

Louisville Metro Housing Authority

Moving to Work Annual Report

Fiscal Year 2018

July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018

Submitted to
U.S. Department of
Housing and Urban Development
September 30, 2018



Louisville Metro Housing Authority

MTW Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2018

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Overview	1
A. Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration Program Overview	1
B. Long Term MTW Goals and Objectives	1
C. MTW Short Term Goals and Objectives	2
II. General Housing Authority Operating Information	9
A. Housing Stock Information	9
Table 1: Actual New Project Based Vouchers	9
Table 2: Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers	10
Table 3: Actual Other Changes to MTW Housing Stock in the Plan Year	10
Table 4: Actual Capital Expenditures FY 2018	13
B. Leasing Information	15
Table 5: Actual Number of Households Served	15
Table 6: Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs	16
Table 7: Local, Non-Traditional Service Programs	17
C. Waiting List Information	18
Table 8: Waiting List Information at Plan Year End	18
D. Information on Statutory Objectives and Requirements	18
Table 9: Local Non-Traditional Households and Income Levels	18
Table 10: Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)*	19
Table 11: Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)	19
Table 12: Transition to Self-Sufficiency	20
III. Proposed MTW Activities	22
IV. Approved MTW Activities	23
A. Implemented MTW Activities	23
A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments	23
Activity #10-2008: Local Definition of Elderly	23
Activity #23-2010: Lease-Up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor	24
A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)	26
Activity #40-2014: Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP – HCV Program	26
Activity #32-2012: Elimination of the Mandatory Earned Income Disregard	28

Activity #8-2008: Standard Medical Deduction	30
Activity #4-2007: Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families	33
Activity #6-2008: Earned Income Disregard for Elderly HCV Families.....	36
A.3 HUD/MDRC HVC Rent Reform Demonstration.....	41
Activity #43-2015: HUD / MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration for HCV Households	41
A.4 Public Housing Development	52
Activity #18-2009: Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal	52
Activity #26-2011: Public Housing – Acquisition of Mixed Income Sites	54
A.5 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities	56
Activity #3-2006: Amount and Distribution of HCV Homeownership Assistance	56
Activity #13-2009: Exception Payment Standards for HCV Homeownership.....	58
Activity #11-2009: Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications for HCV Homeownership.....	61
A.6 Local Leased Housing Program.....	63
Activity #44-2015: SPECIAL REFERRAL MTW HCV PROGRAMS	63
Table 13: LMHA Special Referral MTW Voucher Programs	67
Activity #27-2011: Amend HCV Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility	72
Activity #39-2014: HCV Program Rent Increase Limit	73
Activity #48-2018: Local Project-Based Voucher (PBV) Program.....	74
A.7 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs	81
Activity #37-2014: Accessible Units Sublease Agreement with Frazier Rehab Institute.....	81
Activity #29-2015: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville	82
Activity #49-2018: Beecher Terrace CNI Revitalization – Broader Use of Funds to Support the Development of Off-Site, Mixed-Income Replacement Housing.....	85
Activity #50-2018: Increasing Housing Options for Relocating Beecher Terrace Families	88
B. Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities	91
Activity #28-2011: Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance and Modernization of Public Housing	91
C. MTW Activities On-Hold	92
Activity #25-2010: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities	92
D. Closed Out MTW Activities	93
Activity 45-2016: MTW Special Referral Program – Coalition for the Homeless “Move Up” Initiative	94
Activity #2-1999: MTW Unit Inspection Protocol	96
V. Sources and Uses of Funds	98
A. Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	98

B. Local Asset Management Plan.....	99
VI. Administrative	100
A. HUD Reviews, Audits, and Physical Inspection Issues	100
B. PHA-Directed Evaluations.....	100
C. Certification of Conformance with MTW Statutory Requirements.....	100
VII. Appendices	101
Appendix A: MTW Annual Report Certification	101
Appendix B: MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data.....	102

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. MTW is a demonstration program authorized by Congress, through which participating agencies are provided flexibility to waive certain statutes and federal regulations in order to design and test, unique and locally-driven approaches for providing housing assistance. Approaches must address one or more of the following MTW statutory objectives:

1. Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures;
2. Give incentives to families with children whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training, educational or other programs that assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient; and,
3. Increase housing choices for low-income families.

The program also 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. At the close of each Fiscal Year, LMHA is required to prepare and submit to HUD an MTW Annual Report. The required form and content of the Annual Report are defined by HUD in HUD Form 50900 "Elements for the Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report." For purposes of this document and the required submission to HUD, an "MTW activity" is defined as any activity that requires MTW flexibility to waive statutory or regulatory requirements. As required, the Annual Report focuses primarily on describing the outcomes of existing approved and implemented MTW activities. Please note that HUD revised the required format for the MTW report beginning with MTW reports due on or after May 18, 2018. Accordingly, LMHA's FY 2018 report reflects the new MTW report format.

B. Long Term MTW Goals and Objectives

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. However, 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. As such, 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 and added a seventh goal. The following are LMHA's locally-determine long-term goals:

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;
6. Enhance the Housing Authority's capacity to plan and deliver effective programs; and
7. Develop programs and housing stock targeted to populations with special needs, especially those families not adequately served elsewhere in the community

C. MTW Short 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. During FY 2018, LMHA undertook a range of MTW related and other activities in the Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs which are summarized below. A complete list of LMHA's MTW activities (along with their current status) is shown on the table *Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix*.

- LMHA proposed and HUD approved three new MTW activities. Each of these activities was implemented in FY 2018:
 - Activity #48-2018: Local Project Based Voucher Program was implemented; however, LMHA did not receive any responses to their PBV Request for Proposals (RFP). LMHA will review and revise the RFP and publish a new solicitation in FY 2019.
 - Activity #49-2018: Beecher Terrace CNI Revitalization – Broader Use of Funds to Support Development of Off-Site, Mixed-Income Replacement Housing was implemented; however, acquisition did not occur in FY 2018 and is planned for FY 2019.
 - Activity #50-2018: Increasing Housing Options for Relocating Beecher Terrace Families was implemented in FY 2018 to assist relocating Beecher Terrace families in finding units.
- **Housing Choice Vouchers:** In FY 2018 LMHA provided rental assistance and related services to 9,010 MTW households through the HCV program. An additional 376 households were served through the VASH program.

- **Public Housing:** In FY 2018, LMHA served 3,843 public housing households. Additionally, LMHA continued its preservation and redevelopment efforts across the public housing portfolio.
- **Vision Russell:** LMHA continued its efforts to implement the Vision Russell Choice Neighborhoods Transformation Plan with the following FY 2018 activities:
 - Beecher Terrace relocation Phase I, was completed in FY 2018, with 107 households relocated successfully. Phase II relocation began and expected to be complete in FY 2019. LMHA also intends to begin Phase III of the relocation in January 2019.
 - LMHA prepared for the demolition of 121 units in Phase I. LMHA expects to close on Phase I and Phase II units in FY 2019.
- **Housing Options for Beecher Relocates:** In spite of LMHA's efforts to relocate Beecher families, there continues to be a shortage of one bedroom units both in LMHA's Public Housing Inventory and in the Louisville Metro area. In FY 2018, LMHA leased thirty new, one bedroom units and provided applicable owners with an incentive bonus. Additionally, LMHA provided two bedroom payment standards for Beecher relocates authorized for one bedroom units. LMHA is investigating revisions to its ACOP transfer policy to address the needs of Beecher relocates.
- **Local Project Based Voucher Program:** To assist with the CNI Transformation Plan commitments, LMHA proposed and HUD approved an MTW activity to implement a Local Project Based (PB) Voucher Program. LMHA's goal is to provide PB units as replacement units for Beecher Terrace households. In FY 2018, LMHA issued Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for approximately 160 to 200 off-site PB units and received no responses. LMHA conducted meetings with developers, and as a result of those meetings, LMHA modified its PBV off-site replacement housing strategy and will republish the revised competitive RFP during FY 2019.
- **Off-Site, Mixed Income Replacement Housing:** LMHA anticipates that the vast majority of replacement units for Beecher Terrace households will be subsidized through its Local Project Based Voucher Program. Under this MTW activity, LMHA is also pursuing opportunities to acquire properties where the Housing Authority can provide off-site replacement housing without relying fully on third-party developers. In FY 2018, LMHA moved forward in process to acquire two 4-plexes; four of these units will be used as Beecher replacement housing and four of these units will be acquired using MTW Broader Use of Funds. These units will be restricted to households with incomes below 80% of AMI, but will not receive direct, ongoing operating subsidy. LMHA is still waiting on a pending review of financial impacts and building conditions. Pending that review, LMHA intends to move forward with the purchase. LMHA is also examining the feasibility of acquiring a second, 12-unit apartment building in Russell where the same funding structure would be used.
- **Friary:** During FY 2018, 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 began in FY 2018. The closing is expected to occur in FY 2019.
- **Russell Neighborhood Transformation:** Using Choice Neighborhood Action Grant funds and leveraged funds from the Louisville Metro Government, the following progress was made on four high-impact action activities in Russell during FY 2018:

- A general contractor was selected and four artist groups were commissioned to design large-scale murals on railroad overpasses located between 13th and 15th streets at Jefferson St., Muhammad Ali Blvd., Madison St., and Magazine St. The artists have completed their designs and work should commence in Fall 2018;
 - The number of SmART Stop bus shelters to be constructed in Russell was reduced from six to five due to budgetary constraints. Designs for four of the five shelters were completed and plans are being refined for the fifth. The shelters next to Central High School on Chestnut Street and Catholic Charities on Market Streets were completed in FY 2018. Installation of the other three shelters will occur during Fall and early Winter 2018.
 - Improvements to Sheppard Park, adjacent to Roosevelt-Perry Elementary School, were completed. The park's new amenities include spray grounds, a restroom facility, outdoor musical drums, a new swing set, walking path markers, interpretive signage, benches and waste receptacles.
 - Louisville Metro Government continued to keep one of the three vacant lots along 18th Street cleared of debris and overgrowth, and land banked for future development. Designs for the other two lots were completed including a community gathering space next to Sweet Peaches restaurant at 18th and Muhammad Ali (awardee: Pamela Haines); and fruit orchard and raised garden (awardee: Louisville Grows); and Opportunity Corner, an innovative shipping container retail marketplace (awardee: Canaan Community Development Corporation).
- ***Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization:*** LMHA continues to make great strides toward its off-site replacement commitment. LMHA has acquired all 84 planned scattered site units in areas of low poverty. Currently, LMHA is working with one prospective homebuyer and builder for Sheppard's Homeownership component. Architectural plans have been reviewed and approved, and the financial package is under review. In addition, Habitat for Humanity has obtained site control of 2 lots and plans to obtain 3 additional for homeownership development.
 - ***Special Referral Programs:*** Through its MTW Special Referral 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. In FY 2018, LMHA added two new special referrals/allocations. The first was to House of Ruth to assist individuals who are homeless and HIV-positive. The second was to St. Vincent DePaul's Transitional Housing Program which assists families with children, where the family is either homeless or at risk of becoming homeless; the program combines housing support with case management services.
 - ***Self-Sufficiency and Development Programs:*** In FY 2018 LMHA provided financial literacy, adult education, employment and training programs through its network of partners. Credit Building, Homeownership, Special Referral and the Family Self-Sufficiency programs continued to be vehicles used by LMHA to assist participants in achieving economic self-sufficiency. These initiatives all leverage MTW Block Grant funding to secure additional public and private funding.
 - ***Homeownership:*** LMHA operates three MTW Homeownership activities, all designed to enhance the traditional HCV Homeownership Program. During FY 2018, twenty-one (21) HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home. Furthermore, using MTW flexibility, six one-bedroom-eligible families purchased a unit using the two-bedroom payment standard and three (3) HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home in an exception payment standard area in FY 2018.

