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Special referral program partner records				

<sup>1</sup> Neither the level of LMHA housing subsidy nor task cost is affected by implementation of this activity.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>FY 2016:</b> \$4,108	\$4,108	\$4,522	Yes
	Average earned income of work-able HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected average earned income of work-able HHs affected by this policy at FYE.	Actual average earned income of work-able HHs affected by this policy at FYE.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which this data is available.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time <sup>2</sup>	<b>As of FY 2016:</b> 90 (32% of 279 HHs)	Insufficient data to establish individual benchmarks for Categories 1-4.	95 (44% of 218 HHs)	Insufficient data to establish individual benchmarks for Categories 1-4.
(2) Employed Part-Time <sup>2</sup>				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	Not tracked		Tracking mechanism to be determined	
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	Not tracked			
(5) Unemployed	<b>As of FY 2016:</b> 189 (68% of 279 HHs)	189 (68% of 279 HHs)	123 (56% of 218 HHs)	Yes
(6) Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	# of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (#).	Expected # of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).	Actual # of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<sup>2</sup> Although LMHA did not track part-time vs. full-time employment in FY 2017, the agency did track income from earnings. At FYE, 95 (44%) non-elderly / non-disabled households had income from earnings, while 123 (56%) reported no income from earnings.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households (HHs) Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
# of HHs receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	HHs receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (#).	Expected # of HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>FY 2016:</b> 54 (19% of 279 HHs)	54 (19% of 279 HHs)	47 (22% of 218 HHs)	Yes based on number No based on percentage
	# of work-able HHs receiving TANF prior to implementation	Expected # of work-able HHs receiving TANF as of FYE	Actual # of work-able HHs receiving TANF as of FYE	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
# of HHs receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#)	Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#)	Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2016:</b> 13 (5% of 279 HHs)	13 (5% of 279 HHs)	10 (5% of 218 HHs)	Yes based on percentage No based on number
	# of work-able HHs receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of activity	Expected # of work-able HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE	Actual # of work-able HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Special referral program partners				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available. LMHA tracks FSS participation for this metric. The special referral partner may offer additional self-sufficiency services.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average amount of Section 8 &/or 9 subsidies per HH affected by this policy in	Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$)	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$)	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2016:</b> \$617	\$617	\$628	No

dollars (decrease).	Average monthly Section 8 subsidy per work-able HH prior to implementation of activity	Expected Section 8 subsidy per work-able HH as of FYE	Actual Section 8 subsidy per work-able HH as of FYE	Explanation to be provided
---------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i></b>				
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.
	N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	Gross annual rent revenue from work-able HHs prior to implementation	Expected gross annual rent revenue from work-able HHs during FY	Actual gross annual rent revenue from work-able HHs during FY	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i></b>				
<i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."</i> <sup>1</sup>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>2</sup>	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 of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2016: 32 (11% of 279 HHs)	32 (11% of 279 HHs)	23 (11% of 218 HHs)	Yes based on percentage No based on number
	# of work-able HHs transitioned to self sufficiency annually prior to implementation	Anticipated # of work-able HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY	Actual # of work-able HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Various				

<sup>1</sup> "Employment" means the household is receiving earned income. "Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

<sup>2</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b><i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i></b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline <sup>1</sup>	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2016: <1 month	<1 month	<1 month	Yes
	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

## ACTIVITY #2-1999: MTW Unit Inspection Protocol

### Description

Many of LMHA's partners' residential facilities are newly constructed or renovated. As such, LMHA has used MTW authority to allow the certificate of occupancy to suffice for the initial move-in inspection in lieu of a traditional HQS inspection. This substitution has saved the Housing Authority thousands of dollars since Louisville Scholar House first came online in 2008.

Unit inspections of facilities that participate in HUD's Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program and that are managed by organizations with which the Agency has had a long-term and outstanding relationship, are waived upon initial occupancy, and the agency has the authority to conduct inspections once per year concurrently. These properties include the Chestnut Street YMCA SRO; St. Vincent de Paul SRO; and Willow Place.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #2-1999 was proposed and implemented in FY 1999.

### Impact

This activity has significantly reduced costs to inspect the units associated with these programs. In FY 2017, LMHA used this activity to complete bulk inspections at the YMCA and St. Vincent de Paul.

### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
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 task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 1998: Not available	\$976 (41 units * \$23.80) <sup>1</sup>	\$1,595 (60 units * \$26.59)	No

	Cost of inspecting Mod Rehab units prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected cost of inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual cost of inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the activity (\$).	Explanation to be provided
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records.

<sup>1</sup> Original benchmark only included 41 YMCA units.

<b><i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 1998:</b> Not available	23.9 hours (41 units * 0.6 hours) <sup>1</sup>	36 hours (60 units * 0.6 hours)	No
	Staff time spent inspecting Mod Rehab units prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Expected staff time spent inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual staff time spent inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the activity (\$).	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records.

<sup>1</sup> Original benchmark only included 41 YMCA units.

<b><i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
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.
	<b>As of FY 1998:</b> Not available	0%	0%	Yes
	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).	Explanation to be provided.

Data Source(s): Staff logs.

## **ACTIVITY #27-2011: Amend HCV Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility**

### **Description**

LMHA amended its HCV program admissions policy to allow for the deduction of verified ongoing child-care expenses from a working household's gross income when determining income eligibility. In order to qualify for the adjustment, the family must include a head of household and/or spouse with a demonstrated work history for a period of 12 months or longer.

## Approval and Implementation

Activity #27-2011 was proposed and implemented in FY 2011.

## Impact

The pool of potential families eligible for the child-care deduction is very small. However, because of the potential benefit to working families, the agency believes the activity merits continuation. During FY 2017, LMHA was unable to track the affected households; however, LMHA is working on establishing a tracking mechanism for this activity.

## Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<b><i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per HH affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2010:</b> N/A (No HHs affected by policy)	\$542	Not tracked	N/A
	Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation (\$)	Expected average subsidy per HH affected by this policy as of FYE after implementation (\$)	Actual average subsidy per HH affected by this policy as of FYE after implementation (\$)	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

<b><i>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	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.
	N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	Sum of annual rent revenue from HHs who received the deduction to determine eligibility.	Expected sum of annual rent revenue from HHs who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of FYE	Actual sum of annual rent revenue from HHs who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of FYE	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

## ACTIVITY #39-2014: HCV Program Rent Increase Limit

## Description

This activity places a 2% cap on annual contract rent increases for units where the tenant is already receiving HCV rental assistance. At contract renewal, LMHA limits the landlord's requested rent to whichever is



least: 102% of the previous contract rent for the same tenant; the payment standard; or to the rent as determined through a rent reasonableness analysis. In LMHA's FY 2019 Plan, this activity is being modified to reflect reasonable rent (RR) determinations on a random sample of the units where rent increases were requested.

### Approval and Implementation

Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

### Hardship

Not applicable. This activity does not include rent reform.

### Impact

This activity caps the annual contract rent increases for HCV households.

### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<b><i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average amount of Section 8 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.
	<b>As of FY 2014:</b> \$526 <sup>1</sup>	\$542	\$566	No
	Average subsidy per MTW HCV HH prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) prior to implementation.	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of FYE.	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of FYE.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> FY 2014 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<b><i>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	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.
	N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.			
	Sum of annual rental revenue from HHs affected by this policy	Expected sum of annual rental revenue from HHs affected by this policy during FY	Actual sum of annual rental revenue from HHs affected by this policy during FY	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				



## A.7 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

### ACTIVITY #37-2014: Accessible Units Sublease Agreement with Frazier Rehab Institute

#### Description

This activity allows LMHA to sublease fully accessible units as temporary housing for Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) out-patients of Frazier Rehab Institute. The units are transitional housing provided for up to six months per family. Frazier Rehab Institute is responsible for verifying that the family is eligible to live in the unit (e.g., a program participant, household income is at or below 80% AMI). Two fully-accessible units located at the Liberty Green Community Center are dedicated to this activity. The Community Center is ideally located one-half mile from the Frazier Rehab Institute. Frazier Rehab leases the apartments from LMHA and pays the cost of all utilities. Rent to Frazier Rehab is set at \$210 per month (or roughly 30% of monthly SSI for one person), and Frazier Rehab has agreed to pass on no more than 100% of the rent plus utilities to the tenant (the sub lessee). Frazier Rehab uses a modified version of LMHA's public housing lease as its tenant sublease and has established a hardship policy to define circumstances under which households may be exempted or temporarily waived from the rent Frazier Rehab may charge to the sub lessee. Examples could include involuntary loss of income or unexpected medical expenses. Frazier Rehab also refers sub lessees to area service providers, including the Center for Accessible Living (Kentucky's first Independent Living Center), who can assist households with leaving the program.

