



Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority

Moving to Work 2020 Annual Report

Submitted: March 11, 2021



2832 State Route 59
Ravenna, Ohio 44266

Pamela Nation Calhoun,
Executive Director

Phone: (330) 297-1489

Fax: (330) 297-6295

Email: info@portagehousing.org

Website: www.portagehousing.org

The Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority is dedicated to meeting the housing needs of low-income families and individuals of Portage County by developing, managing, and supporting decent, affordable housing in cooperation with community partners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|-------------|---|
| Section I | Introduction and Overview of MTW Goals.....3 |
| Section II | General Housing Authority Operating Information.....8 |
| Section III | Proposed MTW Activities.....16 |
| Section IV | Approved MTW Activities.....17 |
| | A. Implemented Activities.....17 |
| | B. Not Yet Implemented Activities.....65 |
| | C. Activities on Hold.....67 |
| | D. Closed Out Activities.....68 |
| Section V | Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....88 |
| Section VI | Administrative.....89 |

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF MTW GOALS

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority (PMHA) is located in Portage County, Ohio, a mostly rural county in the midst of Northeast Ohio's metropolitan areas of Cleveland, Akron/Canton, and Warren/Youngstown. The county is home to 162,644 persons and, according to the 2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau, 13.1% of Portage County residents live in poverty.

PMHA was organized in 1968 by a group of local businessmen to provide rental assistance to Ravenna residents. Over the years, the remaining portions of Portage County were added to the Housing Authority's jurisdiction.

Presently, PMHA provides subsidized housing to low and moderate-income families and individuals. The agency operates two housing programs: The Public Housing program which consists of 303 units owned and managed by the agency, and the Section 8 program which entails the administration of a monthly subsidy paid to private landlord on behalf of a specific family or individuals. The Section 8 program provides assistance to over 1900 households/units in Portage County.

PMHA is the only Public Housing Authority (PHA) in Ohio that is currently part of the Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration. PMHA's MTW program began March 15, 1999. PMHA has participated in MTW since its inception. PMHA signed a Standard Agreement in 2008, extending its participation in MTW until the end of its 2018 fiscal year; however, in 2016, PMHA's participation in the demonstration was extended through year 2028.

Throughout its 50+ year history, PMHA has continued to be a proven leader and innovator in affordable housing and has earned the HUD designation of "High-Performer".



Board of Commissioners:

Thomas Sicuro, Board Chairman
Jean Meadows, Board Vice-Chairman
Scott Mikula, Commissioner
John Thomas, Commissioner
Michael Edwards, Resident Commissioner

Executive Director:

Pamela Nation Calhoun

PMHA Management:

Amy Bower, Assistant Director
Pamela Crislip, Chief Financial Officer
Cindy Blevins, Housing Portfolio Manager
Angela Carney, Section 8 Manager
Carolyn Budd, Special Programs Manager
Brandy Jones, Operations Manager
Wes Ransom, Project Manager



Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority established the following short-term MTW goals and objectives for 2020:

1. Achieve and Maintain Excellence in Tenant-Based Housing Programs

- Four (4) households will become new homeowners through the Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program in 2020.

Progress and Accomplishments:

The Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program saw two (2) new homeowners during 2020. The main barriers participants face when trying to become homeowners are low income and poor credit history. Two (2) existing community partners provided credit-repair and homeownership counseling services to PMHA households interested in homeownership.

2. Improve Productivity and Cost Effectiveness

- Examine opportunities to improve productivity and cost effectiveness through technology.

Progress and Accomplishments:

During 2020, PMHA added new elements of electronic data management to its operation utilizing the Yardi system. The Finance Department and Human Resources are 100% electronic and paperless. The Maintenance Department utilizes an electronic inventory control system. The Public Housing Department utilizes a system of electronic inspections. Throughout 2020 and continuing into 2021, PMHA's Public Housing and Section 8 departments have been using various Yardi portals to determine all of its functionality and capabilities before adding new elements of electronic data management.

The PMHA main office continued the usage of its digital touch-screen bulletin board, which provides an interactive interface for program participants and waiting list applicants to access information instantaneously from the office lobby. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the office lobby has been closed to the public since March 2020. However, PMHA continued to offer programmatic forms on its website, for program participants to access remotely. Additionally, PMHA continued to utilize its online application portal, which has streamlined the waiting list process since 2016.

During 2020, PMHA also created an online portal for landlords and program participants. The landlord portal allows landlords to view ledgers and inspection results. The tenant portal allows housing programs participants to make electronic payments to PMHA. In December 2020, PMHA's Applications Department began using the Yardi Compliance Module to electronically complete all applicant notifications and the processing of all Section 8 and Public Housing applications. PMHA is currently working on a similar

electronic process for the Annual and Interim recertifications. These should be fully electronic by July 2021.

3. Collaborate with Community Partners to Leverage Resources to Benefit Households Assisted by PMHA and Portage County

- PMHA will investigate opportunities to develop and manage permanent supportive housing.
- PMHA will investigate methods of inter-agency cooperation that will lessen barriers to assistance for applicants and participants.

Progress and Accomplishments:

Inter-agency cooperation and partnerships related to permanent supportive housing, homelessness, and related areas were maintained. However, no new opportunities were forthcoming. In 2020, PMHA did not put out any new requests for proposals for vouchers to be project-based during the plan year.

PMHA remains active and visible in Portage County. Staff members serve on various community committees and advisory boards, and the agency supports events which promote services that benefit the populations served.

PMHA's long-term vision for the direction of its MTW program, extending through the duration of the MTW Agreement includes:

- 1. Integrating community services that will assist non-disabled, non-elderly residents in continual economic improvement leading to either homeownership or private market housing.**

Progress and Accomplishments:

As indicated, PMHA partners with two (2) agencies to provide homeownership counseling to Public Housing and Section 8 households interested in becoming homeowners, which resulted in two (2) new homeowners during 2020.

- 2. Providing decent, safe, and affordable housing as a matter of choice among elderly and disabled residents in order to promote aging in place and improvement in quality of life.**

Progress and Accomplishments:

PMHA has eliminated minimum rent for elderly and disabled heads of household. Most reside in designated units which include paid utilities and thus eliminates a utility allowance for rent calculation. The results are more household money and streamlined rent calculations.

To accomplish the long-term vision, PMHA will:

- 1. Streamline the delivery of housing through improvements in efficiency and effectiveness within its own resources offered by the Federal Government.**

Progress and Accomplishments:

As mentioned, PMHA implemented a paperless online application process during 2016. This process allows access to the application without having to come to the PMHA office. Additionally, in 2018, PMHA added programmatic forms online to its website, for program participants to access remotely, and these forms are regularly updated. PMHA is in the process of going paperless, with the Finance Department and Human Resources being 100% electronic. The Maintenance Department has implemented electronic inventory control, and in 2020 the Applications Department began using the Yardi Compliance Module to complete all notifications and processing of Section 8 and Public Housing applications. In 2020, PMHA began utilizing the Yardi portals to determine all of its functionality and capabilities for Public Housing and Section 8. PMHA is currently working on electronic processes for Annual and Interim recertifications. These will be fully electronic by July 2021.

- 2. Collaborate with community partners to leverage resources and strengths to improve housing and living conditions within Portage County.**

Progress and Accomplishments:

Since 2007, PMHA has received funds from the City of Kent for the implementation of the “Good Neighbor Program” for Kent residents residing in PMHA-owned housing units. The program offers on-site workshops conducted by a Kent City Police Officer and a Kent City Firefighter, including how to report suspected or real criminal incidents, plus fire prevention and safety. Additionally, Public Housing and Resident Services staff members provide tips to ensure that residents pass housekeeping inspections. In 2020, the funds allowed for a community garden, COVID-19 related personal protective equipment and disinfecting supplies, household cleaning supplies, school supplies for children, reusable tote bags, flashlights, and PMHA-logoed keychains containing a screwdriver set. In 2020, there were only two (2) evictions among Kent public housing residents, with one (1) being for drug-related criminal activity and the other being for other criminal activity.

Through an ongoing partnership with Portage Area Regional Transportation Authority, in 2020 Public Housing households continued to receive a reduced rate for bus passes, which assists with residents’ self-sufficiency efforts.

Additionally, in 2020, PMHA’s full-time Social Services Coordinator assisted residents with short-term case management and referrals. The Social Services Coordinator participates in four (4) partner collaborative groups, and partners with twenty-eight (28) area programs and agencies that serve to meet resident needs.

3. Develop a rent system that:

- Is easier to administer and understand
- Remains affordable to low-income households
- Provides incentive to work
- Removes systemic incentives for people to remain unemployed.

Progress and Accomplishments:

In 2015 PMHA implemented MTW Activity number HCV-9 for Section 8, and in 2018 PMHA implemented MTW Activity PH-14 for Public Housing, as a measure for agency cost savings, staff-time savings, and to decrease the error rate of task execution. Under HCV-9 and PH-14, PMHA calculates total tenant payments and bases rental assistance for all households on a calculation that is 29.6% of gross monthly income and eliminates deductions and allowances for being elderly or disabled, for dependents, and for unreimbursed medical and childcare expenses. The only exception to the 29.6% of monthly gross income is a continuation of a \$50 minimum rent for households who otherwise pay less than \$50 per month.

In 2020, PMHA monitored its rent system to ensure that its efficiency is maximized.