- ***Elderly/Disabled Housing:*** LMHA continued to use MTW flexibility to maximize leasing at elderly/disabled developments. Efforts included changing the definition of elderly from 62 to 55 and above and providing lease-up incentives. In FY 2018, occupancy rates at the targeted developments was up to 94%, representing a 4% increase since inception of this activity.
- ***Rent Policies:*** LMHA's rent policies address both participant self-sufficiency and LMHA administrative efficiency. In FY 2018 LMHA continued to apply the policies related to alternate year reexaminations, application of a standard medical deduction, elimination of the mandatory earned income disregard, and application of an earned income disregard for elderly HCV families. The average employment related income for elderly families where their only other source of income was Social Security, doubled the forecast and is indicative of the effect of the employment incentive for these targeted households.
- ***Owner Rent Increase Limit:*** In FY 2018, LMHA placed a cap on owner rent increases to reflect the lesser of 102% of the previous contract rent for the same tenant or the payment standard. In LMHA's FY 2019 Plan, this activity was modified to reflect approvable rents as the lesser of 102% of the previous contract rent for the same tenant or the exception payment standard. LMHA conducts reasonable rent determinations on a sample of rent increases to ensure that approved rents are consistent with comparable rents for unassisted units.
- ***HUD Rent Reform Demonstration:*** FY 2018 represented the third of six years of the HUD Rent Reform Demonstration. The study sets forth alternative rent calculation and reexamination strategies that have been implemented at four public housing authorities across the country in order to fully test the policies nationally. In FY 2018, LMHA had 604 households in the Alternate Rent Group, and 700 households in the Control Group. The study is scheduled to end in 2021.
- ***Public Housing Development:*** As part of its goal to transform aging portions of LMHA's physical housing stock while providing replacement units, LMHA developed and implemented two MTW Public Housing (PH) development activities. The activities are designed to streamline the development and acquisition processes. In FY 2018 LMHA did not use the flexibilities provided under these activities; however the agency may do so in the future as needed.
- ***Accessible Units:*** In its efforts to provide fully accessible units to individuals with disabilities, LMHA, under its MTW Activity with Frazier Rehab Institute, provided transitional housing for up to six months per family. Frazier Rehab sub-lessees are also referred to area service provider to assist them to leave the program and obtain stable housing. In FY 2018, LMHA served four households under this activity, for six months each.
- ***YouthBuild:*** LMHA provided temporary housing for low-income YouthBuild Louisville (YBL) participants who are experiencing homelessness. Up to three, two-bedroom units are available for YBL participants who may stay in the unit as long as they are active in the YBL program. LMHA provides a PH preference to these individuals upon graduation from YBL. In FY 2018 five households were assisted under the YouthBuild activity.
- LMHA closed out Activity #45-2016: MTW Special Referral Program-Coalition for the Homeless "Move-Up" Initiative. LMHA no longer needed MTW flexibility for this activity and instead established a limited local preference for this targeted population.

Along with its MTW implementation activities, LMHA will implement other initiatives in FY 2019 that do not specifically require MTW authority or Block Grant flexibility to administer. Highlights of LMHA's planned Non-MTW activities include:

- ***Smoke-Free Policy:*** As part of HUD's *Instituting Smoke-Free Public Housing* Final Rule, LMHA implemented its No-Smoking Policy in July 2018. The new restrictions apply not just to residents, but also to visitors, service personnel, and LMHA employees. Per the Final Rule, Public Housing Agencies must ban cigarettes, cigars, pipes, and water pipes (hookahs) in no-smoking areas. LMHA has also opted to ban Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems, such as e-cigarettes, e-cigars, e-pipes, and vape pens.
- ***Grants and Grant Opportunities:*** In FY 2018, LMHA continued to administer existing grants, which include the FSS Coordinator and ROSS grants as well as Choice Neighborhoods Implementation and Action Grants. Additionally, in FY 2018, LMHA submitted two grant applications, which include the AmeriCorps VISTA grant application and the GitHub application through ConnectHomeUSA. In June 2018, LMHA received both grants. ConnectHomeUSA is a pilot initiative with communities, the private sector, and the federal government that seeks to accelerate the adoption and use of broadband technology by children and families living in assisted housing. LMHA received \$1,500 from GitHub, through ConnectHomeUSA, which is being directed towards opening the Parkway Computer Lab. While LMHA did receive a grant from AmeriCorps, LMHA was not able to recruit any VISTA members to date.
- ***Prudent Fiscal Management and Internal Controls:*** LMHA continued to implement its comprehensive program of internal audit, compliance reviews and fiscal management.

Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
50	2018	Increasing Housing Options for Relocating Beecher Terrace Families	Implemented
49	2018	Beecher Terrace CNI Revitalization – Broader Use of Funds to Support Development of Off-Site, Mixed-Income Replacement Housing	Implemented
48	2018	Local Project-Based Voucher Program	Implemented
47	2017	MTW Special Referral Program – ChooseWell Communities	Implemented
46	2017	MTW Special Referral Program – Riverport Scholar House	Implemented
45	2016	MTW Special Referral Program – Coalition for the Homeless “Move Up” Initiative	Closed Out in FY 2018
44	2015	MTW Special Referral Programs	Implemented
43	2015	HCV Program - HUD/MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration	Implemented
42	2015	MTW Special Referral Program – Centerstone	Implemented
40	2014	HCV Program - Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP	Implemented
39	2014	HCV Program - Rent Increase Limit	Implemented
38	2013	MTW Special Referral Program – Parkland Scholar House	Implemented
37	2014	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Frazier Spinal Cord Rehab Institute	Implemented
36	2013	MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Bashford Manor/Newburg	Implemented
35	2012	MTW Special Referral Programs – Allocation of MTW Housing Choice Vouchers	Implemented
34	2012	MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Youngland Avenue	Implemented
33	2012	Public Housing - Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income	Closed Out
32	2012	HCV Program & Public Housing - Elimination of the Earned Income Disregard	Implemented
31	2012	MTW Special Referral Program - Stoddard Johnston Scholar House	Implemented
30	2012	MTW Special Referral Program – 100,000 Homes Initiative	Implemented
29	2015	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville	Implemented
28	2011	Public Housing - Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance, & Modernization	Not Yet Implemented
27	2011	HCV Program & Public Housing - Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility	Implemented
26	2011	Public Housing - Acquisition of Mixed-Income Sites	Implemented
25	2010	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities	On Hold
24	2010	Public Housing - Increased Flat Rents for New Scattered Sites	Closed Out
23	2010	Public Housing - Lease-up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor	Implemented

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
21	2010	Public Housing - Occupancy Criteria Changes for New Scattered Sites - Mandatory Case Management	Closed Out
20	2010	MTW Special Referral Program - Downtown Family Scholar House	Implemented
18	2009	Public Housing - Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal	Implemented
16	2009	Public Housing - Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies	Closed Out
15	2009	MTW Special Referral Program - Louisville Scholar House	Implemented
13	2009	HCV Homeownership Program – Exception Payment Standards (Revised 2016)	Implemented
11	2009	HCV Homeownership Program - Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications	Implemented
10	2008	Locally Defined Definition of Elderly	Implemented
9	2007	Public Housing - Term Limits and Employment/Educational Work Requirements for New Scattered Sites (Revised 2014, 2016)	Closed Out
8	2008	HCV Program & Public Housing - Standard Medical Deduction	Implemented
7	2008	MTW Special Referral Program - Day Spring (Renewed 2012)	Implemented
6	2008	HCV Program - Earned Income Disregard for Elderly Families	Implemented
5	2007	HCV Program - Spatial Deconstruction of HCV Assisted Units	Closed Out
4	2007	HCV Program & Public Housing - Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families (Revised 2012, 2014)	Implemented
3	2006	HCV Homeownership Program - Amount and Distribution of Homeownership Assistance	Implemented
2	1999	MTW Inspections Protocol	Closed out in FY 2018
1	2005	MTW Special Referral Program - Center for Women and Families	Implemented

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

A. Housing Stock Information

LMHA serves eligible low-income households through its two (2) primary housing programs: Public Housing and the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program. LMHA's public housing inventory includes units for families, seniors, and persons with disabilities. These affordable apartments are located throughout the Louisville metro area. Through its Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program, LMHA provides rental assistance to families, seniors and persons with disabilities. The HCV program also provides support to first time homebuyers.

Actual New Project Based Vouchers

In FY 2018 LMHA completed two procurement rounds for project based vouchers (PBVs); however as the agency did not receive any responses, there were no units placed under contract this fiscal year.

Table 1: Actual New Project Based Vouchers

Property Name	Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based		Status at End of Plan Year **	RAD?	Description of Project
	Planned*	Actual			
Various	80-100	0	N/A	0	As part of its Beecher Terrace Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Transformation Plan, LMHA has committed to providing 442 off-site replacement units by September 30, 2023. Most, if not all, of these units will be funded with project based vouchers. For units that the Housing Authority does not own, LMHA completed two procurement rounds for PBVs in FY 2018; however as the agency did not receive any responses, there were no units project based this fiscal year.
Planned/ Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project Based	80-100	0	N/A	0	

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

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

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

In FY 2018 LMHA completed two procurement rounds for PBVs; however as the agency did not receive any responses, there were no units project based this fiscal year as originally planned. After discussions with multiple developers to understand the challenges with the RFP, LMHA has modified PBV off-site replacement housing strategy and will republish the revised competitive RFP during FY19.

Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers

LMHA did not have any PBV projects in its portfolio prior to FY 2018; as a result, there are no properties included in Table 2.

Table 2: Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers

Property Name	Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based		Status at End of Plan Year **	RAD?	Description of Project
	Planned*	Actual			
N/A	0	0	N/A	0	
Planned/Actual Total Existing Project-Based Vouchers	0	0	N/A	0	

* Figures and text in the “Planned” column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

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

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

LMHA did not have any PBV projects in its portfolio prior to FY 2018.

Actual Other Changes to MTW Housing Stock in the Plan Year

Table 3 below provides an update on changes to LMHA’s housing stock during FY 2018 and an update on planned initiatives that were identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Table 3: Actual Other Changes to MTW Housing Stock in the Plan Year

Site	Description from Annual Plan	Status as of June 30, 2018
H Temple Spears, 1515 Cypress St. (AMP TBD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Planned New Public Housing Units;</i> 65 units The H Temple Spears development is an adaptive rehab of an old school building. The building was originally converted into a senior nursing facility and then into a general occupancy apartment building. Although no units meet current accessibility guidelines, all 65 units met the guidelines in effect at the time the school was originally converted into a senior nursing facility. Should LMHA undertake significant rehab in the future, at least 5% of the units will be brought into compliance with accessibility guidelines in effect at that future date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LMHA acquired H Temple Spears in August 2017. While work has not yet begun, funds have been budgeted for FY19. Modernization work is scheduled to begin in FY19.
Beecher Terrace (KY001000002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Planned Removed;</i> 121 units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the demolition of the 121 units in Phase I was originally planned for FY

Site	Description from Annual Plan	Status as of June 30, 2018
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LMHA received a Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Implementation Grant in December 2016. The demolition of 121 units is required to permit the first construction phase, a 117-unit senior building to be constructed on the northern half of Old Walnut Park between 9th and 10th Streets. 	2018, there was a slight delay. These units will be removed in FY 2019 along with an additional 296 units (part of Phase II).
Fegenbush-Whipps Mill (KY001000017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Planned Removed;</i> 21 units 21 for excessive mold and/or lead abatement costs. 13 to Simmons College for student housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In FY 2018 LMHA sold 14 of the originally planned 21 units, which had excessive mold and lead issues. The remaining 7 will be sold in FY 2019. In FY 2018 6 units were sold to Simmons. The remaining 7 units remaining will be sold through a competitive bid process.
HOPE VI Scattered Sites (KY001000034)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Planned Removed;</i> 20 units. 10 units to be removed for recurring water damage and an additional 10 units designated to go to Simmons College for student housing. The 24 units at the Friary (described below are also part of the HOPE VI Scattered Sites project). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 units, with recurring water damage are still being held, and will potentially be sold in FY 2019. Another 10 units will be sold through the competitive bid process.
Park DuValle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Other Changes to the Housing Stock;</i> 108 units to acquire During FY 2018, LMHA plans to acquire full ownership of all 108 units built through Park DuValle Phase III (79 public housing, 18 tax credit, and 11 market rate). The acquisition of Park DuValle Phase IV units will follow in a future year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slightly after the end of FY 2018, LMHA acquired full ownership of all 108 units in Phase III.
Friary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Other Changes to the Housing Stock;</i> 24 units off-line (also included under HOPE VI scattered sites) During FY 2018, LMHA will continue to hold 24 units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA purchased several years ago and had used as Liberty Green HOPE VI replacement public housing. The developer plans to apply for low-income housing tax credits during FY 2018. Once renovation work has been completed, LMHA will use 18 of the renovated units for public housing. An additional six replacement public housing units will be acquired in non-impacted areas. Although disposition may occur during FY 2018, LMHA does not currently anticipate that any acquisition will occur before FYE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 24 units at the Friary were held off-line during FY 2018. During FY 2018 the developer applied and was approved for low-income housing tax credits. The closing is expected to occur in FY 2019.