#### Approval and Implementation

Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

#### Impact

In FY 2017, LMHA served two households through this activity.

#### Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></i>				
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.
	<b>As of FY 2013:</b> 0 hr (units were vacant)	0 hr (0.0 hr * 6 HHs)	0 hr (0.0 hr * 2 HHs)	Yes
	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).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<sup>1</sup> LMHA estimates approximately 3 hours of staff time to perform new applicant “intake” tasks are saved per participant household.

<b><i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI that include a member with a Spinal Cord Injury (increase).	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2013: 0</b>	2	2	Yes
	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PIC				

## **ACTIVITY #29-2015: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville**

### **Description**

This activity allows YouthBuild Louisville (YBL) to sublease public housing units to provide temporary housing for low-income YBL participants who are experiencing homelessness. LMHA subleases up to three 2-bedroom apartments for the use of YBL participants (and their families) and facility space for the YBL program. Units are provided to YBL on an as needed basis. This activity using public housing as an incentive for young people to enroll in the YBL job training program, which increases their chances of becoming self-reliant.

For each month a unit is occupied by an YBL program participant, YBL pays LMHA \$60. YBL certifies that students are income eligible upon entry to the YBL program through the application process and follow-up verification through local and state subsidy programs. The participant and their household may continue to live in the unit as long as they are active in the YBL program. Upon graduation, the household may elect to receive preference for a public housing unit.

All participants residing in the subleased public housing units must meet basic Public Housing Program eligibility criteria (no outstanding rent balance with LMHA or other public housing authority, criminal background check, age 18 or older). LMHA staff verifies that the YBL program participant is eligible for this MTW initiative.

### **Approval and Implementation**

Activity #29-2015 was originally proposed in FY 2011, but not approved by HUD as LMHA lacked Broader Use of Funds authorization at that time. The activity was re-proposed, approved by HUD, and implemented in FY 2015.

### **Impact**

In FY 2017, LMHA served three households under this activity.

### **Changes to Metrics**

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2017 Plan.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY2014:</b> N/A	\$0	\$0. Participants do not receive wages. Instead, they receive a stipend of \$100/week	N/A
	Average annual gross earned income prior to implementation	Expected average annual gross earned income during FY	Actual average annual gross earned income during FY	Explanation to be provided

<sup>1</sup> During FY 2017, all six (6) participants graduated from the YouthBuild Louisville Program. Participants are not required to report their income following graduation; however, four (4) of the participants were employed after graduation; three (3) in full-time positions and one (1) in a part-time position.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Outcome<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	<b>As of FY2014:</b> 0	0	3	Yes
(2) Employed Part-Time	<b>As of FY2014:</b> 0	0	1	Yes
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	<b>As of FY2014:</b> 0	1	2	Yes
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	<b>As of FY2014:</b> 0	1	1	Yes
(5) Unemployed	<b>As of FY2014:</b> 0	1	2	Yes
(6) Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	# of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity	Expected # of HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE	Actual # of total HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE	Explanation to be provided.

<sup>1</sup> Benchmark based on FY 2015 actuals.