SECTION II: GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION

A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION

i. Actual New Project Based Vouchers

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

| PROPERTY NAME | NUMBER OF VOUCHERS NEWLY PROJECT-BASED | | STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR** | RAD? | DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT |
|---------------|--|--------|------------------------------|------|------------------------|
| | Planned* | Actual | | | |
| N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | 0 |
|---|---|

Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based

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

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

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

There were no planned or actual vouchers newly project-based during 2020.

ii. Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers

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

| PROPERTY NAME | NUMBER OF PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS | | STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR** | RAD? | DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|------|--|
| | Planned* | Actual | | | |
| Maple Grove III | 6 | 6 | Leased | No | One 2-BR unit, One 3-BR unit, & Four 4-BR units for families |
| Coleman Professional Services #1 | 9 | 9 | Leased | No | Nine 1-BR units for disabled individuals |
| Coleman Professional Services #2 | 5 | 5 | Leased | No | Five 1-BR units for disabled individuals |
| Family & Community Services #1 | 17 | 17 | Leased | No | Sixteen 2-BR units & One 3-BR unit for families |
| Family & Community Services #2 | 10 | 10 | Leased | No | Two 1-BR units & Eight 2-BR units for families |
| Family & Community Services #3 | 4 | 4 | Leased | No | Four 2-BR units for families |

| | | | | | |
|---|----|----|--------|----|---|
| Portage Housing III | 3 | 3 | Leased | No | Two 3-BR units & One 4-BR unit for families |
| Prospect House | 26 | 26 | Leased | No | Twenty-six 1-BR units for elderly |
| Family & Community Services #6 | 2 | 2 | Leased | No | Two 1-BR units for individuals |
| Family & Community Services #5 | 2 | 2 | Leased | No | One 2-BR unit & One 3-BR unit for families |
| Family & Community Services #4 | 4 | 4 | Leased | No | One studio unit & Three 1-BR units for individuals |
| Coleman Professional Services #3 | 6 | 6 | Leased | No | Four 1-BR units & Two 2-BR units for persons with disabilities |
| Streetsboro Family Homes | 27 | 27 | Leased | No | Twenty-three 3-BR units & Four 2-BR units for families |
| Harvest Rose Stage 1 | 17 | 17 | Leased | No | Seventeen 2-BR units for elderly |
| Harvest Rose Stage 2 | 2 | 2 | Leased | No | Two 2-BR units for elderly |
| Coleman Professional Services #4 | 10 | 10 | Leased | No | Seven 1-BR units, Two 2-BR units, & One 3-BR unit for persons with disabilities |
| Coleman Professional Services #5 | 10 | 10 | Leased | No | Ten 1-BR units for individuals with disabilities |
| Family & Community Services #7 | 4 | 4 | Leased | No | Four 1-BR units for individuals with disabilities |
| Harvest Rose #4 | 2 | 2 | Leased | No | Two 2-BR units for elderly |
| Coleman Professional Services #6 | 4 | 4 | Leased | No | Two studio units & Two 1-BR units for disabled individuals |
| Family & Community Services PARC | 23 | 23 | Leased | No | Twenty-two SRO units for individuals with addiction-related disabilities |
| Family & Community Services Eagle | 8 | 8 | Leased | No | Eight 1-BR units for individuals with addiction-related disabilities |
| Family & Community Services #12 | 6 | 6 | Leased | No | Six studio units for individuals with addiction-related disabilities |
| Family & Community Services Kentway | 21 | 21 | Leased | No | Fifteen studio units & Six 1-BR units for elderly |
| Family & Community Services Kentway II | 7 | 7 | Leased | No | One studio unit & Six 1-BR units for elderly |
| Family & Community Services Kentway III | 3 | 3 | Leased | No | Two 1-BR units & One 2-BR unit for elderly |
| Coleman Professional Services #7 | 11 | 11 | Leased | No | Eleven 1-BR units for disabled individuals |
| Residential Resources for the Developmentally Challenged (Brady Lake) | 8 | 8 | Leased | No | Eight SRO units for individuals with disabilities |
| Prospect House #3 | 8 | 8 | Leased | No | Eight 1-BR units for the elderly |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----|----|--------|----|---|
| The Wilds at Harvest Rose | 23 | 23 | Leased | No | Five 1-BR units & Eighteen 2-BR units for elderly |
| Coleman Professional Services #7 | 4 | 4 | Leased | No | Three 1-BR units & One 2-BR unit for disabled individuals |
| Family & Community Services #14 | 1 | 1 | Leased | No | One 2-BR unit for elderly |
| Family & Community Services #15 | 4 | 4 | Leased | No | Four 2-BR units for disabled families |

| | |
|-----|-----|
| 297 | 297 |
|-----|-----|

Planned/Actual Total Existing Project-Based Vouchers

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

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

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

There were no differences in planned versus actual existing number of vouchers to be project-based. The figure of 291, as listed in the 2020 MTW Annual Plan, was inaccurate due to a staff spreadsheet tracking error in charting the unit totals in each contract.

iii. Actual Other Changes to MTW Housing Stock in the Plan Year

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

| ACTUAL OTHER CHANGES TO MTW HOUSING STOCK IN THE PLAN YEAR |
|--|
| There were no actual other changes to PMHA’s MTW housing stock in the Plan year. As per the 2020 MTW Annual Plan, PMHA planned to explore the potential purchase of 2 properties to replace the Willow Street units acquired previously by Kent State University. During 2020 and presently, PMHA is still actively looking to purchase replacement property. Due to a seller’s market in PMHA’s area of jurisdiction, locating a property has been challenging. |

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

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

| GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALL ACTUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES DURING THE PLAN YEAR |
|---|
| <p>2020 CFP work for 2020 for OH31000001:</p> <p>Community Estates Exterior Siding Rehab: \$153, 942.90 (Finished Exterior work from Plan Year 2019 in 2019 MTW 5-Year Plan)</p> <p>Central Air Community Estates: \$196, 662.44 (Moved up from 2023 Plan Year in 2020 MTW 5-Year Plan)</p> <p>Interior Closet Doors Harvest Woods: \$234, 432.00</p> <p>Basement Waterproofing: \$29,600.00 (Moved up from 2023 Plan Year in 2020 MTW 5-Year Plan)</p> |

Overview of Other Properties Owned and/or Managed by Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority at 2020 Fiscal Year End:

Residential Properties:

Portage Landings, 170 and 221 Spaulding Drive, Kent: These properties are available to market renters and Section 8 voucher holders.

616, 614 and 614 ½ Virginia Avenue, Kent: These properties were sold to Family & Community Services, Inc., on June 30, 2020. PMHA sold these properties because, historically, 616 had been difficult to lease and each of these properties were costly to maintain and required costly rehabilitation work.

Commercial Properties:

219 and 223 West Main Street, Ravenna: The property located at 219 is currently available for lease. Three (3) lessees rent all the office spaces in the property located at 223. One lessee is a for-profit attorney. The second lessee utilizes office space for a program of Family & Community Services, Inc. The third lessee is Stepping Stone Community Services, which offers mental health services. None of the lessees are affiliated with PMHA except through the lease of office space.

6590 Cleveland Road, Ravenna: This property is known as the Opportunity Resource Center, which is used by Maplewood Career Center for adult education and financial literacy activities.

PMHA Administration Building, 2832 State Route 59, Ravenna: This property is the home for PMHA office and maintenance employees.

B. LEASING INFORMATION

i. Actual Number of Households Served

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

| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED THROUGH: | NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED* | | NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED** | |
|--|--|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | Planned^^ | Actual | Planned^^ | Actual |
| MTW Public Housing Units Leased | 3540 | 3444 | 295 | 287 |
| MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized | 17,592 | 18,696 | 1466 | 1558 |
| Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Planned/Actual Totals | 21,132 | 22,140 | 1761 | 1845 |

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

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

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

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

In 2018, PMHA reopened the Section 8 waiting list and strove to become fully leased under MTW Section 8. The waiting list, which, prior to reopening, had become stale with out-of-town applicants who had no intention of relocating to Portage County, was rejuvenated once reopened, with many local individuals and families seeking in-county housing assistance. This trend continued in 2019 and 2020. This coupled with the COVID-19 pandemic starting in 2020, resulted in a higher Section 8 leasing rate.

| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Property-Based | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Homeownership | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Planned/Actual Totals | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

| HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL SERVICES ONLY | AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS PER MONTH | TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE PLAN YEAR |
|---|--|---|
| PMHA does not provide local, non-traditional services | 0 | 0 |

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

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

| HOUSING PROGRAM | DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL LEASING ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS |
|----------------------------|--|
| MTW Public Housing | No leasing issues |
| MTW Housing Choice Voucher | No leasing issues |
| Local, Non-Traditional | Not applicable |

C. WAITING LIST INFORMATION

i. **Actual Waiting List Information**

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

| WAITING LIST NAME | DESCRIPTION | NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ON WAITING LIST | WAITING LIST OPEN, PARTIALLY OPEN OR CLOSED | WAS THE WAITING LIST OPENED DURING THE PLAN YEAR |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Section 8 MTW Waiting List | Community-wide voucher waiting list for Section 8 MTW program and Mainstream programs | 1477 | Open | No, it was opened prior to the plan year |
| Public Housing MTW Waiting List | Community-wide waiting list for Public Housing units | 901 | Open | No, it was opened prior to the plan year |

| | | | | |
|---|---|----|------|-----|
| Scattered Site Public Housing Transfer Request Waiting List | Current Public Housing residents who may qualify for PMHA's MTW scattered site transfer activity (Activity PH-15) | 40 | Open | Yes |
|---|---|----|------|-----|

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:

Applicants may apply for either or both MTW waiting lists. Applicants may appear on both waiting lists simultaneously.

ii. Actual Changes to Waiting List in the Plan Year

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

| WAITING LIST NAME | DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL CHANGES TO WAITING LIST |
|---|--|
| Scattered Site Public Housing Transfer Request Waiting List | PMHA opened this waiting list in connection with Activity PH-15. |
| | |

D. INFORMATION ON STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND REQUIREMENTS

i. 75% of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income

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

| INCOME LEVEL | NUMBER OF LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL HOUSEHOLDS ADMITTED IN THE PLAN YEAR |
|---|---|
| 80%-50% Area Median Income | 0 |
| 49%-30% Area Median Income | 0 |
| Below 30% Area Median Income | 0 |
| Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted | 0 |

ii. Maintain Comparable Mix

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

| BASELINE MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (upon entry to MTW) | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| FAMILY SIZE | OCCUPIED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS | UTILIZED HCVs | NON-MTW ADJUSTMENTS* | BASELINE MIX NUMBER | BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE |
| 1 Person | 90 | 168 | 0 | 258 | 23% |
| 2 Person | 69 | 260 | 0 | 329 | 29% |
| 3 Person | 63 | 195 | 0 | 258 | 23% |
| 4 Person | 44 | 121 | 0 | 165 | 15% |
| 5 Person | 18 | 59 | 0 | 77 | 7% |
| 6+ Person | 13 | 22 | 0 | 35 | 3% |
| TOTAL | 297 | 825 | 0 | 1122 | 100% |

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

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

There were no Non-MTW Adjustments given above.

| 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 | 23% | 806 | 44% | 21% |
| 2 Person | 29% | 371 | 20% | 9% |
| 3 Person | 23% | 317 | 17% | 6% |
| 4 Person | 15% | 211 | 11% | 4% |
| 5 Person | 7% | 85 | 5% | 2% |
| 6+ Person | 3% | 55 | 3% | 0% |
| TOTAL | 100% | 1793 | 100% | 42% |

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

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

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

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

In December 2015, PMHA ended its preferences for admission, with the exception being Veteran status. The current Mix of Family Sizes Served is based on a first-come, first-served basis: date/time selection rather than multiple preferences. As a result, more 1-person households are being served. Additionally, over the past several years, Portage County has seen an increase in housing units and housing choices for older adults and persons with disabilities. Thus, it has become easier for these populations to locate and select housing units in-county. This has resulted a significant increase in housing 1-member households in the past 4 years, thereby accounting for PMHA’s mix of family sizes served to reflect a significant increase in 1-person families and smaller households since the original baseline. Please note, the percentage changes between Plan Years over the past few years has remained consistent: less than 5% variance in any family size categories from 2016 through present, with the exception of 1-person households.