Site	Description from Annual Plan	Status as of June 30, 2018
Iroquois Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other Changes to the Housing Stock;</i> • Replacement of units removed • LMHA is committed to one-for-one replacement of all units removed from its public housing stock beginning with the demolition of Iroquois Homes. During FY 2018, LMHA will be working toward one-for-one replacement of the units listed in the Planned Public Housing Units to be Removed during the Fiscal Year table, as well as the continued replacement of units removed through the demolition of Iroquois Homes. Replacement units may be PBV, public housing, or local, nontraditional units. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMHA is still exploring options for one for one replacement of Iroquois Homes. In addition, LMHA is still looking into to other locations for replacement units off site which may be in the form of PBV, public housing, or local non-traditional units.
Beecher Terrace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other Changes to the Housing Stock;</i> • Replacement of 758 Beecher Terrace Units • LMHA is also committed to one-for-one replacement of all 758 Beecher Terrace units that will be demolished as part of its Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Transformation Plan. Although LMHA currently plans to create replacement units using PBV, a portion of the replacement units may be provided as public housing should this favorably impact the financing of a particular project or be deemed advantageous in order to allow the units to serve households with incomes up to 80% of AMI. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMHA is still exploring the options of replacing a portion of the Beecher Terrace units as public housing. LMHA will examine whether public housing replacement units would favorably impact the financing of a particular project or be deemed advantageous in order to allow the units to serve households with incomes up to 80% of AMI.
Off-site Beecher Terrace replacement units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other Changes to the Housing Stock;</i> • Replacement of Beecher Terrace Units with purchase of two 4-plexes • Off-site Beecher Terrace replacement unit development will begin with the purchase of two 4-plexes (located in the Russell Neighborhood) from New Directions Housing Corp. in FY 2018. Four of these units will be used as Beecher replacement housing. Upon HUD approval of proposed Activity #49-2018, four of the units will be acquired using MTW Broader Use of Funds authority. These units will be restricted to households with incomes below 80% of AMI, but will not receive direct, ongoing operating subsidy. LMHA is also examining the feasibility of acquiring a second, 12-unit apartment building in Russell 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMHA received approval from HUD in FY 2018 to move forward with the proposed method of acquisition of two 4-plexes (located in the Russell Neighborhood). However, LMHA is still waiting on a pending review of financial impacts and building conditions. Pending that review, LMHA may purchase two 4-plexes (located in the Russell Neighborhood) from New Directions Housing Corp. Four of these units will be used as Beecher replacement housing. These units will be restricted to households with incomes below 80% of AMI, but will not receive direct, ongoing operating subsidy. LMHA is also examining the feasibility of acquiring a second, 12-unit apartment building in Russell where the same funding structure would be used.

Site	Description from Annual Plan	Status as of June 30, 2018
	where the same funding structure would be used.	
Park DuValle Phase I (The Oaks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other Changes to the Housing Stock;</i> • Conversion of 59 Park DuValle PH units to PBV or PBRA through RAD • During FY 2018, LMHA will examine the feasibility of converting the 59 public housing units 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. Should the Housing Authority decide to proceed with a RAD application, LMHA will hold a meeting with residents of The Oaks to discuss conversion plans and provide opportunity for comment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been no further activity or additional discussions regarding the Park DuValle acquisitions being converted to RAD. However, this is an ongoing consideration based upon the assumption that the financial impact of the RAD conversion remains positive. LMHA will continue to review the potential for RAD conversions in FY 2019.

General Description of All Actual Capital Expenditures during the Plan Year

Table 4 provides a general description of actual capital expenditures in FY 2018.

Table 4: Actual Capital Expenditures FY 2018

Site Name	Description	Amount
Beecher Terrace - 002	Admin Fee	\$ 191,908
	Beecher Choice Implementation	\$ 91,903
	Resident Stipends	\$ 1,675
	Eviction Prevention	\$ 15,869
	Relocation Cost	\$ 386,977
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 1,428
	Security Service	\$ 8,980
	HALO Community	\$ 47,500
	Site Improvement	\$ 1,058
	Tree Trimming	\$ 9,050
	HVAC Installation	\$ 1,855
	Demolition	\$ 1,029
Parkway Place - 003	Admin Fee	\$ 160,767
	Resident Stipends	\$ 2,025
	Eviction Prevention	\$ 11,499
	Relocation Cost	\$ 1,713
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 77,908
	HALO Community	\$ 47,500
	Tree Trimming	\$ 9,850
	Windows	\$ 74,178

Site Name	Description	Amount
	Flooring	\$ 14,045
	Heating Systems	\$ 949
	Roofs	\$ 71,635
	HVAC Installation	\$ 65
	Comm Ctr/Maint Bldg Sprinklers	\$ 545,531
	Lobby Renovations	\$ 280,000
	Recreational Bl	\$ 1,325
Sheppard Square - 004	Sheppard HOPE VI Units	\$ 185,623
	Tree Trimming	\$ 4,550
Iroquois Homes - 005	Tree Trimming	\$ 9,400
Dosker Manor - 012	Elevator Upgrades	\$ 1,902
	Trash Compactor	\$ 2,845
	Eviction Prevention	\$ 5,839
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 54,761
	Security Improvements	\$ 110,384
	Resident Stipends	\$ 26,002
	HVAC Installation	\$ 352,607
	Admin Fee	\$ 173,173
	Security Service	\$ 692,906
St Catherine - 013	Resident Stipends	\$ 8,270
	Security Service	\$ 110,045
	Eviction Prevention	\$ 3,403
	Admin Fee Transfer	\$ 40,255
	Tree Trimming	\$ 200
	Trash Compactor	\$ 2,843
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 2,956
Avenue Plaza - 014	Resident Stipends	\$ 7,050
	Security Service	\$ 155,766
	Eviction Prevention	\$ 5,660
	Admin Fee Transfer	\$ 75,194
	Tree Trimming	\$ 1,700
	Trash Compactor	\$ 2,844
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 10,259
	Windows Second Floor Lobby	\$ 26,016
	Lobby Security	\$ 139,778
	Parking Lot Repair	\$ 78,072
Scattered Sites - 017	Resident Service	\$ 2,685
	Admin Fee Transfer	\$ 67,345
	Tree Trimming	\$ 6,230
	Exterior Siding	\$ 751
	Roofs	\$ 917
	Fire Damage Rep	\$ 17,849

Site Name	Description	Amount
	Lead Base Paint	\$ 1,925
	Porch	\$ 1,279
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 16,327
	Relocation Cost	\$ 1,200
Lourdes Hall - 018	Resident Service	\$ 8,655
	Security Service	\$ 121,412
	Eviction Prevention	\$ 2,436
	Admin Fee Transfer	\$ 38,483
	Tree Trimming	\$ 600
	Kitchen Renovation	\$ 5,383
	Security	\$ 488,376
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 5,239
	Relocation Cost	\$ 1,498
Park Duvalle - 031	Park Duvalle Capital Contributions	\$ 50,000
Scattered Sites - 034	Eviction Prevention	\$ 2,794
	Admin Fee Transfer	\$ 108,613
	Architectural/Engineering	\$ 238,099
	Tree Trimming	\$ 21,950
	Roof Replacement Six Mile Lane	\$ 3,261
	Lead Base Paint	\$ 6,755
	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 27,426
Sheppard Rental B - 057	Dwelling Eqpt-E	\$ 17,060
Sheppard Hvi Repl - 061	H Temple Spears Generator	\$ 1,625
	Security Service	\$ 17,464
	Tree Trimming	\$ 32,150
	Demolition Clay/Finzer/Jacob	\$ 138,868
	Funding Operation	\$ 959,410
Total		\$ 6,570,684

B. Leasing Information

Actual Number of Households Served

LMHA provided housing assistance to approximately 12,862 households in FY 2018 through the Public Housing and HCV programs, excluding non-MTW vouchers, as shown on the HUD required Table 5 below.

Table 5: Actual Number of Households Served

Number of Households Serviced through:	Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased*		Number of Households Served**	
	Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
MTW HCV Utilized	117,000	108,114	9,750	9,010

MTW Public Housing Units Leased	46,800	46,116	3,900	3,843
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based	36	68	3***	6****
Planned/Actual Totals	163,836	154,282	13,657	12,862

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

**“Planned Number of Households to be Served” is calculated by dividing the “Planned Number of Unit Months” by the number of months in the plan year.

***LMHA’s FY 2018 Plan did not use the HUD required methodology to populate Planned Number of Households Served by Local, Non-Traditional Activities. LMHA revised this number to reflect the HUD required methodology, therefore, it differs from the FY 2018 Plan.

****Actual number of households served reflects the HUD required calculation; however, LMHA served nine households in FY 2018. One unit can serve more than one household at a time, and the lease term is six months for two of the units on the program.

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

Describe any differences between the planned and actual households served:

In FY 2018, the number of HCV Households served was 740 less and the number of Public Housing Households served was 57 less than LMHA planned due to a number of factors described below, under *Discussion of Any Actual Issues/Solutions Related to Leasing*.

HUD requires that all MTW agencies submit Tables 6 and 7 below, which report on local, non-traditional housing and services, i.e., housing units and/or supportive services which use MTW funds but that are not public housing or HCV-related.

Table 6: Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

Local, Non-Traditional Category	MTW Activity Name/Number	Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased*		Number of Households to be Served*	
		Planned^^ **	Actual	Planned^^ **	Actual***
Tenant-Based	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Property-Based	Activity # 37-2014 Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Frazier Spinal Cord Rehab Institute	24	24	2	3
Property-Based	Activity # 29-2015 Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville	12	44	1	3
Property-Based	Activity # 49-2018 Beecher Terrace CNI Revitalization - Broader Use of Funds to Support Development of Off-Site, Mixed-Income Replacement Housing	0	0	0	0
Homeownership	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Local, Non-Traditional Category	MTW Activity Name/Number	Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased*		Number of Households to be Served*	
		Planned^^ **	Actual	Planned^^ **	Actual***
	Planned/Actual Totals	36	68	3****	6

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

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

**Planned number of unit months occupied and planned number of households served was only included as an aggregate number for all local, non-traditional activities in the FY 2018 MTW Annual Plan, as this table was not required in previous HUD Form 50900. As a result, LMHA allocated numbers included in the FY 2018 Plan accordingly across activities.

***Actual number of households served reflects the HUD required calculation; however, LMHA served nine households in FY 2018. One unit can serve more than one household at a time, and the lease term is six months for two of the units on the program.

****LMHA’s FY 2018 Plan did not use the HUD required methodology to populate Planned Number of Households Served by Local, Non-Traditional Activities. LMHA revised this number to reflect the HUD required methodology, therefore, it differs from the FY 2018 Plan.

Table 7: Local, Non-Traditional Service Programs

LMHA does not have any local non-traditional service only programs.

Households Receiving Local, Non-Traditional Services Only	Average Number of Households Per Month	Total Number of Households in the Plan Year
N/A	N/A	N/A

Discussion of Any Actual Issues/Solutions Related to Leasing

Housing Program	Description of Actual Leasing Issues and Solutions
MTW Public Housing	Utilization of LMHA’s public housing portfolio is slightly less than expected. This is primarily due to the fact the LMHA held units vacant in public housing units to account for relocated families from Beecher Terrace.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	LMHA faced a number of challenges related to leasing in the MTW HCV program. The following impacted the number of households LMHA was able to serve throughout FY 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LMHA’s HCV waitlist has not been updated or purged in many years. Therefore, only approximately half of the families selected from the waiting list and contacted for an eligibility interview attended, making it difficult to lease vouchers expediently. LMHA will be exploring purging the MTW HCV waitlist in FY 2019 to address these issues. Additionally, there is low inventory of one-bedroom apartments in the Louisville Metro area. The lack of inventory results in increased search time for voucher holders. LMHA has already implemented a number of initiatives to provide an incentive to owners of one-bedroom units to participate in the HCV program, and will continue to look into other ways to increase the inventory of one-bedroom units available to participants.
Local, Non-Traditional	N/A

C. Waiting List Information

Actual Waiting List Information

Table 8: Waiting List Information at Plan Year End

Waiting List Name	Description	Number of Households on Waiting List	Waiting List Open, Partially Open or Closed	Was the Waiting List Opened During the Plan Year?
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community Wide	13,224	Open	Open
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community Wide	3,608	Open	Open
Federal Public Housing Units	Site-Based	4,417	Open	Open
*This is a preference for existing tenants only and the waiting list is closed to the public.				

Describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists

As LMHA maintains separate HCV and Public Housing wait lists, applicants may apply and be on both waitlists.

Actual Changes to Waiting Lists in the Plan Year

There were no changes to the HCV waiting list in FY18.

Waiting List Name	Description of Actual Changes to Waiting List
NA	NA

D. Information on Statutory Objectives and Requirements

Under the MTW Agreement between LMHA and HUD, LMHA is required to meet certain statutory objectives and other requirements, and to report on them in the MTW Annual Report. The tables below provide the required information.

75% of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income

Table 9: Local Non-Traditional Households and Income Levels

Income Level	Number of Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted in the Plan Year
80% - 50% Area Median Income	
49% - 30% Area Median Income	
Below 30% Area Median Income	5
Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted	

*Information in this table reflects the households served by YouthBuild Louisville only. LMHA will confirm income levels of households served by Frazier Spinal Cord Rehab Institute.

Maintain Comparable Mix

Table 10 provides a breakdown of LMHA households by family size when LMHA became an MTW agency.