<sup>2</sup> During FY 2017, all six (6) of the YouthBuild Louisville participants graduated from the program. Four (4) of the participants are now employed; three (3) in full-time positions and one (1) in a part-time position. All six (6) participants earned construction certifications; one (1) enrolled in job training; two (2) enrolled in college; four (4) earned GEDs; one (1) earned a high school diploma. Three (3) individuals remained in the units at FYE and one (1) moved into permanent, stabilized housing.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) of HHs receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#).	Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2014: 0</b>	1	6	Yes
	# of HHs receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of activity	Expected # of HHs receiving self-sufficiency services during FY	Actual # of HHs receiving self-sufficiency services during FY	Explanation to be provided

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households (HHs) Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i></b>				
<i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as “the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment.”<sup>1</sup></i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) of HHs 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" # should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2014: 0</b>	0	4	Yes
	# of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation	Expected # of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY	Actual # of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY	Explanation to be provided

<sup>1</sup>“Employment” means the household is receiving earned income. “Suitable” is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

<b><i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i></b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.	Expected HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>As of FY 2014: 0</b>	1	2	Yes
	# of HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation.	# of HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity during FY	# of HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity during FY	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

## **B. Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities**

### **ACTIVITY #28-2011: Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance and Modernization of Public Housing**

#### **Description/Update**

The activity is to explore using MTW authority to create locally defined guidelines for the development (including rehabilitation), maintenance and modernization of public housing. During FY 2017, LMHA continued to research reasonable and modest design guidelines, unit size guidelines and unit amenity guidelines that could be used for new public housing development activities. The criteria focuses on strategies for developing sustainable housing, preserving affordable housing, and developing low-income housing in low-concentration, non-impacted areas of the agency's jurisdiction. Strategies include rehabilitation and new construction standards that reduce energy consumption, including Energy Star criteria, and that increase the supply of accessible housing in the community.

In conjunction with the Housing Authority's Choice Neighborhoods Initiative efforts for the Russell neighborhood and the Beecher Terrace public housing development, LMHA continued to examine innovative ways to provide one-for-one replacement of the 758 Beecher Terrace public housing units, including the potential use of locally defined guidelines for the development, maintenance, and modernization of public housing. If LMHA decides not to pursue locally defined guidelines in conjunction with the redevelopment of Beecher Terrace, this activity will be closed out during FY 2018.

Activity #28-2011 was proposed and approved in FY 2011. It has not yet been implemented.

## **C. MTW Activities On-Hold**

### **ACTIVITY #25-2010: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities**

#### **Description/Update**

Activity #25-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010. The activity was placed on-hold in 2012. HUD OGC investigated the use of public housing as emergency housing for victims of human trafficking and found that it was not feasible under MTW to permit families who could not produce valid identification to live in public housing communities. This activity will remain on hold until a resolution, allowing victims of human trafficking to receive much-needed housing assistance, can be reached.

## D. Closed Out MTW Activities

Listed below is a summary of previously approved MTW activities that LMHA has completed, discontinued, or determined do not require MTW authority to implement:

Activity	Plan Year	Close Out Year	Reason for Close Out
Spatial Deconstruction of HCV Assisted Units (Activity #5-2007)	FY 2007	FY 2009	The activity was to limit the concentration of Housing Choice Voucher assisted units in complexes of one hundred or more units to 25% (excluding both elderly/disabled and special referral program sites). This activity was closed at FYE 2009 because of its potential to limit voucher holders' universe of housing choices.
Public Housing - Term Limits and Employment/Education Requirements for New Scattered Sites (Activity #9-2007)	FY 2007	FY 2016 FY 2017	This activity revised the occupancy criteria for detached, single family, scattered site units to include 5-year residency term limits and employment/education requirements for admission and ongoing occupancy. Due to continued low occupancy rates at these sites, the activity was revised in FY 2016 to remove the 5-year residency term limit and in FY 2017, LMHA stopped enforcing the employment/education requirements associated with these units and closed out this activity, allowing LMHA to increase occupancy rates. Please see below for further details.
Explore HUD's Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies (Activity #16-2009)	FY 2009	FY 2014	This activity was never implemented. HUD investigated the possibility of streamlined demolition/disposition activities for MTW agencies, but found that it was not feasible under MTW. Out of concern for residents' rights and the public process, HUD decided that MTW agencies must follow the established procedures for demolition and disposition of property.
Occupancy Criteria Changes for New Scattered Sites – Mandatory Case Management (Activity #21-2010)	FY 2010	FY 2016	This activity revised the occupancy criteria for detached, single-family scattered site units to include mandatory participation in a case management program and movement toward self-sufficiency. Residents moving into one of these units could choose between General Case Management and the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program. Due to low occupancy rates at these sites, this activity was closed out in early FY 2016.
Increased Flat Rents (Activity #24-2010)	FY 2010	FY 2011	LMHA proposed flat rents for the Agency's scattered sites be raised and adjusted based on the square footage, location, age and amenities at the property as rent comparables for the site were completed. LMHA decided not to implement this activity, and flat rents have since been raised across all of the agency's public housing units to meet HUD's recent requirement that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.
Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income – Public Housing Program (Activity #33-2012)	FY 2012	FY 2014	LMHA proposed that families receiving rental assistance under the Public Housing program would pay either 30% of their monthly adjusted income for rent, or the minimum rent established by the LMHA, whichever was higher. Upon further consideration, because the Housing Authority's housing stock includes tax credit units, LMHA considered amending the activity to include "ceiling rents" that would vary by bedroom size and that would be set in