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

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

| MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER | NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY* | MTW PHA LOCAL DEFINITION OF SELF SUFFICIENCY |
|--|--|--|
| PH-4 (Change in Employment Income) & PH-14 (Elimination of Deductions in TTP Calculations) | 123 | Public Housing households with wage income |
| HCV-9 (Elimination of Deductions in TTP Calculations) | 508 | Section 8 (HCV) households with wage income |
| Section 8 Family Self-Sufficiency Program | 45 | Section 8 FSS participation |
| Homeownership Program | 35 | Homeownership Program participants |
| | 36 | <i>(Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities)</i> |
| | 675 | Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency |

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

SECTION III: PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES

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

SECTION IV: APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES

A. Implemented Activities

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM

HCV-1 **Restrict portability moves out of Portage County for the Housing Choice Voucher Program**

Plan Year Approved: 2009

Implemented: 2010

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA will approve portability only to housing authorities who absorb the incoming family or administer Fair Market Rents at or below the amounts applicable to Portage County. This restriction does not apply to portability moves from Portage County that are justified under laws and regulations applicable to the federal Violence Against Women Act and support reasonable accommodations for disability.

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$300 per household | \$150 per household | \$0 per household | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 6 hours per household | 2 hours per household | 0 hours per household | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: This activity is a part of the “port-out” process for Housing Choice Voucher participants who are seeking to move to communities where payment standards exceed those of

PMHA, as a means of reducing impact on budget resources caused by portability moves outside of Ohio to high-rent communities where the receiving Housing Authority may not absorb the incoming participant. In 2020, all participating households either: (1) ported to housing authorities who absorb the incoming families or administer Fair Market Rents at or below the amounts applicable to Portage County, or (2) ported to a higher billing housing authority under reasonable accommodations for disability.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: None. This MTW activity is on scheduled and benchmarks have traditionally been met or exceeded.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

HCV-2 MTW Homeownership Voucher Program

Plan Year Approved: 1999

Implemented: 2000

Amended: 2010

Description: PMHA identifies families with homeownership as one of their goals, screens the family for eligibility, provides the family with referrals to organizations that assist in overcoming barriers to homeownership, and provides a homeownership assistance payment to participants who purchase a home under the program. PMHA will continue to expand the MTW homeownership program on an ongoing basis.

In 2010, this activity was amended to include households who are presently homeowners and under foreclosure to receive assistance with resolving issues with bank/mortgage companies seeking foreclosure.

| HC#6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase) | Number of households that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity. This number may be zero. | Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0 households per year | 2 households per year | 2 households in 2020 | Benchmark met |

| HC#7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase) | Households receiving foreclosure prevention services prior to implementation of the activity. This number may be zero. | Expected number of households receiving foreclosure prevention services after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households receiving foreclosure prevention services after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0 households per year | 1 household per year | 0 households in 2020 | Benchmark unmet |

Impact/Update: The PMHA Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program has been assisting, at minimum, 20 households per year since its implementation. Over the course of 19 years, a total of 70 households achieved homeownership. It should be noted that, during 2020, there were no requests for foreclosure prevention services.

In reviewing the program and current homeownership requirements established by HUD, the PMHA homeownership program probably does not need MTW authorization to operate. However, the slight provisions under MTW provide preferences to maintain the program for Public Housing residents who wish to become homeowners. Public Housing residents with higher incomes are invited to participate in the homeownership program. If enrolled in the program, assistance is provided to obtain homeownership. Currently, 6 Public Housing residents are pursuing homeownership through the PMHA Homeownership program. Services received include first time homeownership education classes and credit repair services, which are the first steps to the achievement of homeownership.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: None. This MTW activity is on schedule and benchmarks have been met or exceeded over the course of 19 years. No requests for foreclosure prevention services were received in 2020.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

HCV-3 Initial rent burden cap from 50% to 70% of adjusted monthly income

Plan Year Approved: 1999

Implemented: 2000

Amended: 2014, 2017

Description: PMHA offers HCV participants to utilize an initial rent burden of 50% of household monthly income as an effort to maximize housing choice and maintain a level of affordability.

During 2014, PMHA implemented an increased Initial Rent Burden Cap of 70% of household monthly income in an effort to assist in increasing housing choices for families who desire to use a greater share of income for housing.

During 2017, PMHA planned to re-implement the original MTW initial rent burden cap of 50% of household monthly income; however, due to programmatic delays, this feature was not re-implemented until January 1, 2018. The return to the initial 50% rent burden cap is due to the negative impact on Section 8 participants. Difficulties with paying higher rent resulted in hardship and/or loss of housing for participants.

| HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of new housing units made available to households at or below 80% AMI as a result of this activity | Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of new housing units made available to households at or below 80% AMI as a result of this activity | Actual number of new housing units made available to households at or below 80% AMI as a result of this activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 15 new housing units | 32 new housing units | Benchmark met |

| HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase) | Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 15 households | 32 (19%) of 172 households | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: This activity allowed for greater housing choice. Households participating were willing to adjust their family expenditures to reflect desires for housing over other wants and needs.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: The MTW activity is on schedule, and baselines and benchmarks have been exceeded. However, due to the negative impact on Section 8 participants, as previously described, PMHA returned to the initial 50% rent burden cap in 2018.

Actual significant changes: Not applicable

Actual non-significant changes: Not applicable

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: No change was made

HCV-4 Project-Based Voucher Program to assist non-profits and developers to increase housing choices for low-income households

Plan Year Approved: 1999

Implemented: 2002

Amended: 2009, 2019 (additional authorizations granted)

Description: PMHA operates a project-based voucher program under a different set of rules and regulations than those provided for under the standard HUD rules for project-based vouchers. PMHA uses several waivers from the original and current HCV guidelines to assist developers to build or rehabilitate properties for the use of homeless, disabled, or other families in need of supportive services.

In 2009, PMHA was granted additional authorizations for the project-based voucher program. PMHA has continued to offer project-based Section 8 assistance to nonprofit organizations and developers to build or rehabilitate properties, in order to increase the supply of rental units available to assist special needs populations in obtaining suitable housing.

In 2019, PMHA was granted authorization to allow for changes to be made to the terms of the project-based Agreements to enter into Housing Assistance Payments (AHAP) contracts for newly constructed or rehabilitated housing, after the AHAPs have already been signed, contingent upon agreement by the project owner and PMHA.

| 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 (homeless, disabled or others in need of social services) at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0 | 270 | 297 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: MTW authorizations and waivers have allowed this locally designed program to remain responsive to potential new projects by local housing developers and foster additional purchase and rehab of existing real estate by those entities.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: Benchmark was exceeded, and this MTW activity is on schedule.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

HCV-5 Alternative Housing Quality Standards Compliance

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

HCV-6 **Time Limits for Housing Choice Voucher Participants**

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

HCV-7 **Capped Utility Reimbursement Checks**

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

HCV-8 **Transitional Housing Vouchers**

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

HCV-9 **Elimination of Deductions in Total Tenant Payment Calculations**

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: 2015

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA calculates total tenant payments and bases Housing Choice Voucher assistance for all households on a calculation that is 29.6% of gross monthly income and eliminates deductions and allowances for being elderly or disabled, for dependents, and for unreimbursed medical and childcare expenses. The only exception to the 30% of monthly gross income is a continuation of a \$50 minimum rent for households who would otherwise pay less than \$50 per month.

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$527 average subsidy per unit per month | \$509 average subsidy per unit per month | \$588 average subsidy per unit per month | Benchmark unmet |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 5 hours or 300 minutes per household | 60 minutes per household | 60 minutes per household | Benchmark met |

| CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of activity (percentage) | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 90% | 2% error rate | 13% error rate (based on 5 months of QC reviews, mainly of newly hired staff) | Benchmark unmet |

| CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rent revenue in dollars | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity | Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | Not applicable to HCV program |

| SS#1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$9,500 | \$9,800 | \$18,929 | Benchmark met |

| SS#2: Increase in Household Savings | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$140 | \$250 | \$1773 | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Full-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 319 | 350 | 299 | Benchmark unmet |
| Employed Full-time | Percentage of total work-able households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of total work-able households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-able households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 22% | 25% | 37% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Part-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 212 | 265 | 189 | Benchmark unmet |
| Employed Part-time | Percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 15% | 19% | 24% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in an Educational Program | Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |
| Enrolled in an Educational Program | Percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in a Job Training Program | Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training program |
| Enrolled in a job Training Program | Percentage of total work-able households enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of total work-able households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-able households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Unemployed | Heads(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 15 | 12 | 119 | Benchmark unmet |
| Unemployed | Percentage of total work-able households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of total work-able households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-able households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 20% | 15% | 15% | Benchmark met |

| SS#4: Households Removed from TANF | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease) | Households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 30 | 20 | 46 | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase) | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 357 | 552 | Benchmark met |

| SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase) | Households transitioning to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected households transitioning to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households transitioning to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 531 | 600 | 508 | Benchmark unmet |

Impact/Update: The elimination of deductions streamlines the rent calculation process by reducing the need for verifications and lessening the potential for errors.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: Some baselines and benchmarks, such as average monthly Section 8 subsidy per unit, are based on 2014-15 analysis of costs, and it is expected that there will be higher overall rental costs and thus higher overall subsidies over the course of time as housing costs in general increase.

Another factor impacting this feature is the revision to the waitlist which removed a work priority for non-elderly/disabled households. As a result, applicants are housed on a first come/first serve basis. This practice has resulted in housing fewer work-able households, thus not meeting benchmarks for employment status. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic that began in 2020, significantly more households experienced unemployment as compared to the baseline and benchmark, as well as compared to previous years' outcomes.

Average error rate remains above 2% due to multiple staffing changes which resulted in several new staff members being hired for recertification processing. This is expected to improve with ongoing departmental support and staff development training.

Baseline, benchmarks, etc. will be reviewed and revised, if needed, during 2021. Overall, this MTW activity is performing as expected given the circumstances described in the prior three (3) paragraphs and is on schedule.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

HCV-10 Biennial Reviews for Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households:

Refer to Section C. – Activities on Hold.

HCV-11 Permit Households at \$0 HAP to Self-Certify Income

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: 2014

Amended: N/A

Description: This activity permits families who are at \$0 HAP to self-certify their income rather than be subjected to a verification process that should have no effect on housing assistance levels, thus reducing costs and staff time while achieving greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$4200 | \$525 | \$525 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 50 hours per year | 6.25 hours per year | 6.25 hours per year | Benchmark met |

| CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 1% estimated | 0% | 0% | Benchmark met |

| CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rent revenue in dollars | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity | Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: This activity eliminates the income verification process for this population without negative impact on overall program operations. The HCV program does not impact agency rental revenues. Thus, this activity is not expected to alter agency rental revenue. Note: HCV-13, implemented 2014, extended the \$0 HAP Period to 12 months (previously the period was 6 months).