Table 10: Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)*

Family Size	Occupied Public Housing Units	Utilized HCVs	Non-MTW Adjustments**	Baseline Mix Number	Baseline Mix Percentage
1 Person	2496	54	0	2550	55%
2 Person	555	33	0	588	12%
3 Person	689	32	0	721	16%
4 Person	436	22	0	458	10%
5 Person	158	20	0	178	4%
6+ Person	137	14	0	151	3%
Total	4471	175	0	4646	100%

*“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.

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

Please describe the justification for any “Non-MTW Adjustments” given above

N/A

Table 11: Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)

Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)				
Family Size	Baseline Mix Percentage**	Number of Households Served in Plan Year^ ***	Percentage of Households Served in Plan Year^^	Percentage Change from Baseline Year to Current Plan Year
1 Person	55%	6,123	45%	-10%
2 Person	12%	2,335	17%	5%
3 Person	16%	2,169	16%	0%
4 Person	10%	1,543	11%	1%
5 Person	4%	789	6%	2%
6+ Person	3%	570	4%	1%
Total	100%	13,529	100%	
**The “Baseline Mix Percentage” figures given in the “Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)” table should match those in the column of the same name in the “Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)” table.				
*** The variance in households served shown in Tables 5 and 11 is due to the methodology used to populate each table. Table 5 represents the total number of units months leased divided by 12, and therefore is an average of total households served; Table 11 represents all households that have been served through the fiscal year.				

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

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

Describe the justification for any variances of more than 5% between the Plan Year and Baseline Year

While LMHA served 10% less one person families in FY 2018 than in the baseline year, the reduction is not indicative of the LMHA’s population or need. The reduction in families served is most likely due to 1 bedroom unit vouchers expiring. As there is a shortage of 1 bedroom units in the Louisville Metro market, voucher holders are searching for housing for longer periods of time and often their voucher expires. LMHA will be exploring other strategies to expedite the lease up of 1 bedroom (and 1 person families) in FY 2019.

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

HUD requires information on households transitioned to self-sufficiency for any MTW activities that report on HUD’s standard metric SS #8. Table 12 below provides the HUD-required information.

Table 12: Transition to Self-Sufficiency

MTW Activity Name/Number	Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency*	MTW PHA Definition of Self Sufficiency
6-2008/ HCV Program - Earned Income Disregard for Elderly Families	7	Elderly families whose only source of income was Social Security who now have employment income. “Employment” means the household is receiving earned income. “Suitable” is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500.
29-2015/ Public Housing Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville	0	Non-disabled/non-elderly families that obtain and maintain suitable employment. “Employment” means the household is receiving earned income. “Suitable” is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500.
43-2015/ HUD / MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration for HCV Households	Alt Rent Group: 120 Control Group: 186	Non-disabled/non-elderly families that obtain and maintain suitable employment. “Employment” means the household is receiving earned income. “Suitable” is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500.
44-2015/ Special Referral MTW HCV Programs	32	Non-disabled/non-elderly families that obtain and maintain suitable employment. “Employment” means the household is receiving earned income. “Suitable” is defined as annual gross

		earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500.
Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency	345	

*Figures should match the outcome reported where metric is used in Section IV of this Annual MTW report.

III. Proposed MTW Activities

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

IV. Approved MTW Activities

A. Implemented MTW Activities

This section of the MTW Annual Report provides information and updates on MTW activities that have been previously approved by HUD and implemented.

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 94% at the end of FY 2018. Higher occupancy rates improve LMHA's operating revenues (which achieves greater cost effectiveness of federal expenditures), and increase housing choices for zero- and one-bedroom-qualified applicants age 55 to 61.

Activity #10-2008: Local Definition of Elderly

Description/Update

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 one-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 2018, the average occupancy rate was 94%. Higher occupancy rates improve the agency's operating revenues and maximize the cost effectiveness of federal funding.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA did not experience any challenges in achieving benchmarks during FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes have been made to the metrics identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Housing Choice #4: Displacement Prevention				
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). This activity affects families whose Head, Co-head or Spouse is age 55+.	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 (#).	
	As of FY 2007: 0	0	0	Yes
	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.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2007: 0	100	115	Yes
	Prior to implementation, # of non-disabled HHs where head, co-head, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, co-head, nor spouse is older than 61.	Expected # of non-disabled HHs where head, co-head, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, co-head, nor spouse is older than 61 living at an affected site at FYE.	Actual # of non-disabled HHs where head, co-head, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, co-head, nor spouse is older than 61 living at an affected site at FYE.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

*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/Update

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 is 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 2018, occupancy at this site was 94.4%.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA did not experience any challenges in achieving benchmarks during FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes have been made to the metrics identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<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).	
	As of FY 2013:* \$1,212,767	\$1,250,000	\$1,437,552	Yes
	Annual Dosker Manor rental revenue prior to implementation	Expected gross annual Dosker Manor rental revenue	Actual gross annual Dosker Manor rental revenue	
Data Source(s): PHA financial records				

* 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/Update

For 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 2015. The activity was implemented in FY 2016.

Impact

This activity was implemented in January 2016. During FY 2018, 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.

Hardship

Not applicable. Excluding income does not create a hardship.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA does not track data on exclusion of financial aid above and beyond tuition and fees, and as such cannot determine how many participants will be able to benefit from this exclusion or speak to challenges reaching benchmarks.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks. Please note that LMHA unintentionally left this activity out of the FY 2018 MTW Plan; however, it remains a current activity.

Metrics

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).	

	As of FY2015: \$25.07/ household (HH) (\$25.07/staff hour X 1.0 hour)	\$26.90/ HH (\$26.90/staff hour X 1.0 hour)*	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	

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

* 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.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	
	As of FY2015: 1.0 hour/household (HH)	1 hour (1 HH X 1.0 hour)	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	

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

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	
	As of FY2015: 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	

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

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

Description/Update

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.

Impact

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

Public Housing Program: By FYE 2018, there were no longer any public housing households who received the EID.

As there are no longer any households receiving EID across LMHA's portfolio, full cost savings were realized in FY 2018, and staff no longer spend time calculating EIDs for participants of either the HCV or public housing programs.

Hardship

No hardship requests were received during FY 2018.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA did not experience any challenges in achieving benchmarks during FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks. Please note that LMHA unintentionally left this activity out of the FY 2018 MTW Plan; however, it remains a current activity.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
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).	
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: \$447 (15 households (HHs) X \$29.80)	\$0 (0 HHs X \$0)	\$0 (0 HHs X \$0)	Yes
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014: * \$2,154 (62 HHs X \$34.74)	\$0 (0 HHs X \$0)	\$0 (0 HHs X \$0)	Yes
	# 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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

*Activity implemented in public housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: 20.1 hours (15 households (HHs) X 1.34 hours)	0 hours (0 HHs X 0 hours)	0 hours (0 HHs X 0 hours)	Yes
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014: * 65.1 hours (62 HHs X 1.05 hours)	0 hours (0 HHs X 0 hours)	0 hours (0 HHs X 0 hours)	Yes
	# 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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

*Activity implemented in public housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). 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 (%).	
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: Not tracked	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014:* Not tracked	Not tracked	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	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 annually.	Actual error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP annually.	
Data Source(s): Staff logs; Emphasys				

*Activity implemented in public housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
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).	
	HCV Program			
	N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV program.			
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014:* \$93,300	\$93,300	Not Tracked**	
	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.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

*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.

**LMHA does not track households who would have been eligible for the EID.

Activity #8-2008: Standard Medical Deduction

Description/Update

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.

Impact

This activity continued to result in administrative cost savings during FY 2018. Foregoing the verification of medical expenses for the 5,540 households that took the standard medical deduction resulted in savings of \$55,420.

Hardship

No hardship requests were made during FY 2018.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA cannot forecast the number of households with medical expenses greater than \$1,600. This is a HUD required metric. However, LMHA continues to experience significant savings from this streamlined deduction. While rental revenue did not meet the identified benchmark, it still represents a 12% increase in from the prior year.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks.

Metrics

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 verifying household (HH) medical expenses and 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).	
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2009: \$29,714 (3,529 HHs X \$8.42)	\$2,158 (243 HHs X \$8.88 (0.33 hours X \$26.90/hour))	\$529 (57 HHs X \$9.29 (0.33 hours X \$28.16/hour))	Yes
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2009: \$5,246 (623 HHs * \$8.42)	\$141 (12 HHs X \$11.73 (0.33 hour X \$35.55/hour))	\$687 (57 HHs X \$12.05 (0.33 hours X \$36.50/hour))	Yes
Agency-Wide				
	As of FY 2009: \$34,960	\$2,299	\$1,216	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

*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).

**Benchmarks will be adjusted annually to account for variations in staff cost.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline*	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete verifications of medical expenses and calculations of medical deduction 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).	
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2009: 1,176 hours (3,529 households (HHs) * 0.33 hours)	80 hours (243 HHs * 0.33 hours)	19 hours (57 HHs * 0.33 hours)	Yes
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2009: 208 hours (623 HHs * 0.33 hours)	4 hours (12 HHs * 0.33 hours)	19 hours (57 HHs * 0.33 hours)	No
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY 2009: 1,384 hours	84 hours	38 hours	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.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

*FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
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 (%).	
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked

	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2009: 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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				
Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
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).	
	HCV Program			
	N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV program.			
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	\$4,265,448	\$4,138,560	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

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

Description/Update

This activity allows LMHA to conduct a biennial recertifications for applicable households.

In 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, a full reexamination is conducted every odd numbered fiscal year. In even numbered years, families are required to complete a mini-reexamination packet, which they return to the agency by mail.

In the public housing program, each year 50% of all elderly and disabled families receive a full reexamination of family information, income and rent.

Approval and Implementation

Activity #4-2007 was originally proposed in 2007. LMHA implemented the HCV component in FY 2007 and the Public Housing component in FY 2008. This activity was amended in FY 2012.

Impact

FY 2018 was an even numbered fiscal year, LMHA conducted mini recertifications only for all applicable families in the HCV Program. As a result of this streamlined recertification process, \$8,075 was expended to complete mini recertifications for the HCV Program in FY 2018.

In the public housing program during FY 2018, the agency spent \$36,974 to conduct full reexaminations of approximately 50% of the public housing families that were either elderly (age 62+) or disabled.

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.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

The number of public housing households who had regular recertifications in FY 2018 was greater than anticipated. LMHA may need to look at rebalancing the number of households who have full recertifications on the even and odd years in order to balance work load and cost and time savings.

Changes to Metrics

Benchmarks for the CE #1 Agency Cost Savings and CE #2 for the HCV program were corrected to reflect only those households who are elderly or disabled and over age 55 and whose only source of income is SS or SSI.

Metrics

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 (\$).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).	
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2008: * \$5,799 (919 mini-recertifications X 0.25 staff hours X \$25.24/hour)	Even FYs: \$7,714 (1,147 mini-recerts X 0.25 staff hours X \$26.90/hour) Odd FYs: \$30,854 (1,147 full recerts X 1.0 staff hours X \$26.90/hour)	\$8,075 (1,147 mini recerts X .25 staff hours X \$28.16/hour)	Yes
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2008: ** \$16,695 (894 full recertifications X 0.75 staff hours X \$24.90/hour)	\$25,383 (952 full recerts X 0.75 staff hours X \$35.55/hour)	\$36,974 (1,336 full recerts X 0.75 staff hours S \$36.50/hour)	No
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2008: \$22,494	Even FY: \$33,097 Odd FY: \$56,237	\$45,049	No
	# of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost	Expected # of recerts of eligible	Actual # of recerts of eligible HHs	

	to conduct a recert prior to implementation.	HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per recert.	<i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per recert.	
--	--	---	---	--

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs.

*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.

**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.

***Benchmarks will be indexed annually to account for variations in staff cost.

<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).	
	HCV Program			
	As of 2008: 578 hours (2,312 mini-recerts X 0.25 hours)	Even FYs: 287 hours (1,147 mini recerts X .25 staff hours) Odd FYs: 1,147 hours (1,147 full recerts X 1.0 staff hours)	287 hours (1,147 mini recerts X .25 staff hours)	No
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2008: 671 hours (894 full recerts X 0.75 hours)	714 hours (952 full recerts X 0.75 staff hours)	1,002 hours (1,336 full recerts X 0.75 staff hours)	No
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2008: 1,249	Even FYs: 1,757 hours Odd FYs: 4,884 hours	1,289 hours	No
	# 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.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<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).	
	HCV Program			
	N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV program.			

	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	\$4,750,000	\$4,138,560	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

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

Description/Update

This activity provides a \$7,500 earned income disregard to elderly families in the HCV program whose 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.

Impact

Seventeen (17) households qualified for the EID in FY 2018. This activity provides elderly families who choose to work with the ability to exclude \$7,500 of their earned income and maintain a more affordable rent. Seven (7) households met LMHA's self-sufficiency definition having achieved the goal of earned income in excess of \$14,500.