Activity	Plan Year	Close Out Year	Reason for Close Out
			accordance with the annual tax-credit ceiling rents, as published by the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC). KHC is the tax credit allocating agency for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. However, this significant change was never submitted to HUD. Rather, in 2014, LMHA raised flat rents to conform to new HUD regulations mandating that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.

## **ACTIVITY #9-2007: Employment/Education Requirements in New Scattered Site Units**

### *1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #9-2007 was proposed and implemented in FY 2007. The activity originally included a five-year occupancy term limit for affected units that was eliminated via a significant change to the activity in FY 2016. The activity was also linked to Activity #21-2010 that required residents of affected units to participate in mandatory case management; however, Activity #21-2010 was closed out as part of the FY 2016 Annual Report.

### *2. Activity Description*

Many of LMHA's Scattered Sites are highly desirable properties, especially the single-family homes acquired or constructed through the Housing Authority's most recent HOPE VI revitalization projects. When these units first began to come online as part of the Liberty Green HOPE VI project, LMHA was concerned that, in some instances, the amenities and low rent structure could discourage residents from moving out of the units towards self-sufficiency. Using its MTW flexibility, LMHA began piloting term limits, work/education requirements, and mandatory case management for residents at these sites and evaluating the potential of the initiatives to incent residents to move up and out of the Public Housing program.

Jointly, these activities imposed a five-year occupancy term limit; required that adults who were neither elderly nor disabled either work at least 20 hours per week or be enrolled full-time at an accredited post-secondary educational institution; and provided that all families (including elderly and disabled) must participate in a case management program.

Because employment/education requirements, mandatory case management, and five-year term limits were tightly linked, LMHA reported the outcomes for all three interventions using a single set of metrics, and is unable to determine how much each intervention separately influenced the outcomes.

Taken together, these requirements have been successful at moving families toward self-sufficiency as evidenced by the outcome data reported in prior Annual Reports. However, LMHA continuously struggled to maintain a high level of occupancy at these units, with three-bedroom units especially hard to fill, leading the Housing Authority to create an admissions preference for qualified, three-bedroom-eligible families in 2014. The new preference did not lead to a substantial improvement in occupancy levels, and by 2015, staff were considering additional measures to improve occupancy.

As employment levels for these families had been consistently high (with more than 60% reporting earnings each year), LMHA staff did not believe that the employment/education requirements were the determining factor dissuading families from occupying these units. Instead, staff reached a consensus decision that term



limits and mandatory case management requirements were the primary causes and, as noted above, LMHA eliminated the term limits and closed out the mandatory case management requirements in FY 2016.

Subsequently, LMHA continued to experience occupancy issues in the affected units. In light of the overarching importance of maintaining full occupancy, a decision was made in FY 2017 to discontinue the employment/education requirement.

### *3. Plan Year Closed Out*

LMHA discontinued implementation and closed out Activity #9-2017 in FY 2017.

### *4. Final Outcomes and Lessons Learned*

As noted in the close out report on Activity #21-2010, the three interventions referenced proved successful at moving families towards self-sufficiency. Based on FY 2016 (the last full year of implementation), the employment rate for non-elderly/non-disabled households was two times the rate across all of the agency's public housing (74% versus 37% reported earned income), and average earned income was more than 2.5 times as high (\$17,660 for affected households versus \$6,834 across all public housing). Average monthly rent payments for all families living in these units were also higher (\$325 versus \$165), reducing the agency's per unit subsidy costs for participating households.