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: The MTW activity is on schedule. Benchmarks were met.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

HCV-12 **Use Lesser of Actual Unit Size or Unit Size of Voucher Issued for Utility Allowances**

Refer to Section D. - Closed-Out Activities

HCV-13 **Extend the \$0 HAP Period to 12 Months**

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: 2014

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA extends the period of time that a \$0 HAP family may be considered a Housing Choice Voucher participant household from 6 months to up to 12 months.

The impact of this activity asserts that some families either are reluctant to attain \$0 HAP status or when notified that they are at \$0 HAP, they take measures that reduce their income so as to begin receiving HAP assistance again. By increasing the period allowed for \$0 HAP, PMHA expects to see more families achieve \$0 HAP and to exit the program at \$0 HAP rather than to return to HAP payment status. For those who achieve \$0 HAP status through employment, the extended period allows a safety net to the household as they adjust to paying market rents without assistance and stabilize themselves in their new employment situation.

| SS#1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark Note: This activity is not expected to affect household income |
| | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$32,303 average for all \$0-HAP households, and \$38,454 average for work able \$0-HAP households only | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Full-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 12 | 11 | 21 | Benchmark met |
| Employed Full-time | Percentage of work-able households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of work-able households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-abled households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 100% | 92% | 100% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Part-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 1 | 1 | 0 | Benchmark unmet |
| Employed Part-time | Percentage of work-able households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of work-able households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-abled households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 8% | 8% | 0% | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in an Educational Program | Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |
| Enrolled in an Educational Program | Percentage of work-able households Enrolled in an Educational Program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of work-able households Enrolled in an Educational Program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-abled households Enrolled in an Educational Program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in a Job Training Program | Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training programs |
| Enrolled in a Job Training Program | Percentage of work-able households Enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected percentage of work-able households Enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-abled households Enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training programs |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Unemployed | Heads(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | Benchmark met |
| Unemployed | Heads(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0% | 0% | 0% | Benchmark met |

| SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease) | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 5 | 2 | 0 | Benchmark met |

| SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease) | Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | Benchmark met Note: Households participating do not receive subsidy. |

| SS#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) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | Benchmark met |

| SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase) | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| 12 | 12 | 12 | 25 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: \$0 HAP households remain on the program an additional 6 months, for a total of 12 months. This additional time provides a safety net to continue working and build confidence in the ability to remain employed and maintain housing without subsidy. This feature has also

seen households without employment income become \$0 HAP due to a combination of other income sources within each household.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: The MTW activity is on schedule. It is important to note that some \$0 HAP households have more than one income source, thus wage income alone is not always the reason a household becomes \$0 HAP. Many households have income combinations that include wages, child support, pensions, and/or Social Security income for one or more household member. It is beneficial to consider total household income, due to multiple-income source households, when evaluating effectiveness of this policy.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

HCV-14 **Permit Decreases in Payment Standards at Next Scheduled Verification**

Refer to Section B. - Not Yet Implemented Activities

HCV-15 **Change the Allocation of Interest Earned for the Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency Program**

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: 2015

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA will no longer apply escrow credits for interest earned on funds deposited for the Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency Program. These funds will be made available for ongoing HAP needs for the Housing Choice Voucher Program as a whole. PMHA expects that the impact of this activity will provide minimal additional revenue (\$200) to the Housing Choice Voucher funds. Staff savings of approximately 12 hours per year will result.

| CE#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 prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$700 Annually | \$0 | \$0 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete 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) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 12 Annually | 0 | 0 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: This activity eliminates interest on HCV FSS escrow credits, with minimal negative impact on FSS participants, while saving staff time and providing minimal agency cost savings.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: The MTW activity is on schedule and outcomes are as expected.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

HCV-16 Incentive for New Landlords

Plan Year Approved: 2019

Implemented: 2019

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA provides new landlords a one-time additional incentive Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) of \$200.00 upon the execution of a HAP contract for a tenant-based HCV participant. A new landlord is defined as a landlord who has not rented to a voucher holder within the past two (2) years. The landlord is not eligible for the \$200.00 incentive HAP payment if the contract is executed for a transfer of units with the same landlord, or if the contract is executed due to a lease renewal or change. Additionally, properties owned or managed by PMHA or any other PHA would be ineligible from the incentive HAP payment.

Because PMHA operates in a rental market with an ongoing stigma related to HCV participants, the purpose of this activity is to encourage new landlords to open their properties to voucher holders.

| HCV#5: Increase in Resident Mobility | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase) | Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to the implementation of this activity (number) | Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 15 | 1 | Benchmark unmet |
| Improve voucher success rate | Average voucher success rate prior to implementation of activity (percentage) | Expected average voucher success rate prior to implementation of activity (percentage) | Actual average voucher success rate after implementation of activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 68% | 73% | 80% | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: This activity encourages landlords who are on the fence about renting to an HCV participant versus a market rate renter, to “take a chance” on renting to the HCV participant, without the incentive being cost-detrimental to PMHA. While only one (1) household was able to improve their living situation through this activity, overall, the voucher success rate continued to improve. Benchmarks will be reviewed in 2021.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: PMHA conducted quarterly new landlord orientation sessions during 2020, with very minimal landlord attendance. The format of the orientations switched from in-person to virtual due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It was challenging to recruit attendees to participate in the virtual format. Those in attendance indicated that the \$200 one-time payment was an incentive to them and that a damage claim policy would also be an incentive to them. PMHA has scheduled quarterly virtual new landlord orientation

sessions for 2021, with improved marketing efforts, in order to provide opportunities to survey and research new landlord interest and the types of incentives that will attract and retain new landlords while expanding HCV participants' housing choice. This MTW activity is not yet on schedule, but improved outcomes are as expected in 2021.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM

PH-1 Escalating Minimum Rent

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

PH-2 Maximum Rent

Plan Year Approved: 2009

Implemented: 2009

Amended: N/A

Description: Maximum Rent allows for rents set at less than 30% of adjusted income. Maximum rents are \$465 per month for 1- and 2-bedroom units, and \$490 per month for 3- and 4-bedroom units, regardless of income. Income re-verifications are biennially for these households. Households have no time limit for ceiling rents.

| SS#1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$25,000 | \$28,695 | Benchmark met |

| SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease) | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 22 | 10 | 10 | Benchmark met |

| SS#7: Increase in Agency Rent 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) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$33,899 per month | \$37,899 per month | \$61,898 per month | Benchmark met |

| SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase) | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 27 | 123 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: The Maximum Rent feature offers rent relief to households who attain better employment and/or increase their income, capping their rents at levels designed to encourage long-term residents, resident asset accumulation, and provide greater stability to PMHA Public Housing developments.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: Historically, benchmarks have been achieved, and this MTW activity is considered to be on schedule.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

PH-3 Elderly and Disabled Rent Re-certifications Biennially

Refer to Section D. – Closed Out Activities

PH-4 Change in Employment Income

Plan Year Approved: 2008

Implemented: 2012

Amended: N/A

Description: Change in employment income resulting in an increase in annual income of any amount is not processed until the next annual re-certification. However, residents are expected to report changes.

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | Number of residents with income increases or decreases of \$1,000 or less in annual income 41 residents x 3 hours x \$18.50 (hourly rate)= \$2276 | 53 residents x 1 hour x \$18.00 (2019 hourly rate)= \$954 | 43 residents x 1 hour x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$771 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 41 residents x 3 hours= 123 hours | 53 residents x 1 hour= 53 hours | 43 residents x 1 hour= 43 hours | Benchmark met |

| CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 3% | 0% | 0% | Benchmark met |

| CE#5: Increase in Agency Rent Revenue | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcomes | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rent revenue in dollars (increase) | Rent revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual rent revenue after implementation of the activity (dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$36,865 monthly rent (December) | \$35,000 monthly rent (December) | \$46,606 monthly rent (December) | Benchmark met |

| SS#1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$14,683 | \$20,000 | \$23,754 | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Full-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 72 | 72 | 80 Employed Full-Time | Benchmark met |
| Employed Full-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 60% | 60% | 65% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Part-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 48 | 48 | 43 Employed Part-Time | Benchmark unmet |
| Employed Part-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| Percentage | 40% | 40% | 35% | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in an Education Program | Head(s) Households of Enrolled in an Education Program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | Information is not available and is not related to current MTW activities | PH does not document enrollment in an education program |
| Enrolled in an Education Program | Head(s) Households of Enrolled in an Education Program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | Information is not available and is not related to current MTW activities | PH does not document enrollment in an education program |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in a Job Training Program | Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PH does not document enrollment in a job training program |
| Enrolled in a Job Training Program | Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | PH does not document enrollment in a job training program |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Unemployed | Head(s) of Households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 103 | 97 | 63 | Benchmark met |
| Unemployed | Head(s) of Households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 47% | 40% | 22% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Other | Head(s) Households in other category prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | Benchmark met |
| Other | Head(s) Households in other category prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0% | 0% | 0% | Benchmark met |

| SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease) | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 11 | 9 | 10 | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase) | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 110 | 120 | 123 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: Not processing earned income increases until the next annual re-certification results in the savings of staff time spent on securing and processing verifications. This activity also eliminates time and costs associated with resident/staff meetings. In short, this activity reduces typical time spent on such re-certifications and has no negative impact on monthly rent revenues.

It should be noted that family households move to and from Public Housing throughout the year. Typically, families leaving Public Housing are higher-income households with more earned income than families moving into Public Housing. Thus, the increase in full-time and part-time employment appears to be minimal.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: Historically, baselines and benchmarks have been met or close to being met, and the activity is on schedule.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

PH-5 Rent Adjustment for Income Decreases

Plan Year Approved: 2009
 Implemented: 2009
 Amended: N/A

Description: Decreases in income resulting in less than \$1,000, or lasting less than 30 days, will not be processed until the next annual re-certification.

This rent reform activity is seldom used. However, whenever a household experiences an income decrease less than \$1,000, the time to process the decrease is costly to the PMHA and has minimal impact on the household when the income decrease lasts less than 30 days.

On many occasions, households locate new employment or other sources of income within 30 days. Thus, the PMHA views this activity as being effective as a cost-savings feature. This activity does not give incentives to households to achieve self-sufficiency.

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 3 hours x \$18.00 (current hourly rate) per 13 recertification= \$702 | 2 residents x 0 hours x \$18.00 (current hourly rate)= \$0 | 5 residents x 0 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$0 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 3 hours per re-certification x 13 residents= 39 hours | 0 hours | 0 hours | Benchmark met |

| CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 3% | 0% | 0% | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: The rent process was simplified and is effective as an agency cost-savings feature.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There were no hardship requests since the implementation of this activity.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: PMHA feels that this activity is beneficial to ward off having to process rent changes lasting less than 30 days or income changes less than \$1,000. This MTW activity is on schedule.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

PH-6 Overall Percentage of Income Amounts for Rent Calculations

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

PH-7 Eliminate Allowance for Non-Reimbursed Childcare Expenses and Replace with 4% Overall percentage of earned income

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

PH-8 Deduction for Elderly or Disabled Adults

Refer to Section D. – Closed Out Activities

PH-9 Providing Transitional Housing

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities

PH-10 PMHA to Operate Two Group Homes as Public Housing

Plan Year Approved: 2009
Implemented: 2009
Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA operates two group homes as Public Housing.