Hardship

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA did not experience any challenges in achieving benchmarks during FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

In FY 2018, LMHA established baselines, benchmarks and outcomes for SS #3. While this metric typically reflects work-able households (non-elderly and non-disabled), this activity is only applicable to elderly families. As such, LMHA used the number of elderly families receiving Social Security as the universe and then identified the portion of that universe with earned income. The 2018 data for this metric will be used as the baseline, benchmark and outcome for the FY 2018 report. Education and job training are not tracked for this population.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline*	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

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).	
	FY 2009: \$5,651	\$5,500	\$11,322	Yes
	Average gross annual earned income of elderly households with earned income and only Social Security (SS) income.	Expected average earned income of elderly households with earned income and only SS income.	Actual average earned income of elderly households with earned income and only SS income.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC				

*FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
<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>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline***	Benchmark**	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?
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 (#).	
Employed Full or Part-Time	As of FY 2018: 40 (9%) Number and percent of elderly HHs with earned income and SS income	40 (9%) Number and percent of elderly HHs with earned income and SS income	40 (9%) Number and percent of elderly HHs with earned income and SS income	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	N/A
Enrolled in Job Training Program	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	N/A
Unemployed	As of FY 2018: 402 (91%) Number of elderly HHs with SS income and no earned income	402 (91%) Number of elderly HHs with SS income and no earned income	402 (91%) Number of elderly HHs with SS income and no earned income	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 (%).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

*Baseline updated in FY 2018 report to reflect applicable metrics for the targeted population in this activity.

**LMHA used a universe of elderly families with Social Security income to determine the metrics for this activity.

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline*	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 (#).	
	As of FY2009: 0	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.	

Data Source(s): Emphasys

*FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available. There are no services associated with this activity.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency*</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline**	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 (#).	
	As of FY 2009: 0	0	7	Yes
	# of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency annually prior to implementation.	Anticipated # of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY.	Actual # of elderly households with earned income and SS income, where earned income is greater than \$14,500.	

Data Source(s): Emphasys

*Self-Sufficiency is defined as the ability of an elderly family, whose only source of income is Social Security, to obtain and maintain suitable employment. “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).

**FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<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).	
	As of FY2009: \$100.96 (16 HHs X .25 staff hours X \$25.24/hour)	\$0(10 HHs X 0 staff hours * \$26.90/hour)	\$0 (17 HHs X 0 staff hours * \$28.16/hour)	Yes
	# of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per HH	Anticipated # of HHs that will receive EID <i>multiplied by</i> the	Actual # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the	

	to track/calculate annually prior to implementation.	average anticipated cost per HH to track/calculate annually.	actual average cost per HH to calculate/track annually.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

*FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>CE #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).	
	As of FY2009: 4 hours (16 HHs X 0.25 hours)	0 hours (17 HHs X 0 hours)	0 hours (17 HHs X 0 hours)	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.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

*FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</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 (%).	
	FY 2009: 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.	
Data Source(s): Staff logs				

*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).	
	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.	
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 four 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/Update

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 recertifications per household per year;
- A revised methodology for determining tenant rent to owner;
- A simplified utility allowance schedule; and
- 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.

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 2018, 604 of the Alternate Rent Group households and 700 Control Group families (67% 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 2018 data 483 (80%) heads of household in the Alternate Rent Group and 315 (45%) heads of household in the Control Group reported earned income at their most recent certification. In addition, at the end of the fiscal year, 120 Alternate Rent Group and 186 Control Group non-elderly/non-disabled households, were self-sufficient, i.e., receiving annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500. It should be noted that the Alt Rent Group has 209 households with earned income under \$5,000 where the Control Group only had 42 households with earned income under \$5,000. This disparity in earned income impacts the average earned income for the Alt Rent Group and Control Group.

Hardship

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

Thirty four hardship requests were received during FY 2018. In 29 of these cases the request was approved.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA did not experience any challenges in meeting benchmarks. Where the Alt Rent group had 7 recertifications which were completed out of sequence, outcomes were slightly off from benchmarks which is not indicative of any challenge meeting benchmarks.

Changes to Metrics

LMHA identified data necessary to track the employment status and education portion of metric SS #3 and included baselines, benchmarks and outcomes in the FY 2018 report. As this was the first year this data was reported the baselines, benchmarks and outcomes are the same.

Metrics

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	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).	
	Cost per Annual Certification (Cert)			
	As of FY2015: Alt Rent Group: \$54,920 (1 annual cert * 1,000 households (HHs) X \$54.92/cert) Control Group: \$54,920 (1 annual cert X 1,000 HHs * \$54.92/cert) <u>Per annual cert cost:</u> \$54.92 (\$50.14 staff cost (2 hours X \$25.07/hour) + \$4.78 (mail & reproduction costs))	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years): \$0 (0 certs X \$0 per cert) Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years): \$54,920 (1,000 certs X \$54.92) Control Group (All Years): \$54,920 (1,000 certs X \$54.92) <u>Cost per annual cert:</u> \$54.92 (\$50.14 staff cost (2 hours X \$25.07/ hour) + \$4.78 (mail & repro costs))	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): \$427 (7 certs X \$61.02/cert) Control Group: \$36,978 (606 certs X \$61.02/cert) <u>Cost per annual cert:</u> \$61.02 (\$61.02 staff cost (2 hours X \$28.12/ hour) + \$4.78 (mail & repro costs))	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group***
	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.	
	Cost per Full Interim Certification (Cert)			

		Alt Rent Group: \$18,805 (500 certs X \$37.61/cert) Control Group: \$75,220 (2,000 certs X \$37.61/cert) <u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hour X 1.5 hours)	Alt Rent Group:**** \$34,426(815 certs X \$42.24/cert) Control Group: \$24,246 (574 certs X \$42.24/cert) <u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$42.24 (staff cost of \$28.16/hour X 1.5 hours)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group****
	Average # of interim certs received by study-eligible HHs ¹ 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.	.
	Cost per Streamlined Interim Certification (Cert)			
	As of FY2015: Alt Rent Group: \$75,220 (2 traditional interim certs per HH * 1,000 HHs X \$37.61/cert) <u>Per traditional interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hour X 1.5 hours)	Alt Rent Group: \$25,070 (1,000 certs X \$25.07/cert) <u>Per streamlined interim cert cost:</u> \$25.07 (staff cost of \$25.07/hour X 1.0 hours)	Alt Rent Group:** Not tracked	N/A
	Average # of traditional interim certs received by study-eligible HHs ¹ 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.	
	Cost of Rent Calculation			

	As of FY2015: Alt Rent Group: \$25,070 (1,000 HHs X \$25.07 per rent calculation) Control Group: \$25,070 (1,000 HHs X \$25.07 per rent calculation) <u>Per rent calculation cost:</u> \$25.07 (staff cost of \$25.07/hour X 1.0 hours)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): \$0 (0 rent calculations X \$25.07 per cert) (Triennial Cert Years): \$25,070 (1,000 rent calculations X 1.0 staff hours X \$25.07/hour) Control Group (All Years): \$25,070 (1,000 rent calculations X 1.0 staff hours X \$25.07/hour)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): \$197 (7 rent calculations X 1.0 staff hours X \$28.16/hour) Control Group: \$17,065 (606 rent calculations X 1.0 staff hours X \$28.16/hour)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group***
	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.	
	Cost to Determine Income from Assets			
	As of FY 2015: Alt Rent Group: \$13 (2 HHs (0.22% X 1,000 HHs) X \$6.27 per asset income determination) Control Group: \$13 (2 HHs (0.22% X 1,000 HHs) X \$6.27 per asset income determination) <u>Per asset income determination cost:</u> \$6.27 (staff cost of \$25.07/hour X 0.25 hours)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years): \$6 (1 HH X \$25.07 per staff hour X 0.25 hours) Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years): \$13 (2 HHs X \$25.07 per staff hour X 0.25 hours) Control Group (All Years): \$13 (2 HHs X \$25.07 per staff hour X 0.25 hours)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): \$0 (0 HHs) Control Group: \$7 (1 HHs X \$28.16 per staff hour X 0.25 hours)	Yes

	% 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.	
--	---	--	--	--

*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.

**Benchmarks will be indexed annually to account for variations in staff costs.

***Includes regular recertifications and interim recertifications. As a result of a processing error, annual recertifications were completed for seven households in the Alternate Rent Group.

****LMHA is not currently tracking traditional and streamlined interim certifications separately. All interim certifications have been reported as traditional certifications.

<i>CE #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).	
	Time to Complete Annual Certification			
	As of FY 2015: Alt Rent Group: 2,000 hours (1,000 HHs X 2.0 hours per annual cert) Control Group: 2,000 hours (1,000 HHs X 2.0 hours per annual cert)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years): 0 hours (0 certs X 2 hours/cert) Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years): 2,000 hours (1,000 HHs X 2.0 hours/cert) Control Group (All Years): 2,000 hours (1,000 HHs X 2.0 hours/cert)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): 14 hours (7 certs X 2.0 hours/cert) Control Group: 1,212 hours (606 certs X 2.0 hours/cert)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group*
	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.	
Time to Determine Tenant Rent				

	As of FY 2015: Alt Rent Group: 1,000 hours (1,000 HHs X 1.0 hours per tenant rent determination) Control Group: 1,000 hours (1,000 HHs X 1.0 hours per tenant rent determination)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): \$0 (0 rent calculations X 1 hour/determination) (Triennial Cert Years): 1,000 hours (1,000 determinations X 1.0 hour/determination) Control Group (All Years): 1,000 hours (1,000 determinations X 1.0 hour/determination)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): 7 hours (7 rent determinations * 1.0 hour/determination) Control Group: 606 hours (606 determinations * 1.0 hour/determination)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group*
	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined multiplied by average staff hours 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 hours required to determine tenant rent.	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined during FY multiplied by average staff hours required to determine tenant rent.	
	Time to Determine Utility Allowance (UA)			
	As of FY 2015: Alt Rent Group: 250 hours (1,000 HHs X 0.25 hours per UA determination) Control Group: 250 hours (1,000 HHs X 0.25 hours per UA determination)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): \$0 (0 rent calculations X .08 hour/determination) (Triennial Cert Years): 80 hours (1,000 determinations X 0.08 hours per determination) Control Group (All Years): 250 hours (1,000 determinations X 0.25 determination)	Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Year): .56 hours (7 determinations X 0.08 hours per determination) Control Group (All Years): 168 hours (673 determinations X 0.25 determination)	Yes
	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined multiplied by average staff hours required to determine UA prior to implementation.	Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined during FY multiplied by average staff hours required to determine UA.	Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined during FY multiplied by average staff hours required to determine UA.	

*Includes regular recertifications; interim recertifications and hardship requests are excluded. As a result of a processing error, annual recertifications were completed for 7 households in the Alternate Rent Group.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).	
	Average Error Rate in Determining TTP			
	As of FY2015: 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	
	Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance (UA)			
	As of FY2015: 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	

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
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 (\$).	
	As of FY2016: \$7,195	Alt Rent Group: \$8,285 Control Group: \$6,335	Alt Rent Group: \$9,580 Control Group: \$18,122	Yes
	Average annual gross earned income of Alt Rent and 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	

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
<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>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome*	Benchmark Achieved?
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 (#).	
Employed Full-Time	As of FY 2018: Alt Rent Group: 483 (80% of 604 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 483 (80% of 604 HHs) Control Group: 316	Alt Rent Group: 483 (80% of 604 HHs) Control Group: 315	Yes

	Control Group: 316 (45% of 700 HHs)	(45% of 700 HHs)	(45% of 700 HHs)	
Employed Part-Time	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	
Enrolled in an Educational Program	As of FY 2018: Alt Rent Group: 72 HHs Control Group: 49 HHs	Alt Rent Group: 72 HHs Control Group: 49 HHs	Alt Rent Group: 72 HHs Control Group: 49 HHs	
Enrolled in Job Training Program	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Alt Rent Group: Not Tracked Control Group: Not Tracked	Alt Rent Group: Not Tracked Control Group: Not Tracked	
Unemployed	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Alt Rent Group: 154 (21% of 722 HHs) Control Group: 549 (60% of 915 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 121 (20% of 604 HHs) Control Group: 385 (55% of 700 HHs)	
Other	As of FY 2015: Not tracked	Alt Rent Group: 0 Control Group: 0	Alt Rent Group: Control Group: 0	Yes
	# 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 (#).	

*Full-time vs. part-time employment status is not tracked for either Alternate Rent Group or Control Group households. LMHA determines employment as earned income and includes all employment as full time employment.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households (HHs) Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2016: 69 (4% of 1,637 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 36 (5% of 722 HHs) Control Group: 33 (4% of 915 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 32 (5% of 604 HHs) Control Group: 20 (3% of 700 HHs)	Yes
	% of Alt Rent and Control Group HHs receiving TANF at FYE.	Expected # of Alt Rent/Control Group HHs receiving TANF as of FYE.	Actual # of Alt Rent/Control Group HHs receiving TANF as of FYE.	