While the three interventions were effective at increasing household earned income, LMHA continuously struggled to maintain a high level of occupancy at these units, with three-bedroom units especially hard to fill. The Housing Authority tried to address this situation by implementing an admissions preference for qualified three-bedroom-eligible families in 2014; however, the new preference did not lead to a substantial improvement in occupancy levels.

In a further effort to improve occupancy, LMHA removed the term limit and mandatory case management requirements; however, occupancy for the affected units continued to be subpar. Therefore, MHA has, elected to close out this activity in the interests of increasing occupancy.

### *5. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit*

None.

### *6. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity*

LMHA tracked the following HUD Standard Metrics for Activity #9-2007, the outcomes of which are summarized below by fiscal year. As the activity was discontinued before the end of the fiscal year, data is reported through FY 2016, which was the last full year of implementation. Self-sufficiency metrics exclude elderly and disabled families.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income<sup>1</sup></i></b>						
<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>	<b>FY 2013</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	\$16,959	\$16,959	\$17,660
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC						

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal actual average gross annual earned income of non-elderly/non-disabled families in affected units at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #2: Increase in Household Savings<sup>1</sup></i></b>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	\$3,310	\$3,310	\$3,031
Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance						

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal average value of FSS/IDA escrow accounts held by families residing in affected units at FYE.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status<sup>1</sup></i>							
Status	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016 <sup>3</sup>
(1) Employed Full-Time <sup>2</sup>	61 (78%)	63 (80%)	61 (79%)	77 (73%)	49 (44%)	49 (44%)	78 (74%)
(2) Employed Part-Time <sup>2</sup>					20 (18%)	20 (18%)	
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	9 (8%)	9 (8%)	At least 2
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	At least 1
(5) Unemployed	17 (22%)	15 (20%)	16 (21%)	29 (27%)	31 (28%)	31 (28%)	28 (26%)
(6) Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Number of Households</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>106</b>
Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance; Emphasys							

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of heads of household (non-elderly/non-disabled families only) in each employment status category at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<sup>2</sup> Although LMHA did not track part-time vs. full-time employment until FY 2014, the agency did track income from earnings in FY 2010 – FY 2013. Households reporting any income from earnings at FYE are reported as “Employed” (categories 1 & 2 combined) while households with no earned income are reported as “Unemployed” (Category 5).

<sup>3</sup> In FY 2016, LMHA only tracked categories 1-4 above for households enrolled in case management or in the FSS Program. While full-time vs. part-time employment was not tracked for all households, LMHA did track income from earnings. During FY 2016, seventy-eight (74%) of 106 non-elderly / non-disabled heads of household had income from earnings, while 28 (26%) reported no income from earnings.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)<sup>1</sup></i>						
FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	7 (6% of 111 HHs)	7 (6% of 111 HHs)	2 (2% of 106 HHs)
Data Source(s): Emphasys						

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of non-elderly/non-disabled families in affected units receiving TANF income at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i>						
FY 2010	FY 2011 <sup>2</sup>	FY 2012 <sup>2</sup>	FY 2013 <sup>2</sup>	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
36 (36% of 100 HHs)	79 (83% of 95 HHs)	84 (83% of 101 HHs)	97 (79% of 123 HHs)	98 (88% of 111 HHs)	98 (88% of 111 HHs)	20 (19% of 106 HHs)
Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance; Emphasys						

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of non-elderly/non-disabled households in affected units participating in the FSS Program or in LMHA case management services at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<sup>2</sup> Outcomes for FY 2011 – FY 2013 include elderly and disabled families.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households<sup>1</sup></i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	\$6,108	\$6,108	\$1,078

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal average annual subsidy per affected unit. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data. FY 2016 outcome is calculated only for units occupied by non-elderly/non-disabled units and as follows: Average of [Prorated Project Expense Level – (Gross Rent – Utility Allowance)]. Outcome appears to have been calculated using a different formula in fiscal years 2014/2015.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue<sup>1</sup></i></b>						
FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	\$368,316	\$368,316	\$413,532