1. **Walnut House**, located in the city of Ravenna, houses persons with severe mental illnesses in partnership with Coleman Professional Services. Coleman Professional Services provides on-site services to resident, including mental health services, daily living skills, and transportation. This property has 13 units of housing.

2. **Washington Group Home**, located in Ravenna Township, has a capacity for 8 individuals to reside in a supportive, group home environment. PMHA has a partnership with Family and Community Services, Inc. to lease the building for the purposes of providing housing and services to men who are addressing alcohol and drug addiction issues. Family and Community Services, Inc. provides residents with comprehensive services to facilitate a successful transition back into community living. The program has flourished and is well-received in the community.

This project was finalized during the first half of 2013. Residents are not entered in PIC due to the nature of the specific population served. Family and Community Services, Inc. screens and selects eligible candidates for this program known as ROOT. Thus, Standard HUD Metrics do not apply.

Impact/Update: This MTW activity remains on schedule.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: None. This MTW activity is on schedule.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

PH-11 **Deduction for Absent Child**

Refer to Section D. - Closed out Activities.

PH-12 **Cap on Dependent Child Deduction**

Refer to Section D. - Closed out Activities.

PH-13 **Residents Paying Ceiling Rents May Self-Certify Income**

Plan Year Approved: 2015

Implemented: 2016

Amended: N/A

Description: Residents paying ceiling rents are allowed to self-certify their income for the purposes of the re-verification process. Such families pay the same rental amount regardless of

income increases. This activity results in reducing costs by saving staff time devoted to income verification and also achieves greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 36 resident recertifications x 3 hours x \$18.50 (hourly rate) = \$1998 | 36 resident recertifications x 0 hours x \$18.00 (current hourly rate) = \$0 | 2 resident recertifications x 0 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate) = \$0 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 3 hours per re-certification | 0 hours | 0 hours | Benchmark met |

| CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 3% | 0% | 0% | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: The objective of this activity is to reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures. The impact of this activity is that revenue will increase. It should be noted that PMHA adopted a waiver authorized under Notice PIH 2020-33 that allows all residents to self-certify income; therefore, the outcome under CE#1 reflects utilization of this MTW feature prior to the waiver adoption on April 10, 2020.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There is no recognition of hardship for this policy.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: This MTW activity is on schedule and continues to meet baselines and benchmarks.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

PH-14 Elimination of Deductions in Total Tenant Payment Calculations

Plan Year Approved: 2018

Implemented: 2018

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA calculates total tenant payments and bases Public Housing assistance for all households on a calculation that is 29.6% of gross monthly income and eliminates deductions and allowances for being elderly or disabled, for dependents, and for unreimbursed medical and childcare expenses. The only exception to the 30% of monthly gross income is a continuation of a \$50 minimum rent for households who otherwise pay less than \$50 per month. This activity reduces the HAP expense.

| CE#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 prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 295 households x 3 hrs. x \$18.50 = \$16,373 per year | 295 households x 1 hr. x \$18.50 = \$5458 per year | 287 households x 1 hr. x \$17.93 = \$5146 per year | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 3 hours or 295 households = 885 hours annually | 1 hour per 295 households = 295 hours annually | 1 hour per 287 households = 287 hours annually | Benchmark met |

| CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of activity (percentage) | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 23% | 5% error rate | 0% | Benchmark met |

| CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rent revenue in dollars | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity | Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$61,600 | \$107,200 | \$61,898 | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$18,900 | \$18,900 | \$23,754 | Benchmark met |

| SS#2: Increase in Household Savings | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$798 | \$798 | \$1238 | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Full-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 87 | 87 | 80 | Benchmark unmet |
| Employed Full-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Heads(s) of work-abled households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 45% | 45% | 41% | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Employed Part-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 55 | 55 | 43 | Benchmark unmet |
| Employed Part-time | Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Heads(s) of work-abled households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 28% | 28% | 22% | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Unemployed | Head(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected Head(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 71 | 71 | 63 | Benchmark met |
| Unemployed | Head(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected Head(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 26% | 26% | 22% | Benchmark met |

| SS#4: Households Removed from TANF | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease) | Households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 5 | 5 | 10 | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase) | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 149 | 149 | 218 | Benchmark met |

| SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase) | Households transitioning to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected households transitioning to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households transitioning to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 142 | 142 | 123 | Benchmark unmet |

Impact/Update: The elimination of deductions streamlines the rent calculation process by reducing the need for verifications and lessening the potential for errors.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: One factor impacting this feature is that the waitlist does not have a work priority for non-elderly/disabled households. As a result, applicants are housed on a first come/first serve basis. This practice has resulted in housing fewer work-able households and an increase in households that receive TANF.

PMHA did not foresee this activity having an impact of self-sufficiency overall; thus, unmet benchmarks are not surprising, as it was expected that benchmarks and outcomes would be similar, with slight variance due to the overturn of residents throughout the year.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic that began in 2020, fewer households had employment income as compared to the baselines and benchmarks, as well as compared to previous years' outcomes.

Baseline, benchmarks, etc. will be reviewed and revised, if needed, during 2021. Overall, this MTW activity is performing as expected given the circumstances described in the prior three (3) paragraphs and is on schedule.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

PH-15 Scattered Site Transfers

Plan Year Approved: 2020

Implemented: 2020

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA fills vacancies in Public Housing scattered single family and/or duplex units by offering unit transfers to select current Public Housing families based on their household size and positive rental histories with PMHA. These desirable scattered site units are offered to select families who are eligible for the bedroom size of the unit available and who meet specific rental history criteria, including being a Public Housing resident for twelve (12) months, having zero (0) housekeeping violations for twelve (12) months, having zero (0) substantiated neighbor complaints for twenty-four (24) months, and having a timely rent payment history for twelve (12) months. This activity results in reducing costs by saving on damage repairs, move-out costs, and staff time incurred to turn over the units between tenancies.

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$3380 (unit turnover costs) + \$3419 (labor costs) = \$6479 total annual costs | \$1146 (unit turnover costs) + \$803 (labor) = \$1210 total annual costs | \$0 <i>*see below</i> | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity | 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 16.85 hours per 15 households = 252.75 hours annually | 4.14 hours per 15 households = 62.1 hours annually | 0 hours <i>*see below</i> | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: The objective of this activity is to reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness, and the impact of this activity is that revenue will increase. This activity launched in February 2020 and, to date, three (3) households have transferred into scattered site units. *None of these households have vacated their scattered site units; therefore, there have been no costs to turn over the units since implementing the activity. Additional data will be needed in 2021 to determine the success of this activity.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There is no recognition of hardship for this policy.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: Based on limited information from February 2020 through present, this MTW activity is on schedule and meets baselines and benchmarks. However, there have been challenges in filling vacancies in three (3) scattered site properties in outlying communities within the county. Units in outlying locations that are not on a bus route and do not have easy access to employment opportunities, grocery stores, medical facilities, and benefits offices are, historically, more challenging to fill.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

BOTH HOUSING VOUCHER & PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS

B-1 Exclusions of Overtime, Bonuses, and Income from Assets

Plan Year Approved: 1999
Implemented: 2000
Amended: 2012

Description: To promote the accumulations of assets, PMHA excludes income from overtime and bonuses, and interest from bank assets such as checking and savings accounts and certificates of deposit.

This activity was modified in 2012 for the Public Housing program to exclude income from “new” employment until annual re-certification. For reporting purposes this exclusion is reflected along with income from overtime and bonuses.

Public Housing Program

| SS#2 Increase in Household Savings | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcomes | Benchmark Achieved |
| Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | 42 households Average- \$14,773 | Benchmark met |
| Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From Income from Bank Assets | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Income from Bank Assets | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$500 | \$500 | 154 households Average- \$1238 | Benchmark met |

| CE#1: Agency Cost Savings | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$54 per resident 20 residents x 3 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$1076 | \$54 per resident 20 residents x 3 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$1076 | \$36 per resident 43 residents x 2 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$1542 | Benchmark met |

| Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From Income from Bank Assets | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark From Wage Exclusions |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| | \$54 per resident 50 residents x 3 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$2690 | \$54 per resident 50 residents x 3 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$2690 | \$36 per resident 154 residents x 2 hours x \$17.93 (current hourly rate)= \$5522 | Benchmark met |

Housing Choice Voucher Program

| <i>SS#2 Increase in Household Savings</i> | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcomes | Benchmark Achieved |
| Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From Income from Bank Assets | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Income from Bank Assets | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$200 | \$200 | 767 households Average- \$1773 | Benchmark met |

| <i>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</i> | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From Income from Bank Assets | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark From Wage Exclusions |
| | \$47 per resident 500 residents x 3 hours x \$15.64 (current hourly rate)= \$23,460 | \$47 per resident 500 residents x 3 hours x \$15.64 (current hourly rate)= \$23,460 | \$31 per resident 767 Households x 2 hours x \$15.64 (current hourly rate)= \$23,992 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: This activity promotes the accumulation of assets. The amounts of excluded income from these sources generally have a small impact on rent revenue; however, it has

simplified some aspects of rent calculations, as it relates to bank assets and as an alternative to the earned income disallowance. The exclusion of overtime and bonuses tend to be minimal.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: This activity is on schedule. Historically, baselines and benchmarks have been met or exceeded.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

B-2 Cap on dependent child deduction

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities.

B-3 Utility Allowance Payments are used to repay participant debts owed to the Housing Authority

Plan Year Approved: 2009
 Implemented: 2010
 Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA withholds utility allowance checks from households who owe PMHA money, to be used to repay those debts. Once the tenant account is returned to zero balance, the utility allowance checks resume.

Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs

| 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$5,300 | 100 households repaid \$15,864 | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: This activity has been useful in reducing the administrative burden of sending utility allowance payments to the same households that PMHA is pursuing collection actions against for the repayment of debts owed to the Housing Authority.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There have been no hardship requests since the implementation of this activity.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: This MTW activity is on schedule. Benchmarks have been met or exceeded since its implementation.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

B-4 Pro-ration of the utility allowance schedule up to the percentage of pro-ration of funding as established by HUD due to appropriations

Plan Year Approved: 2009

Implemented: 2014 for Public Housing Program only, Refer to Section B. Not Yet Implemented Activities for HCV Program.

Amended: N/A

Description: To offer an additional tool to deal with reductions in HUD subsidy for Public Housing or Housing Choice Vouchers, PMHA has authority to reduce utility allowance payments to address funding shortfalls. This feature was not utilized in 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 due to no benefit to the residents and minimal benefit to the agency as compared to administrative burden.

Public Housing Program

| 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$31,116 | \$0 | Benchmark unmet |

Impact/Update: Historically, this activity has provided a minimal reduction on the impact of HUD funding decreases by decreasing expenses. However, this activity provides no benefits to the residents and may put them at risk for utility shut offs. This activity was not utilized in 2020.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were received.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: This activity was not utilized in 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 for Public Housing. A reimplementation date has not been determined.