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency*</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# of HHs receiving services aimed to increase self-	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 (#).	

sufficiency (increase).	As of FY 2015: Alt Rent Group: 0 (0% * 1,000 HHs) Control Group: 0 (0% * 1,000 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 8 (1% of 722 HHs) Control Group: 15 (2% of 915 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 8 (1% of 604 HHs) Control Group: 22 (3% of 700 HHs)	Yes
	% 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.	

*Metric captures households enrolled in the Housing Authority's FSS Program.

Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)*				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/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 (\$).	
	As of FY 2015: \$634/month	Alt Rent Group: \$608/month Control Group: \$628/month	Alt Rent Group: \$717/month Control Group: \$673/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	

*Per unit subsidy equals average HAP to Owner.

Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
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 (\$).	
	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.	

Self-Sufficiency #8: Households (HHs) Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency*				
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 (#).	
	As of FY 2016: Alt Rent Group: 161 (22% of 722 HHs) Control Group: 188 (21% of 915 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 161 (22% of 722 HHs) Control Group: 188 (21% of 915 HHs)	Alt Rent Group: 120 (20% of 604 HHs) Control Group: 186 (27% of 700 HHs)	Yes for Control Group No for Alt Rent Group*
	% of Alt Rent and 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.	

*Self-Sufficiency is defined as the ability of a non-disabled/non-elderly family to obtain suitable employment. “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 Elite*. 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/Update

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. In FY 2018 LMHA did not submit any development or acquisition proposals under this activity.

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 2018; however, it may be used in the future.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

As there were no submittals under this activity in FY 2018, LMHA cannot report on challenges.

Changes to Metrics

No changes have been made to the metrics identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	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).	
	As of FY 2008: \$12,249 (9 submittals X 25 hours X \$54.44/hour)	\$930 (2 submittals X 7.5 hours X \$62.00/hour)	\$0 (0 submittal X 0 hours X \$62.00/hour)	Yes
	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).	
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ 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 ¹	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).	
	As of FY 2008: 225 hours (9 submittals X 25 hours)	15 hours (2 submittals X 7.5 hours)	0 hours (0 submittals X 7.5 hours)	Yes
	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).	
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	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 (#).	
	As of 2008: 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	
Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs				

¹ 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/Update

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. In FY 2018 LMHA did not acquire any units for public housing or vacant land for developing public housing, therefore there was not any movement under this activity.

Approval and Implementation

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

Impact

LMHA did not use the regulatory flexibility provided through this MTW activity during FY 2018; however, it may be used in the future. 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.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

As there were no submittals under this activity in FY 2018, LMHA cannot report on challenges.

Changes to Metrics

No changes have been made to the metrics identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings¹</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).	
	As of FY 2010: 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).	

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

¹ 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 ¹	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).	
	As of FY 2008: 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).	

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

¹ 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 (#).	
	As of 2008: 0	0 ¹	0	Yes
	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.	

Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs

¹ 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/Update

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 2018, twenty-one (21) HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home. The average home sales price was \$123,383, with an average mortgage interest rate of 3.833%. Twelve (12) of the buyers together received a total of \$204,300 in HOME down payment assistance through Louisville Metro Government.

This activity permitted six one-bedroom-eligible families to purchase a unit using the two-bedroom payment standard. None of these households purchased a home in an exception payment standard area.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA did not experience any challenges in achieving benchmarks during FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2018 Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings¹</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).	
	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).	

Data Source(s): N/A

¹ 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 Savings¹</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).	
	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).	
Data Source(s): N/A				

¹ 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.

<i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark ¹	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2005: 0	2	6	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 (#).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

¹ Benchmark based on FY 2015 outcome.

<i>Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark ¹	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2005: 0	2	6	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 (#).	

Activity #13-2009: Exception Payment Standards for HCV Homeownership

Description/Update

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 twenty (20) families to buy homes in areas of opportunity. Three (3) HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home in an exception payment standard area during FY 2018.

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.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA did not experience any challenges in achieving benchmarks during FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2018 Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings¹</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).	
	As of FY 2008: 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).	
Data Source(s): N/A				

¹ 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 Savings¹</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).	
	As of FY 2008: 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).	
Data Source(s): N/A				

¹ 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.

<i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2008: 0	2	3	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 (#).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<i>Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

# 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2008: 0	2	3	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 (#).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

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

Description/Update

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 removed this change from the closed-out activities matrix as it should just be reflected as a change to this existing activity. The remaining portion of the activity was left out of the FY 2018 Plan.

Approval and Implementation

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

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.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

There were no challenges in achieving benchmarks in FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2018 Plan.

Metrics

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
	As of FY 2008: \$179 (12 verifications * 0.5 hours * \$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 (\$)	
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
	As of FY 2008: 6 hours (12 verifications * 0.5 hours)	0 hours	0 hours	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 (\$)	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs				

<i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</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 (%).	
	As of FY 2008: 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 (%).	
Data Source(s): Staff logs.				

A.6 Local Leased Housing Program

Activity #44-2015: SPECIAL REFERRAL MTW HCV PROGRAMS

Description/Update

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 13,224 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.
- In FY 2018, LMHA allocated vouchers to two partners:
 - Up to 10 vouchers to St. Vincent DePaul's Transitional Housing Program, which assists families with children, where the family is either homeless or at risk of becoming homeless, combining housing support with case management services.
 - Up to 10 vouchers to the House of Ruth to assist individuals who are homeless and HIV-positive, combining housing with wraparound social service support services. Special Referral Program participants will be required to live at the House of Ruth's Glade House, a single-room occupancy facility, after which time vouchers become fully portable. Inspections will be conducted with each new occupant and once per year concurrently.

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 #46-2017: Riverport Scholar House

Under this activity, LMHA allocated up to 64 additional vouchers to the Family Scholar House's new Riverport campus. 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. Voucher issuance and leasing for this allocation began in FY 2018.

Activity #47-2017: ChooseWell Communities

LMHA provided an initial allocation of up to 10 vouchers to ChooseWell in FY 2016 and an additional allocation of 60 vouchers in FY 2017 to assist families that include a pregnant or post-partum mother who has successfully completed residential and/or intensive outpatient treatment for addiction.

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 2009 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 2015.
- 12) Activity #46-2017 (Riverport Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2017.
- 13) Activity #47-2017 (ChooseWell Communities) was proposed and implemented in FY 2017.

Impact

During FY 2018 LMHA continued to provide housing subsidy to families through partnerships with supportive services agencies. LMHA provided two new allocations in FY 2018; one allocation of 10 vouchers to St. Vincent DePaul Transitional Housing Program which assists families with children, where the family is either homeless or at risk of becoming homeless, combining housing support with case management services.

A table summarizing LMHA’s Special Referral Programs follows:

**Table 13: LMHA Special Referral MTW Voucher Programs
Fiscal Year 2018**

Organization	Site	Voucher Allocation	FY Proposed	FY First Voucher Issued	Portable? <i>Term Limited?</i>	Streamlined Admission?	MTW Inspections?
100K Homes Initiative	N/A	50	2012	2012	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Center for Women and Families	Villager	22	2005	2005	Full portability upon program completion.	Yes	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
Centerstone	N/A	50	2015	2015	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Choices, Inc.	Choices owned units	5	2014	2014	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
ChooseWell Communities	N/A	60 in 2016 + 10 in 2017	2016, 2017	2016	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Coalition for the Homeless	N/A (Rapid Re-housing)	20	2012	2013	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Day Spring	Day Spring constructed units	4	2009	2009, 2012*	Full portability.	Yes	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Family & Children's Place	N/A	10	2017	2017	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Family Scholar House	Louisville	56	2008	2008	Full portability upon program completion.	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. is used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
	Downtown	54	2010	2011			
	Stoddard Johnston	57	2012	2012			
	Parkland + 5 off-site	53	2012 Amended	2012			
	Riverport	64	2017	2018			
House of Ruth	Glade House	10	2018	2018	Full portability.	No	Yes: Inspection with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
Kentucky Housing Corporation	N/A	10	2016	2016	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
St. Vincent dePaul	1015-A S. Preston St.	10	2018	2018	Full portability.	No	Yes: Inspection with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
Wellspring	Youngland Avenue	5	2012	2012	Full portability.	Yes	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
	Bashford Manor/Newburg	8	2012	2013		No	
	N/A	10	2016	2016		No	

*Referral program suspended during FY2010 and FY2011.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

In FY 2018 LMHA allocated 10 vouchers to St. Vincent DePaul's Transitional Housing Program and 10 vouchers to the House of Ruth.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

The outcome average subsidy did not meet the benchmark as a result of the new allocation of vouchers for St. Vincent DePaul and House of Ruth.

Changes to Metrics

LMHA has identified data to inform metrics for SS #3 employment, unemployment and enrolled in education. Accordingly, the benchmarks and outcomes reflect data from FY 2018.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following, combined HUD Standard Metrics for these activities. All Self-Sufficiency metrics for this activity exclude elderly and disabled families. While 335 households participated in a Special Referral Program at fiscal-year-end, the Self-Sufficiency outcomes below only include the 293 families that were neither elderly nor disabled.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings¹</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 (\$).	
	\$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 (\$).	
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ 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 Savings¹</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).	
	0 hours	0 hours	0 hours	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).	

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

¹ 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 Leveraged¹</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 (\$).	
	\$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 (\$).	
Data Source(s): Special referral program partner records				

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

<i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
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 prior to implementation of the activity (\$).	Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	
	FY 2016: \$4,108	\$4,108	\$10,890	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.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2016 is the earliest year for which this data is available.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
<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>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
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 (#).	
(1) Employed Full-Time ²	As of FY 2016: 90 (32% of 279 HHs)	138 (47% of 293 HHs)	138 (47% of 293 HHs)	Yes
(2) Employed Part-Time ²				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	As of FY 2018: 2 HHs have full-time adult students	2 HHs have full-time adult students	2 HHs have full-time adult students	

(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	Not tracked	Not tracked		
(5) Unemployed	As of FY 2016: 189 (68% of 279 HHs)	189 (68% of 279 HHs)	159 (54% of 293 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 (#).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

² 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.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households (HHs) Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# 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 (#).	
	FY 2016: 54 (19% of 279 HHs)	54 (19% of 279 HHs)	50 (17% of 218 HHs)	Yes
	# 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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency¹</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 (#)	
	As of FY 2016: 13 (5% of 279 HHs)	13 (5% of 279 HHs)	11 (4% of 293 HHs)	Yes
	# 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	
Data Source(s): Special referral program partners				

¹ 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.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	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 household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$)	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$)	
	As of FY 2016: \$617	\$617	\$667	No
	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

¹ FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
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).	
	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency*				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline**	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (<<PHA definition 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).	
	As of FY 2016: 32 (11% of 279 HHs)	32 (11% of 279 HHs)	31 (11% of 293 HHs)	Yes
	# 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	
Data Source(s): Various				

*Self-Sufficiency is defined as the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain suitable employment. "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).

**FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time
--

Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	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).	
	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).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

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

Description/Update

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 2018, LMHA was unable to track the affected households; however, LMHA is working on establishing a tracking mechanism for this activity.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

LMHA does not have a tracking mechanism to account for families with child care expenses removed from gross income calculation for income eligibility purposes at admission, and as such cannot determine the average subsidy per household affected or speak to challenges reaching benchmarks.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2018 Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
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).	
	As of FY 2010: 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 (\$)	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

<i>SS #7: 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).	
	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

Activity #39-2014: HCV Program Rent Increase Limit

Description/Update

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. This activity was since revised in the FY 2019 Plan.

Approval and Implementation

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

Impact

This activity caps the annual contract rent increases for HCV households. Benchmarks did not reflect the 2% increase nor did household income increase significantly to impact a reduction in subsidy.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2018 Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
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).	
	As of FY 2014: \$526¹	\$542	\$589	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.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2014 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>SS #7: 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).	
	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

Activity #48-2018: Local Project-Based Voucher (PBV) Program

Description/Update

The Housing Authority's Local PBV Program has been designed with the following key objectives in mind:

- Supporting neighborhood revitalization, especially the transformation of the Russell neighborhood (which includes Beecher Terrace), by creating new housing choices that provide in-neighborhood relocation options for displaced LMHA residents and attract new residents to the neighborhood;
- Increasing housing choices for low-income families in high-opportunity areas;
- Providing options for low-income families to live in mixed-income and mixed-use developments; and
- Incentivizing developers to preserve or create affordable housing units that expand housing options for low-income families.

Use of the following MTW authorities will further the Housing Authority's ability to meet these key objectives:

Proposal Selection Process

Policy: PBV proposals may be selected based on any one of the following three methods:

1. The results of a previous competition (no MTW authority required);
2. Issuance of a Request for Proposals, which may be limited to a specific site or sites or to geographic areas that meet certain criteria (for example, non-impacted census tracts); or
3. Selection of LMHA-owned properties without a competitive process or prior HUD approval.