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal gross annual rental revenue from affected units. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<b><i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i></b>						
FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	56 (50% of 111 HHs)	56 (50% of 111 HHs)	55 (52% of 106 HHs)

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of non-elderly/non-disabled families that met LMHA's definition of "self-sufficiency" at FYE. LMHA considers families reporting at least \$14,500 in earned income annually (\$7.25 hourly minimum wage \* 2,000 hours) to be self-sufficient. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<b><i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time<sup>1</sup></i></b>						
FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	28 months	28 months	1 month

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Scattered site waitlist records

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal average waitlist time in months for eligible families requesting to move to an affected units during FY. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

## 7. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.

LMHA did not report HUD Standard Metrics until FY 2014; thus, many outcomes are not available for earlier years.

## V. Sources and Uses of Funds

---

### A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

LMHA submitted all required FY 2017 annual financial information in the prescribed format through HUD's Financial Assessment System.

#### Activities Using Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

LMHA used the single fund flexibility authorized in the MTW Program to transfer approximately \$1,276,376 from the Section 8 MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program to the Central Office Cost Center (COCC). This transfer was necessary for the following reasons:

1. The COCC had to absorb a large charge (approximately \$725,000) for the current fiscal year to adjust its Compensated Absence Liability to actual. This adjustment was significantly larger than previous years. Fifteen staff members became eligible for payouts at retirement due to their age and tenure with LMHA.
2. LMHA's past participation in numerous HOPE VI programs and its current involvement in the CHOICE Program have resulted in fewer LMHA owned units. The loss of these units have resulted in reduced income to the COCC at a time when the complexity of tasks performed and the qualifications and expertise required to perform those tasks have increased. LMHA has undertaken several successful cost-cutting efforts to offset the lost income. However, it will be necessary going forward to utilize MTW flexibility to help sustain the COCC financially as these varied and complex functions continue to be performed in support of LMHA's mission.

Although LMHA utilizes the funding flexibility available in the MTW Program, LMHA adheres to all statutes and regulations relative to HUD's asset management program. All budgeting and reporting within the Public Housing Program is done on an individual site basis, and LMHA utilizes a "fee for service" methodology that charges the sites only for the services they receive.

LMHA also used the single fund flexibility authorized in the MTW Program to acquire units related to its HOPE VI revitalization effort at Sheppard Square, Park DuValle, and Liberty Green. These acquisitions included:

1. \$2,035,262 to acquire Park DuValle Phase II, a tax-credit project that had reached the end of its first fifteen year tax-credit compliance period. The cost paid off the remaining debt for the property.
2. \$2,711,952 to acquire the First Link property for future development.
3. \$590,096 to acquire the 2301 Terrior Court property.
4. \$80,703 to acquire the 2918 Rodman St. property.
5. \$82,789 to acquire the 932 So. Hancock St. property.
6. \$2,757,206 to acquire the 2714 Holly Park property.
7. \$32,245 to acquire several So. Preston St. properties.

Finally, LMHA spent approx. \$13,000 on its scholarship program to benefit deserving public housing residents and Section 8 participants.

## B. Local Asset Management Plan

Has LMHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?

Yes

Has LMHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

No

Has LMHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

No

## C. Commitment of Unspent Funds

There were no planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of LMHA's fiscal year.

Account	Planned Expenditures	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
N/A	No current planned commitments or obligations	\$0	\$0
	Total Obligated or Committed Funds	\$0	\$0

## **VI. Administrative**

---

### **A. HUD Reviews, Audits, and Physical Inspection Issues**

The Housing Authority of Louisville was rated a high performer under the Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) and the Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) for FY 1998, and the agency retains this high performer designation for the duration of its participation in the MTW Demonstration.

LMHA had no HUD reviews, audits, or physical inspection issues that required the agency to take action to address the issue during FY 2017.

### **B. PHA-Directed Evaluations**

Not applicable. LMHA is not currently directing any evaluations of its MTW Program.

### **C. Certification of Conformance with MTW Statutory Requirements**

**Moving to Work Demonstration Annual Report Certification**

Acting on behalf of the Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA) as its authorized official, I certify that LMHA met the three statutory requirements of the Moving to Work Demonstration Program in Fiscal Year 2017:

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



Tim Barry, Executive Director



Date