While PMHA reserves the right to pro-rate the utility allowance schedule for Housing Choice Vouchers in response to pro-rated funding from appropriations by Congress to HUD, an implementation date for the HCV program has not been determined.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

B-5 **Single Fund Budget Flexibility**

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities.

B-6 **Income verifications conducted for approved government programs may be substituted for PMHA income verifications if performed within the previous 90 days**

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities.

B-7 **Employment and education deductions**

Refer to Section D. - Closed Out Activities.

B-8 **Adoption of Local Investment Policies**

Refer to Section B. - Not Yet Implemented Activities.

B-9**Verifications of Income Valid for 180 Days**

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: 2014

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA extends the length of time for verified application data to be considered valid to 180 days. It is anticipated that this activity will reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures. It also will reduce the amount of duplicative work caused by various factors in validating all needed information provided at the time of a completed application and processing from the wait list.

Public Housing Program

| CE#1: Agency Costs 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 1 hour per household x \$18.00 x 5 households= \$90 | 0 hours per household x \$18.00 x 5 households= \$0 | 0 hours per household x \$17.93 x 49 households= \$0 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours) | Expected amount of time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Actual amount of time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 1 hour per household x 5 households= 5 hours | 0 hour per household x 5 households= 0 hours | 0 hours per household x 49 households= 0 hours | Benchmark met |

Housing Choice Voucher Program

| CE#1: Agency Costs 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 1 hour per household x \$15.38 x 1017 households= \$15,641 | 0 hours per household x \$15.38 x 1243 households= \$0 | 0 hours per household x \$15.64 x 1154 households= \$0 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours) | Expected amount of time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Actual amount of time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 1 hour per household x 5 households= 5 hours | 0 hours per household x 5 households= 0 hours | 0 hours per household x 1154 households= 0 hours | Benchmark met |

Impact/Update: During 2020, 49 Public Housing and 1154 HCV households were impacted by this feature, which saved staff time and agency costs.

For rent reform activities/public housing term limit activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were made.

Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies: This MTW activity is on schedule, and baselines and benchmarks have been met.

Actual significant changes: None

Actual non-significant changes: None

Actual changes to metrics/data collection: None

B-10 Eliminate All Excluded Income from the Income Verification Process

Refer to Section C. – Activities on Hold.

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

HCV-14 Permit Decreases in Payment Standards at Next Scheduled Verification

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: N/A

Description: PMHA proposed changing the implementation of new payment standards established by the housing authority to be effective at the date of the anniversary of household assistance (formerly known as the annual verification), rather than be implemented the second annual verification following the change. Under present regulations, housing authorities may not lower payment standards until the 2nd annual certification after the lowering of the payment standards, which hampers a PHA from taking action to lower HAP costs quickly and more fairly across all participant households. In 2013, PMHA raised minimum rents from \$25 to \$50 as part of its response to the federal sequester and the need to reduce HAP costs. This increased the rent burden on the lowest income participants and for lesser results on HAP than if PMHA were permitted to reduce payment standards slightly, across the board for all participants. This activity would allow PMHA to be able to adjust HAP spending quickly and in a more equitable manner (compared to raising minimum rents or adjusting rent calculations) that can spread the cost of budget cuts across a greater portion of the HCV recipient population more quickly.

Actions: It has been noted that typically Fair Market Rent (FMR) for the local HUD Metropolitan Fair Market Rent Area increase year-to-year, and PMHA's payment standards increase accordingly; thus, this feature would be unlikely have any impact. This activity will be under review again in 2021, for possible modification or close-out.

HCV-17 Protecting Tenants Living in Foreclosed Rental Properties

Plan Year Approved: 2020

Implemented: N/A

Description: PMHA proposed an initiative to protect tenants who are living in foreclosed rental properties owned by the Portage County Land Bank. This activity would provide tenant-based voucher assistance to those who are living in rental properties that have gone through foreclosure and then became owned by the Portage County Land Bank. These tenants were the renters in the units when the foreclosures took place. The program size would not exceed twenty-four (24) eligible participants in eligible units. The land bank would refer households to PMHA, and PMHA would then complete an eligibility determination for each household, in accordance with all of the standard requirements of PMHA's MTW HCV eligibility determination. Under this activity, the tenants who are eligible based upon PMHA's MTW HCV eligibility determination, including income eligibility and are therefore struggling to make rent payments to the land bank, would receive vouchers.

Actions: PMHA has not implemented this activity; however, it will be reviewed for possible implementation in 2021.

B-4 **Pro-ration of the utility allowance schedule up to the percentage of pro-ration of funding as established by HUD due to appropriations**

Plan Year Approved: 2009
Implemented: 2014 for Public Housing only, N/A for HCV

Description: To offer an additional tool to deal with reductions in HUD subsidy for Public Housing or Housing Choice Vouchers, PMHA has authority to reduce utility allowance payments to address funding shortfalls. This activity was implemented in 2014 for the Public Housing Program, but it was not utilized from 2017 through 2020.

Actions: This activity is under review to determine if it will be re-implemented in the future for the Public Housing Program and/or implemented for the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

B-8 **Adoption of Local Investment Policies**

Plan Year Approved: 2014
Implemented: N/A

Description: PMHA seeks to evaluate and utilize State of Ohio investment alternatives when appropriate for earning greater returns without compromising asset safety. This activity would allow PMHA to invest in a state government program for state and local governments in Ohio that permits pooled collateralized investment that obtains higher interest rates than is typically available to PMHA on its own while remaining completely liquid as an asset. This activity is under review to determine if it will be implemented in the future.

Actions: PMHA has not implemented new local investment policies; however, this activity will be reviewed for possible implementation in the future.

B-12 **Offender Re-Entry Initiative**

Plan Year Approved: 2020
Implemented: N/A

Description: PMHA proposed an Offender Re-Entry Initiative, with a program size that would not exceed 150 eligible participants who were incarcerated, involved in drug court and/or court-ordered diversion programs, and/or released from in-patient treatment within the past twelve (12) months, and were seeking affordable housing upon re-entry into the community. This activity would provide an immediate impact for offenders coming out of prison and/or treatment facilities, who need housing and supportive services, and who would otherwise be left homeless and

without services needed for successful reintegration into the community. All eligible participants must be referred to PMHA by its re-entry program partner, Portage County Adult Probation.

This initiative would operate primarily as a Section 8 tenant-based voucher program, to allow for maximum housing choice, where the majority of participants would receive a voucher to utilize at privately-owned market-rate units within Portage County. However, PMHA would allow the reunification option in existing Section 8 and Public Housing households, as well as set aside at least one (1) PMHA-owned unit for emergency short-term stays.

Participants would be expected to remain in compliance with all requirements set forth by Portage County Adult Probation while participating in this program. The Portage County Adult Probation office would advise PMHA of any noncompliance. If a participant is noncompliant with the terms of his/her probation, he/she could be terminated from this program and thereby have his/her voucher terminated. Participants must utilize their vouchers for housing within Portage County only. Portability would not be permitted under this program.

Actions: PMHA has not implemented this activity; however, it will be reviewed for possible implementation in 2021.

C. Activities on Hold

HCV-10 Biennial Reviews for Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households:

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: 2014

Amended: 2015-2016 (on hold May 2015-April 2016, re-implemented May 2016)

Description: PMHA would conduct reviews of income at least once every 24 months as opposed annually. Families could continue to request interim reviews at any time. This activity would be applied to all MTW vouchers held by households not considered elderly and/or disabled. This activity is expected to simplify income verifications, saving time for PMHA staff, participants, and other agencies.

Reactivation status: Not applicable at present. This activity was placed on hold effective January 2019 due to issues with the management system tracking capabilities and related administrative burden.

B-10 Eliminate All Excluded Income from the Income Verification Process

Plan Year Approved: 2014

Implemented: 2014

Amended: N/A

Description: PMHA would cease verifying any fully excluded income sources for households. This activity is expected to simplify income verifications, saving time for PMHA staff, participants, and other agencies.

Reactivation status: Not applicable at present. While PIH 2013-04 provides guidance for this activity, the approval as a MTW activity would ensure that developed practices would continue if PIH 2013-04 is rescinded, amended, or superseded.

B-11 **Elderly and Disabled Rent Re-certifications Every Three Years**

Plan Year Approved: 2014
Implemented: 2014
Amended: N/A

Description: This activity would allow PMHA to conduct re-certifications at least once every three years for elderly and disabled households. This activity is expected to increase administrative efficiency and reduce cost through the reduction of annual re-certifications.

Reactivation status: Not applicable at present. This activity was placed on hold for the HCV program effective April 2019, and for the Public Housing program effective December 2019, due to issues with the management system tracking capabilities and related administrative burden.

D. Closed Out Activities

HCV-5 **Alternative Housing Quality Standards Compliance**

Plan Year Approved: 2011
Implemented: 2011
Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2014

Description: PMHA may use the results of municipal housing/rental housing inspections as an alternative to HQS, where available. This activity was implemented as a means of ensuring Housing Quality Standards were upheld while minimizing the amount of intrusion upon Section 8 landlords and participants through multiple housing inspections by various government entities. HQS standards were met while reducing a duplication of efforts among inspection entities.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity was workable when the PMHA served as a contract agent for the City of Ravenna to do its inspections of rental units. When this arrangement ended, it was not feasible to continue this activity due to incompatible inspection schedules. City inspections were no longer up to date when needed to ensure Section 8 compliance with Housing Quality Standards. The City of Kent inspections of rental units also did not meet the requirements for HQS compliance. Thus, this activity did not yield the expected results.