Proposal Selection Requirements

Policy: Up to 100% of units within any given project may be awarded PBV assistance. However, in furtherance of the Housing Authority's commitment to the development of mixed-income housing, at its sole discretion, LMHA may limit the percentage of units that may be project-based at any given project to some amount less than 100%.

Requirements for Rehabilitated and Newly Constructed Units

Policy: When LMHA has received owner notice that the rehabilitated or newly constructed housing is completed, the Housing Authority will inspect the units to determine if the housing has been completed in accordance with the Agreement to Enter a HAP Contract (AHAP), including compliance with HQS standards, except that in lieu of LMHA inspection of the units, the owner may submit the Certificate of Occupancy issued by Louisville Metro Government as evidence of compliance.

HAP Contract Term

Policy: The initial term of the HAP contract will not exceed 20 years or be less than one year. LMHA may agree to enter into an extension at the time of the initial HAP contract term or any time before expiration of the contract, for an additional term not to exceed 20 years, if LMHA determines an extension is appropriate to continue providing affordable housing for low-income families. LMHA may provide for multiple extensions; however, in no circumstance may such extensions exceed 20 years, cumulatively.

Inspections

Policy: LMHA will not inspect units at new tenant turnover. LMHA will inspect all units within a specific building concurrently once per year. Should the owner add or substitute a unit covered under the HAP contract, LMHA will inspect the new or substitute unit before providing assistance to that unit. LMHA will also conduct complaint inspections upon tenant request.

Locally-Defined Definition of Elderly

Policy: For the purpose of determining the order in which families on the Housing Authority's PBV waiting list are referred by LMHA to the owner of a project-based elderly or elderly/disabled building, an "Elderly Family" will be defined as a family whose head (including co-head), spouse, or sole member is a person who is at least 55 years of age. It may include two or more persons who are at least 55 years of age living together, or one or more persons who are at least 55 years of age living with one or more Live-In Aides.

Income Limits

Policy: The income eligibility limit for PBV units will be increased from 50% to 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) except in the case of PBV units that are subject to a lower income restriction due to limitations imposed by other 3rd-party funding sources (for example, units that also have low-income housing tax credits or funding awarded through the National Housing Trust Fund). In the case of funding sources that impose an income cap that falls between 50% and 80% of AMI, the maximum allowable income cap will be used (For example, PBV units that also have low-income housing tax credits capped at 60% of AMI, would have an income eligibility limit of 60% of AMI).

Income and Asset Verification

Policy: For PBV units that are also low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC) units, LMHA will utilize the LIHTC program's Tenant Income Certification form to verify income and assets both for determining eligibility at admission and at recertification.

Approval and Implementation

Activity #48-2018 was proposed and implemented in FY 2018.

Impact

LMHA published Request for Proposals (RFP) beginning May 9, 2018. Two procurement rounds were completed without any responses from interested parties.

Hardship

Not Applicable

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

As a result of meetings with developers due to the lack of response to LMHA's RFP, LMHA modified its PBV off-site replacement housing strategy and will republish the revised competitive RFP during FY19.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2018 Plan. Please note that due to the lack of response to LMHA's RFPs, there were no PBV contracts issued in FY 2018. Accordingly outcomes cannot be reported

Metrics

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings¹				
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).	
	Unit Inspections			
	As of FY2017: Total cost is \$0 (No PBV units) FY2017 average inspection cost per HCV unit: \$37.03 (1.5 inspections per unit * 0.6 hours per inspection * \$41.14 per staff hour)	\$1,234.20 using FY2017 staff cost (50 initial inspections for units where LMHA is inspector (as opposed to units where CO is used) * 0.6 hours per inspection * \$41.14 per staff hour)	TBD	TBD
	Income / Asset Verification			
	As of FY2017: Total cost is \$0 (No PBV units) FY2017 average verification cost per HCV unit: \$21.12 (0.75 hours per verification * \$28.16 per staff hour)	\$1,126.40 using FY2017 staff cost (0.4 hours per verification * 100 verifications * \$28.16 per staff hour)	TBD	TBD
	Total Savings			
	As of FY 2017: \$0 (No PBV units) FY2017 average verification + inspection cost per HCV units: \$58.15	\$3,454.40 (FY 2018 total verification & inspection cost for all PBV units - FY2017 total verification & inspection cost for 100 HCV units)	TBD	TBD
	Cost of inspecting and verifying income/assets for PBV units annually prior to implementation	Expected cost of inspecting and verifying income/assets for PBV units during FY	Actual cost of inspecting and verifying income/assets for PBV units during FY	

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

¹ Although average per unit inspection and verification costs are expected to decrease over time (when comparing traditional HCV units to new PBV units), total inspection and verification costs are expected to increase over time as new PBV units are developed.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings¹				
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).	
	Unit Inspections			
	As of FY2017: 0 hours (No PBV units) FY2017 average inspection hours per HCV unit: 0.9 hours (1.5 inspections per unit * 0.6 hours per inspection)	30 hours (50 initial inspections for units where LMHA is inspector (as opposed to units where CO is used) * 0.6 hours per inspection)	TBD	TBD
	Income / Asset Verifications			
	As of FY2017: 0 hours (No PBV units) FY2017 average verification hours per HCV unit: 0.75 hours	40 hours (0.4 hours per verification * 100 verifications)	TBD	TBD
	Total Savings			
	As of FY 2017: 0 hours (No PBV units) FY2017 average verification + inspection hours per HCV unit: 1.7 hours	100 hours (FY 2018 total verification & inspection hours for all PBV units - FY2017 total verification & inspection hours for 100 HCV units)	TBD	TBD
	Staff hours expended inspecting and verifying income/assets for PBV units annually prior to implementation	Expected staff hours expended inspecting and verifying income/assets for PBV units during FY	Actual staff hours expended inspecting and verifying income/assets for PBV units during FY	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ Although average staff time spent per unit on inspections and verifications is expected to decrease over time (when comparing traditional HCV units to new PBV units), total staff time spent per unit on inspections and verifications is expected to increase over time as new PBV units are developed.

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	
	As of FY 2017: \$0 (No PBV units)	\$19,048,700 (\$190,487 (TDC for a 2-BR walkup) * 100 units)	TBD	TBD
	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity	Expected amount leveraged during FY	Actual amount leveraged during FY	
Data Source(s): CNI quarterly reports; PHA financial records				

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) of new housing units made available for households (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 (#).	
	As of 2017: 0 (No PBV units)	100	TBD	TBD
	PBV units acquired/developed prior to implementation of the activity	Expected PBV units acquired/developed during FY	Actual PBV units acquired/developed during FY	
Data Source(s): CNI quarterly reports; Emphasys				

HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	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).	
	As of FY 2017: 65 months	63 months	TBD	TBD
	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected average applicant time on wait list during FY.	Actual average applicant time on wait list during FY.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# of HHs at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of HH, give that type in this box: Families relocating from the Beecher Terrace public housing development	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 (#).	
	As of FY 2017: 23 HHs moved (no assistance lost)	130 HHs moved (no assistance lost)	TBD	TBD
	# of HHs that lost assistance/ moved prior to implementation.	Expected # of HHs that will lose assistance/move during FY.	Actual # of HHs that lost assistance/ moved during FY.	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
# of 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2017: 0 (No PBV units)	100	TBD	TBD
	# of HHs residing in a PBV unit prior to implementation of the activity	Expected # of HHs residing in a PBV unit at FYE	Actual # of HHs residing in a PBV unit at FYE	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

A.7 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

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

Description/Update

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 #37-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

Impact

In FY 2018, LMHA served four households through this activity through this activity.

Hardship

Frazier Rehab 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.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

There were no challenges in achieving benchmarks in FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes were made to the baseline or benchmarks listed in the FY 2018 Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings¹</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).	
	As of FY 2013: 0 hour (units were vacant)	0 hour (0.0 hour * 6 HHs)	0 hour (0.0 hour * 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).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

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

<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 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2013: 0	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 (#).	
Data Source(s): PIC				

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

Description/Update

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 proposed and implemented in FY 2015.

Impact

In FY 2018, LMHA served five households under this activity.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

There were no challenges in achieving benchmarks in FY 2018.

Changes to Metrics

No changes have been made to the metrics identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
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).	
	As of FY2014: 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	

¹ 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.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>
<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>

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark ¹	Outcome ²	Benchmark Achieved?
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 (#).	
(1) Employed Full-Time	As of FY2014: 0	0	1	Yes
(2) Employed Part-Time	As of FY2014: 0	0	4	Yes
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	As of FY2014: 0	1	4	Yes
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	As of FY2014: 0	1	5	Yes
(5) Unemployed	As of FY2014: 0	1	0	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	

¹ Benchmark based on FY 2015 actuals.

² 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2014: 0	1	5	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	

<i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households (HHs) Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</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,	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 (#).	
	As of FY 2014: 0	0	0	Yes

the "Outcome" # should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	# 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	
--	---	--	--	--

*Self-Sufficiency is defined as the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain suitable employment. "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).

<i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
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 (#).	
	As of FY 2014: 0	1	4	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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

Activity #49-2018: Beecher Terrace CNI Revitalization – Broader Use of Funds to Support the Development of Off-Site, Mixed-Income Replacement Housing

Description/Update

HUD awarded LMHA a \$29,575,000 Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI) Implementation Grant in December 2016 for the revitalization of the Beecher Terrace public housing development and the wider Russell neighborhood. All buildings on the current Beecher Terrace site will be razed and replaced with a vibrant, sustainable mixed-income, mixed-use community.

Current Beecher Terrace households will be relocated in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (URA). Post-revitalization, relocated Beecher Terrace households will receive a lifetime admission preference for both on-site and off-site replacement units. While LMHA anticipates that most (if not all) of the 442 off-site replacement units will be subsidized through the Housing Authority's Local Project-Based Voucher (PBV) Program, LMHA is also pursuing opportunities to acquire properties where the Housing Authority can provide off-site replacement housing itself without relying on a 3rd-party developer or owner. To date, LMHA has already obtained site control for two turnkey four-plexes (eight units in total) in the Russell neighborhood. As these units are move-in ready, their acquisition would provide immediate relocation options for Beecher Terrace residents in their current neighborhood.

LMHA received approval from HUD in FY 2018 to move forward with proposed method of acquisition of two 4-plexes (located in the Russell Neighborhood). However, LMHA is still waiting on a pending review

of financial impacts and building conditions. Pending that review, LMHA may purchase two 4-plexes (located in the Russell Neighborhood) from New Directions Housing Corp. Four of these units will be used as Beecher replacement housing. These units will be restricted to households with incomes below 80% of AMI, but will not receive direct, ongoing operating subsidy. LMHA is also examining the feasibility of acquiring a second, 12-unit apartment building in Russell where the same funding structure would be used.

Approval and Implementation

Approved and implemented in FY 2018.

Impact

LMHA did not acquire the units in FY2018. Acquisition is expected to occur in FY 2019.

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

As units were not acquired in FY 2018, LMHA cannot report on challenges in achieving benchmarks.

Changes to Metrics

No changes have been made to the metrics identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Metrics

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidies 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).	
	As of FY 2017: \$5,460	\$0	TBD	TBD
	Average annual HAP payment for a 2-BR HCV household prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected average annual subsidy for household residing in an affected non-traditional unit at FYE.	Actual average annual subsidy per household residing in an affected non-traditional unit at FYE	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

<i>SS #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 (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	
	As of FY 2017: \$7,536 (\$1,884 per household * 4 households)	\$33,600 (\$8,400 per household * 4 households)	TBD	TBD
	Total average annual Rent to Owner for four 2-BR HCV households prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected PHA rental revenue during FY (annualized).	Actual PHA rental revenue during FY (annualized).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

<i>HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	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 (#).	
	As of 2017: 0	4	TBD	TBD
	Local, non-traditional units acquired/developed prior to implementation of the activity	Expected number of local, non-traditional units acquired/developed during FY	Actual number of local, non-traditional units acquired/developed during FY	
Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs				

<i>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number (#) 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 (#).	
	As of FY 2017: 0	4	TBD	TBD
	# of HHs moving to a local, non-traditional unit prior to implementation	Expected # of households moving to a local, non-traditional unit during FY	Actual # of households moving to a local, non-traditional unit during FY	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<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).	
	As of FY2017: \$84.48 (4 HHs * 0.75 hours per verification * \$28.16 per staff hour)	\$84.48 (4 HHs * 0.75 hours per verification * \$28.16 per staff hour)	TBD	TBD
	Total average annual cost of verifying income/assets for 4 HCV household prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected cost of verifying income/assets for affected units during FY	Actual cost of inspecting and verifying income/assets for PBV units during FY	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

Activity #50-2018: Increasing Housing Options for Relocating Beecher Terrace Families

Description/Update

LMHA has determined that a large proportion of relocating Beecher households will need one-bedroom units. While today's site has 355 one-bedroom units, there are a number of other current Beecher families who are over-housed resulting in an estimated 409 families who are one-bedroom-eligible based on their household size and composition. This activity employs two mechanisms to increase the range of housing options available to relocating Beecher Terrace families and to increase the ability of the Housing Authority's HCV Program to absorb additional one-bedroom-eligible households:

Increased Payment Standard for One-Bedroom-Eligible Households (Relocating Beecher Terrace Households Only)

LMHA will offer a two-bedroom payment standard to all one-bedroom-eligible households moving from the Beecher Terrace public housing development to an HCV unit in relocation phase II or III.¹ Both the regular two-bedroom payment standard (set at 100% of FMR) and the increased two-bedroom payment standard offered to families leasing in high opportunity census tracts (set at 110% of FMR) will be available to these households.