There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

| <i>PMHA Metric: Streamline Inspection Process</i> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of Government Entities sharing inspection information | Number of government entities sharing inspection information prior to implementation of the activity | Expected number of government entities sharing inspection information after implementation of the activity | Actual number of government entities sharing inspection information after implementation of the activity | The outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0 | 1 | 1-City of Ravenna | Benchmark met |

HCV-6 Time Limits for Housing Choice Voucher Participants

Plan Year Approved: 2013

Implemented: 2014

Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2017

Description: PMHA established time limits for the Housing Choice Voucher program. Participants who are able to work (i.e., not considered elderly or disabled, or are a parent of a child under age 1) are expected to work or attend an approved school program, or they will lose a month of eligibility of HCV assistance. Each individual is granted 36 months of unemployment/non-participation in education. When an individual reaches the end of their 36 months, they will be considered ineligible for housing assistance for no less than one year, and all rent calculations for the household will be calculated on a pro-ration basis similar to the treatment given to other households with ineligible members.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity, as written, proved to be very difficult to track and prone to errors. No households were impacted by this activity since its full impact would not have materialized until 2018.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table: Not applicable

HCV-7 Capped Utility Reimbursement Checks

Plan Year Approved: 2012
Implemented: N/A
Amended: N/A

Closed Out: 2017

Description: This activity was intended to eliminate “double dipping” for utility costs by setting utility allowance reimbursement maximums based on the State of Ohio’s PIPP Plus program, a program that subsidizes low-income households’ utilities by allowing them to pay utility bills on the basis on income, not on the amount of service used. However, these same families were eligible for and receiving utility reimbursement checks with the intention to pay off their entire month’s utility bill.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity was on hold for several years as PMHA worked with its software provider to determine if rent calculations and utility allowance checks could be accurately performed and issued. It was determined that the cost for software changes were not affordable for the value gained from the implementation of this activity.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table: Not applicable

HCV-8 Transitional Housing Vouchers

Plan Year Approved: 2012
Implemented: 2012
Amended: N/A

Closed Out: 2017

Description: The Transitional Housing Voucher allowed for PMHA to move a long-standing transitional housing program previously located at Renaissance Place, a Public Housing development, to a tenant-based program. This change allowed for Public Housing to become more uniformly managed while offering a more flexible approach to housing formerly homeless persons for one year and offered a greater choice in housing for this population. Supportive services were provided to participating households. This activity provided a one-year voucher to

families. Intensive supportive services were provided to participants, with an emphasis on employment and self-sufficiency. The voucher ended after one year and was not renewable, but participants were eligible to obtain Public Housing or a traditional Housing Choice Voucher during their time in this program.

The Transitional Housing Program depended on a long-standing partnership with Family and Community Services to provide intensive case-management services to previously homeless households. PMHA’s offering was to provide the “shelter” needed to solidify the existence of the program. Thus, no resources were leveraged on behalf of the PMHA.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: Requests for transitional housing vouchers occurred from 2012-2014 but then elapsed over the last three years of this activity. This was due to the service provider not accepting new program families and restrictions limiting the time for participation in the program. Since the program became voucher based in 2012, a total of 5 previous homeless households participated.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

| 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 average amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$0 | 2012-2017- \$0 | Benchmark met |

| SS#5 Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 1 per year | 2012-2017- 5 | Benchmark unmet |

| SS#8 Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase) | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number) This number may be zero | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 1 | 2012-2017- 5 | Benchmark unmet |

| HC#7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase) | Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity (number) This number may be zero | Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 0 | 1 | 2012-2017- 5 | Benchmark unmet |

HCV-12 Use Lesser of Actual Unit Size or Unit Size of Voucher Issued for Utility Allowances

Plan Year Approved: 2014
 Implemented: N/A
 Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2014

Description: PMHA will apply the lesser utility allowance of either the actual unit size leased by the family, or the unit size of the voucher issued.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This proposed activity was passed into a Federal Law July 2014. This activity was included in the 2014 Plan prior to the passing into Federal Law.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table: Not applicable

PH-1 Escalating Minimum Rent

Plan Year Approved: 2008

Implemented: 2008

Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2011

Description: Minimum Rent of \$25 will increase by \$25 every two years during tenure in Public Housing and will be capped not to exceed \$250 per month, which would be attained after 18 years of Public Housing residency. Households with a head or co-head of household, or spouse, who is elderly (62 years of age or older) and/or disabled will have no minimum rent. Departure or death of the sole elderly or disabled household member will result in the minimum rent requirement being re-instated for remaining household members.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This escalating minimum rent feature was originally implemented as an alternative to arbitrary time limits. Benchmarks were achieved, but the feature proved to be very cumbersome in its implementation and operation. As a result, rent reforms permissible under conventional PHA rules were implemented by year-end of 2011, raising the minimum rent to \$50 per month for non-elderly, non-disabled households. The original activity of escalating minimum rent was administratively burdensome and not helpful for achieving PMHA goals of encouraging work activity and self-sufficiency.

While the activity met the projected benchmarks, the implementation yielded a high risk for inaccurate rent calculations due to the fluctuation of minimum rents which would vary among households.

There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

| CE#5 Increase in PMHA Rental Revenue for Public Housing Households | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| 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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$557,771 | Increase of \$30,000 | 2010-\$587,771 2011-\$622,790 | Benchmark met |

PH-3 Elderly and Disabled Rent Re-certifications Biennially

Plan Year Approved: 1999

Implemented: 2000
Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2014

Description: PMHA conducted rent recertifications for elderly and disabled households every two years instead of annually. The activity was expanded to triennial rent re-recertification in 2014 and was identified as Activity B-11.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity was changed in Plan Year 2014 to Re-Certification of Elderly and Disabled to Every Three Years for both Public Housing residents and Section 8 Tenants.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table: Not applicable

PH-6 Overall Percentage of Income Amounts for Rent Calculations

Plan Year Approved: 2012
Implemented: 2012
Amended: N/A

Closed Out: 2018

Comment: The percentage of earned income was set at 26% of income in an effort to promote work activity and offset the elimination of the allowance for non-reimbursed childcare expenses.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity closed with the approval of activity PH-14, Elimination of Deductions in Total Tenant Payment Calculations, which sets percentage of income at 29.6% of gross monthly income with no deductions.

The rent process was simplified, and the number of employed households steadily increased. This activity was cost effective by reducing the need for verifications and thus, saving staff time. Minimal increases were seen within the self-sufficiency metrics; however, this may be due to the fluid nature of Public Housing. Families typically leave Public Housing with higher incomes than those households moving to Public Housing. PMHA considers this activity to have had a positive effect on cost effectiveness and has continued with implementation of activity PH-14.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

| CE#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) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$2,210 | \$2,204 (113 households x 1.5 hours x \$13.00 or current hourly rate) | 2017- (142 households x 1.5 hours x \$16.04) \$3,417 | Benchmark unmet due to larger population of households |

| SS#1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$14,000 | \$15,000 | 2017- \$18,903 | Benchmark met - Earned income of households increased annually since implementation of this activity |

| SS#2: Increase in Household Savings | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$0 | \$200 | \$798 | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Full-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 72 | 72 | 2017- 87 | Benchmark met - The number of households employed full time increased when compared to both the baseline and benchmark |
| Employed Full-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 60% | 60% | 61% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Employed Part-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 48 | 48 | 2017- 55 | Benchmark met |
| Employed Part-Time | Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 40% | 40% | 39% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in an Education Program | Head(s) Households of Enrolled in an Education Program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | | | Information is not available and is not related to current MTW activities | PH does not document enrollment in an education program |
| Enrolled in an Education Program | Head(s) Households of Enrolled in an Education Program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | | | Information is not available and is not related to current MTW activities | PH does not document enrollment in an education program |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Enrolled in a Job Training Program* | Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 1 | 1 | 0 | Benchmark not met |
| Enrolled in a Job Training Program* | Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| Percentage | 100% | 100% | 0% | Benchmark not met |

*Note: PH tracks this information related to residents participating in Section 3, however no residents participated in 2017.

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Unemployed | Head(s) of Households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 103 | 97 | 71 | Benchmark met |
| Unemployed | Head(s) of Households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| Percentage | 47% | 40% | 26% | Benchmark met |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Other* | Head(s) Households in other category prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual Head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | Benchmark Met |
| Other* | Head(s) Households in other category prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Actual Head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0% | 0% | 0% | Benchmark Met |

*Note: PH had no households in the "other" category during 2017.

PH-7 Eliminate Allowance for Non-Reimbursed Childcare Expenses and Replace with 4% Overall Percentage of Earned Income

Plan Year Approved: 2012
 Implemented: 2012
 Amended: N/A

Closed Out: 2018

Description: Allowances for non-reimbursed childcare expenses were eliminated from rent calculations in part of an overall rent reform that reduced the percentage of income counted towards rent for households with earned income. The purpose of this feature was to simplify rent

calculations for transparency shared by both residents and PHA staff, as well as reduce administrative burden relating to documentation. This activity was intertwined as part of PH-6 Overall Percentage of Income Amounts for Rent Calculations described above.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity closed with the approval of activity PH-14, Elimination of Deductions in Total Tenant Payment Calculations, which sets percentage of income at 29.6% of gross monthly income with no deductions.

PMHA considers this activity to have had a positive effect on cost effectiveness, as intertwined with activity PH-6, and continued with implementation of activity PH-14.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table: Refer to PH-6.

PH-8 **Deduction for Elderly and Disabled Adults**

Plan Year Approved: 2009
Implemented: N/A
Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2014

Description: PMHA was considering increasing the deduction from income from \$400 to a higher amount as part of a larger rent reform.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity was intended to be included as part of a larger rent reform initiative, but it was ultimately not included due to cost and funding reasons.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table: Not applicable

PH-9 **Providing Transitional Housing**

Plan Year Approved: 1999
Implemented: 1999
Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2012

Description: Up to 42 units of transitional housing were set aside for previously homeless families at Renaissance Place and Community Estates. Through partnership with Family and Community Services and its Portage Area Transitional Housing (PATH) program, residents received on-site intensified case management services as they moved toward self-sufficiency over the course of a two-year time limit.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: During 2012, the long-standing partnership with Family and Community Services and its Portage Area Transitional Housing (PATH) program evolved to address a more permanent supportive housing program as defined by HUD. It was determined that a Public Housing format was ineffective for the operation of a supportive housing program. Because of the change from a two-year Transitional Housing program to a one-year supportive housing program with the emphasis on transitioning in place, PMHA found the number and cost of unit turnovers increasing, since not all participants were able and willing to transition in place. Renaissance Place consists of three- and four-bedroom units. Many of the PATH families required two-bedroom units. With HUD new program guidelines, the landscape of the PATH program changed. PMHA opened its entire housing stock to PATH participants with the emphasis on moving participants into the units with the needed number of bedrooms. However, this approach diluted the relationship between participants and PATH staff. Thus, because of programmatic changes, it became necessary to phase-out the Transitional Housing program by the end of 2012.

While the activity met the projected benchmarks and the program proved to transition previously homeless families into permanent housing, the revised HUD regulations made it economically unfeasible to continue this program as Public Housing. As a result, it was incorporated into the Section 8 Voucher program.

There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

| HC#6: Increase in Resident Mobility | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase) | Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase) | Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | There was no transitional housing program prior to the implementation of this activity | Minimum of 42 households per year participating in the program | 2010- 64 2011- 64 2012- 44 | Benchmark met |

| HC#4: Displacement Prevention | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of previously homeless households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease) | Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity | Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | There was no transitional housing program prior to the implementation of this activity | 24 households per year since households could stay a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 4 years in transitional housing or lose assistance due to non-compliance | 2010-22 2011-22 2012-44 | Outcomes were met however, in 2012 the transitional housing program was phased out due to new HUD guidelines |

| HC#6: Increase in Resident Mobility | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase) | Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase) | Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | There was no transitional housing program prior to the implementation of this activity | 10 per year | 2010- 11 2011- 22 2012- 13 | Benchmark met |

PH-11 Deduction for Absent Child

Plan Year Approved: 2009
 Implemented: N/A
 Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2013

Description: The activity was proposed as part of a larger overall rent reform policy that allowed, under limited circumstances, the opportunity for families to receive a rent calculation

deduction if the family was paying child support for up to two (2) children not residing in the household.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: A decision was reached after reviewing the documentation and work efforts needed to verify circumstances involved, that this activity would not be implemented due to administrative burden, the resulting impact on households, and further policy discussion relating to desired results on low-income participant households.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity

Summary Table: Not applicable

PH-12 **Cap on Dependent Child Deduction**

Plan Year Approved: 1999

Implemented: 2000

Amended: 2014

Closed out: 2018

Description: The Public Housing Program gave a \$480 allowance for each family member (other than the head or spouse), who was disabled or a minor, and for family members who were 18 and older who were full-time students or who were disabled. This allowance was not to exceed \$960, except that current residents (as of April 23, 1999) were entitled to an allowance of \$480 for each family member who was a minor and for family members who were 18 and older and full-time students or who were disabled as of June 1, 2000. In Plan Year 2014, due to a revision of rent reform activities for the HCV program, this activity was no longer relative to the HCV program.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity closed with the approval of activity PH-14, Elimination of Deductions in Total Tenant Payment Calculations, which sets percentage of income at 29.6% of gross monthly income with no deductions.

PMHA considers this activity to have had a positive effect on reduction of costs and in achieving greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures. The impact of this activity was that rental revenue increased as compared to the traditional HUD system of treatment of dependent child deductions. The result of the capped dependent child activity was successful. However, with the implemented rent reform activity, it is no longer relevant.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

| 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) | Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$18,240 | \$18,000 (varying on the composition of families at any one time) | 2017- 47 households with 63 children x \$480= \$30,240 | Benchmark met |

B-2 Cap on dependent child deduction

Plan Year Approved: 1999
 Implemented: 2000
 Amended: N/A

Closed Out: 2014 (HCV), 2018 (Public Housing)

Description: This activity allowed for a \$480 allowance for each family member (other than the head or spouse), who was disabled or a minor, and for family members who were 18 and older who were full-time students or who were disabled. This allowance was not to exceed \$960, except that current residents (as of April 23, 1999) were entitled to an allowance of \$480 for each family member who was a minor and for family members who were 18 and older and full-time students or who were disabled as of June 1, 2000.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity was discontinued for the Housing Choice Voucher Program in 2014 and the Public Housing Program in 2018 due to revised rent-reform policies which included a flat 29.6% of income calculation. The revised rent-reform policies omitted this step from the rent calculation in an attempted to streamline the process. Advantages included a decrease in staff time and rent calculation error.

The results of the capped dependent child activity were successful. However, with the implemented rent reform activity, it is no longer relevant.

There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

Housing Choice Voucher Program

| 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) | Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$0.00 | \$3,000 | 2014- 454 Households= \$323,040 | Benchmark met |

Public Housing Program

| 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) | Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$18,240 | \$18,000 (Varying on the composition of families at any one time) | 2017- 47 Households = \$30,240 | Benchmark met |

B-5 Single Fund Budget Flexibility

Plan Year Approved: 2009

Implemented: 2009

Amended: N/A

Closed Out: 2014

Description: PMHA was authorized to use single fund budgeting and full fungibility for specified funds under the restated MTW agreement and had used this authority in limited measures.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: In discussions with the MTW office, it was determined that this activity is no longer considered a MTW activity for the purposes of the current activities section of this plan and will no longer be reported as such.

There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table: Not applicable

B-6 **Income verifications conducted for approved government programs may be substituted for PMHA income verifications if performed within the previous 90 days**

Plan Year Approved: 2009
Implemented: N/A
Amended: N/A

Closed Out: 2014

Description: PMHA would use the information gathered and certified to by residents in their eligibility determinations performed for other means-tested programs, if this information were no older than 90 days.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: This activity was not implemented after changes in leadership at other agencies diminished the willingness to exchange information with the Housing Authority.

There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Provide Summary Table: Not applicable

B-7 **Employment and education deductions**

Plan Year Approved: 1999
Implemented: 2000
Amended: N/A

Closed out: 2012 (Public Housing), 2015 (HCV)

Description: This activity was implemented to reward work, with the expectation that households would reap a reward for achieving earned income through a flat deduction. Also, it was anticipated that staff time would be saved by the elimination of having to secure third-party documentation for the education deduction which was tedious and time consuming for staff.

Reason Activity Was Closed Out: PMHA discontinued this activity 2012 for Public Housing residents. Replacing this activity was the implementation of a 4% deduction on all earned income and an income exclusion for new earnings until annual re-certification. The activity was

discontinued for HCV program in 2015 due to rent reform activities and subsequently closed out.

There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.

Summary Table:

Public Housing Program

| SS#2 Increase in Household Savings | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds benchmark |
| | \$0.0 | \$12.50 per month for each participating household | Employment Deduction of \$500= \$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2010- 60 HH 2011- 59 HH Education Deduction of \$500= \$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2010- 17 HH 2011- 18 HH | Benchmark met |

Housing Choice Voucher Program

| SS#2 Increase in Household Savings | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds benchmark |
| | \$0.0 | \$12.50 per month for each | Employment Deduction of \$500= | Benchmark met |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | participating household | <p>\$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2014-108 HH</p> <p>Education Deduction of \$500= \$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2014-24 HH</p> <p>Employment and Education Deduction of \$500 each=\$25 per monthly savings per Household 2014=2 HH</p> | |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|--|

SECTION V: SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

A. ACTUAL SOURCES AND USES OF MTW FUNDS

i. Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

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

ii. Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

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

iii. Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

The MTW PHA shall provide a thorough narrative of actual activities that use only the MTW single fund flexibility. Where possible, the MTW PHA may provide metrics to track the outcomes of these programs and/or activities. Activities that use other MTW authorizations in Attachment C and/or D of the Standard MTW Agreement (or analogous section in a successor MTW Agreement) do not need to be described here, as they are already found in Section (IV) of the Annual MTW Report. The MTW PHA shall also provide a thorough description of how it used MTW single fund flexibility to direct funding towards specific housing and/or service programs in a way that responds to local needs (that is, at a higher or lower level than would be possible without MTW single fund flexibility).

| |
|---|
| ACTUAL USE OF MTW SINGLE FUND FLEXIBILITY |
| PMHA does not have any activity that uses only MTW Single Fund Flexibility. |

B. LOCAL ASSET MANGEMENT PLAN

- i. Did the MTW PHA allocate costs within statute in the Plan Year?
- ii. Did the MTW PHA implement a local asset management plan (LAMP) in the Plan Year?
- iii. Did the MTW PHA provide a LAMP in the appendix?

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

| |
|---|
| This section is not applicable to PMHA. |
|---|

SECTION VI: ADMINISTRATIVE

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

There are no issues that PMHA must take action to address.

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

No outside evaluation of the PMHA's MTW demonstration program is undertaken. However, on a regular basis, management and line staff review MTW activities, participant progress, and internal systems, procedures, and reports. Suggestions for improvements are taken under advisement and implemented if feasible.

C. Certification of Meeting the MTW Statutory Requirements Submittal

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority certifies that it has met the MTW statutory requirements for 2020 with respect to:

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

D. MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data

Not applicable.

Certifications of Compliance
(see next page)

CERTIFICATIONS OF COMPLIANCE

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING**

**Certifications of Compliance with Regulations:
Board Resolution to Accompany the Annual Moving to Work Plan**

Acting on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the Moving to Work Public Housing Agency (MTW PHA) listed below, as its Chairman or other authorized MTW PHA official if there is no Board of Commissioners, I approve the submission of the Annual Moving to Work Plan for the MTW PHA Plan Year beginning 01/01/2020, hereinafter referred to as "the Plan", of which this document is a part and make the following certifications and agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in connection with the submission of the Plan and implementation thereof:

- (1) The MTW PHA published a notice that a hearing would be held, that the Plan and all information relevant to the public hearing was available for public inspection for at least 30 days, that there were no less than 15 days between the public hearing and the approval of the Plan by the Board of Commissioners, and that the MTW PHA conducted a public hearing to discuss the Plan and invited public comment.
- (2) The MTW PHA took into consideration public and resident comments (including those of its Resident Advisory Board or Boards) before approval of the Plan by the Board of Commissioners or Board of Directors in order to incorporate any public comments into the Annual MTW Plan.
- (3) The MTW PHA certifies that the Board of Directors has reviewed and approved the budget for the Capital Fund Program grants contained in the Capital Fund Program Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report, form HUD-50075.1 (or successor form as required by HUD).
- (4) The MTW PHA will carry out the Plan in conformity with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
- (5) The Plan is consistent with the applicable comprehensive housing affordability strategy (or any plan incorporating such strategy) for the jurisdiction in which the PHA is located.
- (6) The Plan contains a certification by the appropriate state or local officials that the Plan is consistent with the applicable Consolidated Plan, which includes a certification that requires the preparation of an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, for the MTW PHA's jurisdiction and a description of the manner in which the Plan is consistent with the applicable Consolidated Plan.
- (7) The MTW PHA will affirmatively further fair housing by fulfilling the requirements at 24 CFR 903.7(o) and 24 CFR 903.15(d), which means that it will take meaningful actions to further the goals identified in the Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) conducted in accordance with the requirements of 24 CFR 5.150 through 5.180, that it will take no action that is materially inconsistent with its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing, and that it will address fair housing issues and contributing factors in its programs, in accordance with 24 CFR 903.7(o)(3). Until such time as the MTW PHA is required to submit an AFH, and that AFH has been accepted by HUD, the MTW PHA will address impediments to fair housing choice identified in the Analysis of Impediments to fair housing choice associated with any applicable Consolidated or Annual Action Plan under 24 CFR Part 91.
- (8) The MTW PHA will comply with the prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of age pursuant to the Age Discrimination Act of 1975.
- (9) In accordance with 24 CFR 5.105(a)(2), HUD's Equal Access Rule, the MTW PHA will not make a determination of eligibility for housing based on sexual orientation, gender identify, or marital status and will make no inquiries concerning the gender identification or sexual orientation of an applicant for or occupant of HUD-assisted housing.
- (10) The MTW PHA will comply with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 and 24 CFR Part 41, Policies and Procedures for the Enforcement of Standards and Requirements for Accessibility by the Physically Handicapped.
- (11) The MTW PHA will comply with the requirements of section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, Employment Opportunities for Low-or Very-Low Income Persons, and with its implementing regulation at 24 CFR Part 135.
- (12) The MTW PHA will comply with requirements with regard to a drug free workplace required by 24 CFR Part 24, Subpart F.
- (13) The MTW PHA will comply with requirements with regard to compliance with restrictions on lobbying required by 24 CFR Part 87, together with disclosure forms if required by this Part, and with restrictions on payments to influence Federal Transactions, in accordance with the Byrd Amendment and implementing regulations at 49 CFR Part 24.