LMHA defines "high opportunity census tracts" as those census tracts that have: a) a poverty rate less than 40%; and, b) a minority concentration that is no more than 20% above that of the Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Statistical Area as a whole. Appendix 1 of LMHA's Administrative Plan incorporates a map showing these high opportunity census tracts, which are referred to as "rental exception payment census tracts". While payment standards are set at 100% of FMR for all other census tracts, LMHA has set payment standards for high opportunity areas at 110% of FMR,

One-bedroom-eligible families will only be permitted to use the two-bedroom payment standard to lease a two-bedroom unit. If a family chooses to lease a one-bedroom unit, they will receive the one-bedroom

¹ Relocation Phase I was completed in December 2017. Thus, this activity will only apply to families relocating from Beecher in phases II and III.

payment standard. Although LMHA does not anticipate any relocating households will select a zero-bedroom unit, should they do so, they will receive the zero-bedroom payment standard.

HCV Owner Incentive Fee (HCV Program-Wide)

To encourage owner participation in the HCV Program and increase the inventory of one-bedroom units available to these relocating Beecher families within the Louisville Metro area, LMHA will pay a \$1,000 incentive fee to owners who lease a one-bedroom unit to a family entering LMHA's HCV Program (to include relocating Beecher families). For the purposes of this activity, a family will be considered to be "newly-admitted" and the unit eligible for an incentive fee if:

- The family is signing a lease under the HCV Program for the first time;
- The family is moving from one LMHA housing program to another (e.g., moving from the Public Housing Program to the HCV Program);
- The family is using the portability provisions provided through the HCV Program to move with continued HCV assistance from another Public Housing Agency's jurisdiction to LMHA's jurisdiction; or
- The family has experienced an interruption of voucher assistance where the Public Housing Agency formerly assisting the family submitted an End of Participation action to HUD using form HUD-50058 or HUD-50058 MTW.

The incentive fee will be paid in two installments of \$500 each, with the first installment paid during the first month of the HAP contract and the second installment paid following the first anniversary of the HAP contract's effective date. Should the HAP contract be terminated for any reason within the first year, the owner will not receive the second \$500 installment.

Approval and Implementation

Activity #50-2018 was approved and implemented in FY 2018.

Impact

In FY 2018, thirty (30) owners were eligible to receive the owner incentive. This incentive has been effective in marketing efforts to identify and attract owners with one bedroom units

Hardship

Not applicable.

Actual Non-Significant Changes

There were no non-significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Actual Significant Changes

There were no significant changes to this activity in FY 2018.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

In spite of LMHA efforts to assist Beecher relocatees in finding units with vouchers, only one, one bedroom eligible family leased a two bedroom unit and received the two bedroom payment standard. Additionally, the owner incentive for a new one bedroom unit on the voucher program fell short of LMHA's goal of 75 new units; yielding only 30 new units. LMHA will continue to look for alternative strategies for relocating Beecher families.

Changes to Metrics

No changes have been made to the metrics identified in the FY 2018 Annual Plan.

Metrics

<i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (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).	
	As of FY 2017: 84 months	84 months ¹	TBD	TBD
	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list at FYE (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list at FYE (in months).	
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ Increasing the number of units on the HCV Program is not expected to reduce HCV waitlist time during FY 2018, as LMHA expects the majority of these additional units will be leased to relocating Beecher households.

<i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
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 (#).	
	Landlord Incentive Fee (HCV Program-Wide)			
	As of FY 2017: 132 (# of newly-admitted 1-BR HCV families)	152 (# of newly-admitted 1-BR HCV families)	30	No
	Increased Payment Standard (Relocating Beecher Families Only)			
	As of FY 2017: 0 (1-BR-eligible HHs relocating to 2-BR HCV unit)	75 (1-BR-eligible HHs relocating to 2-BR HCV unit)	1 (1 BR-eligible HH relocated to a 2 BR HCV unit)	No
	# 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	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Beecher relocation records				

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. LMHA originally planned on developing these guidelines in FY 2018, in conjunction with its CNI activities for the Russell neighborhood and the Beecher Terrace public housing development, specifically in relation to one-for-one replacement efforts. However, there was a slight delay in LMHA's one-for-one replacement plan due to a lack of responses to LMHA's RFP for PBVs. While LMHA is currently pursuing 2 acquisitions for replacement opportunities, LMHA is not ruling out the possibility of new construction or substantial rehab. Therefore, LMHA may in future implement and utilize this activity.

Status

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.

Status

This activity will remain on hold until a HUD OGC 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.

Activity	Plan Year	Close Out Year	Reason for Close Out
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 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.
Employment/Education Requirements in New Scattered Site (Activity #9-2007)	2007	2017	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 elected to close out this activity in the interests of increasing occupancy.

Activity 45-2016: MTW Special Referral Program – Coalition for the Homeless “Move Up” Initiative

- Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
Activity #45-2016 was proposed and implemented in FY 2016.
- Activity Description*
The “Move Up” Special Referral Program in partnership with the Coalition for the Homeless allocates up to 100 vouchers to formerly homeless families, allowing them to transition from homeless services vouchers to HCV vouchers, thus freeing up additional homeless services vouchers to serve currently homeless families.
- Plan Year Closed Out*
LMHA closed out Activity #45-2016 in FY 2018.
- Reason Why Activity was Closed Out*
Upon further review of this activity, the Housing Authority, with MTW Office concurrence, has determined that this partnership can be continued without MTW authority through the provision of a “limited admission preference” to the agency’s HCV Program.

5. *Final Outcomes and Lessons Learned*

LMHA, through the experience of this activity, learned that the use of limited admission preferences, without using MTW flexibility, can be used as a vehicle to address the housing needs of specific groups of individuals. This determination is based on a review of HUD guidance provided through PIH Notice 2013-15, "Guidance on housing individuals and families experiencing homelessness through the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs."

6. *Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit*
None.

7. *Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity*

LMHA tracked the following HUD Standard Metrics for Activity #45-2016, the outcomes of which are summarized below by fiscal year. The metrics for this activity were combined with other MTW voucher allocations and as such do not solely represent the outcomes for households under this voucher allocation.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
\$0	\$0

Implementation of this activity did not modify any LMHA-completed tasks. Housing Authority staff determines applicant eligibility and performs all certifications.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
0 hours.	0 hours.

Implementation of this activity did not modify any LMHA-completed tasks. Housing Authority staff determines applicant eligibility and performs all certifications.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
\$0	\$0

There were no resources leveraged to implement and maintain this activity.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
\$4,108	\$4,522

<i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>		
	FY 2016	FY 2017
Employed	90 (32%)	95 (44%)
Enrolled in Education Program	Not Tracker	Not Tracked
Enrolled in Job Training Program	Not Tracker	Not Tracked
Unemployed	189 (68%)	123 (56%)

<i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from TANF</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
54	47

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
13	10

LMHA tracks FSS participation for this metric. The special referral partner may offer additional self-sufficiency services.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
\$617	\$628

<i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
\$0	\$0

LMHA realized no rental revenue from the HCV Program

<i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
\$32	23

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,

<i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i>	
FY 2016	FY 2017
> 1 than 1 month	< than 1 month

Activity #2-1999: MTW Unit Inspection Protocol

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

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

2. Activity Description

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.

3. Plan Year Closed Out

LMHA closed out Activity #2-1999 in FY 2018.

4. Reason Why Activity was Closed Out

There are no longer any new Mod-Rehab units coming on line and as such, MTW flexibility is no longer needed to allow the certificate of occupancy to suffice for initial move-ins in lieu of a traditional HQS inspection.

5. Final Outcomes and Lessons Learned

This activity has significantly reduced costs to inspect the units associated with these programs.

6. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit

None.

7. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity

LMHA tracked the following HUD Standard Metrics for Activity #2-1999, the outcomes of which are summarized below by fiscal year. While this activity began in FY 1999, metrics are available only from FY 2009 through FY 2017

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>								
FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
\$717	\$717	\$717	\$745	\$758	\$1,005	\$1,005	\$1,626	\$1,595
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>								
FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
24 hours.	24 hours	24 hours	24 hours	24 hours	23.9 hours.	23.9 hours.	39 hours	36 hours.
<i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i>								
FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	Not Tracked

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

A. Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

i. Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

LMHA submitted all required FY 2018 unaudited and audited information in the prescribed Financial Data Schedule (FDS) format through the Financial Assessment System – PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system.

ii. Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

LMHA submitted all required FY 2018 unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the FASPHA, or its successor system.

iii. Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

LMHA used the single fund flexibility authorized in the MTW Program in FY2018 as described below.

- LMHA transferred \$4,430,614 from the Section 8 MTW HCV Program to the public housing AMPs. This transfer helped offset operating subsidy shortfalls of approximately 7% across calendar years 2017 and 2018. Additionally, it helped to maintain operations at the AMPs at a high level as well as maintaining a balanced operating budget. The HUD approved project expense levels (PEL) at some AMPs do not adequately provide for management services at the level deemed necessary by LMHA.
- LMHA transferred \$959,410 from the Capital Fund Program (CFP) to an AMP to fund the purchase of new public housing units (H Temple Spears). This expense was a budgeted item in CFP.
- LMHA used the single fund flexibility authorized in the MTW Program to transfer approximately \$1,249,116 from the Section 8 MTW HCV Program to the Central Office Cost Center. This transfer was necessary for the following reasons:
 - The COCC had to absorb a significant charge (approx. \$556,000) for the current fiscal year to adjust its Compensated Absence Liability to actual. Additional staff members became eligible for payouts at retirement due to their age and tenure with LMHA. Leave balances continued to grow for other employees, which increased the liability as well.
 - Several COCC employees retired that were eligible for retirees' health insurance coverage until age 65. This resulted in a \$438,000 charge to increase the liability to actual.
 - 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.

- LMHA also used the single fund flexibility authorized in the MTW Program to acquire property related to its HOPE VI revitalization effort at the Sheppard Square housing development, the Beecher Terrace CHOICE grant, and a new building for Section 8 HCV staff. These acquisitions included:
 - Sheppard Square HOPE VI replacement \$32,862 (230 Terrier Ct).
 - Various expenses and property acquisition related to the CHOICE grant \$450,684 (3143 Vermont Ave; 663 So. 23rd St; 608 So. 16th St).
 - Purchase of United Building \$2,890,453 – this acquisition will be the new home of the Section 8 HCV staff. Mechanicals and other systems in the old building were failing, and the rehab costs were prohibitive.
- Finally, LMHA spent approx. \$18,750 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?	<div>Yes</div>
Has LMHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?	<div>No</div>
Has LMHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?	<div>No</div>

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.

HUD's QA Division performed a restricted net position validation review in August 2017, which resulted in one finding. HUD determined that the LMHA's general depository agreement with the Bank was not in compliance with HUD requirements. Specifically, LMHA's executed agreement has an amendment with additional assurances. However, HUD requires PHAs to use HUD's agreement with no amendments. LMHA has been working with HUD on resolving the matter throughout the fiscal year, however, it remains open. Currently, LMHA is waiting on HUD's response to a waiver sent to the field office requesting the use of a proposed amendment to the HUD agreement. Additionally, HUD performed 9 REAC inspections at LMHA public housing sites. LMHA has begun and will continue to address deficiencies identified in REAC inspections.

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

LMHA certifies that, in FY 2018, it continued to meet the three statutory objectives of the MTW program. Appendix A includes the certification required by HUD.

VII. Appendices

Appendix A: MTW Annual Report Certification

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 2018:

1. Ensuring that at least 75% of households assisted by LMHA are very low-income;
2. Continuing to assist substantially the same total number of households as would have been assisted had LMHA not participated in the MTW demonstration; and,
3. Maintaining a comparable mix of households (by family size) served as would have been served had LMHA not participated in the MTW demonstration.



Lisa Osanka, Executive Director

8/15/18

Date

Appendix B: MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data

Not applicable