Housing Authority of the City of Reno

Moving to Work Annual Report

Fiscal Year 2017

July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017

Submitted to HUD on September 29, 2017
Resubmitted to HUD on August 29, 2018

1525 East Ninth Street • Reno NV 89512-3012 • www.renoha.org
Serving Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County

Mission Statement

Provide fair, sustainable, quality housing in diverse neighborhoods throughout Reno, Sparks and Washoe County that offers a stable foundation for low-income families to pursue economic opportunities, become self-sufficient and improve their quality of life. In doing so, the Housing Authority will continue to cultivate strong community partnerships, promote fiscal responsibility, and administer all of its programs and activities in an efficient, ethical, and professional manner.

Housing Authority of the City of Reno
1525 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV 89512-3012
www.renoha.org

Board of Commissioners

Dick Scott
Chair

Mark Sullivan
Vice Chair

Alana Dixon-McAllister

Hillary Schieve

Barbara Wilhelms

Management Team

Amy Jones
Executive Director

Mishon Hurst
Deputy Executive Director

Tim O'Fallon
Director of Modernization & Rehabilitation

Heidi McKendree
Director of Rental Assistance

April Lawson
Director of Administration

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 6

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information 12

A. Housing Stock Information 13

B. Leasing Information 17

C. Wait List Information 23

III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested 26

IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted 28

A. Implemented Activities 28

2017-01: Increase verified application data for HCV applicants 31

2017-02: Asset threshold to determine eligibility for admission 34

2016-01: Simplification of medical deductions 36

2016-02: Redefine near-elderly person 43

2016-04: Allow HCV participants to lease units that exceed the 40% rent burden 46

2016-05: Eliminate Earned Income Disallowance (EID) 48

2016-06: Disregard earned income of PH household members, age 18-20, who are not the head of household, co-head or spouse 52

2016-07: Implement a $75 fee for each additional HQS inspection when more than two inspections are required 55

2016-08: Expand Project Based Voucher Program 58

2015-01: Elimination of all negative rents & simplification of HCV utility allowances 62

2015-02: Allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units 67

2015-03: Assign PBVs to up to 100% of units in non-Public Housing RHA-owned properties 70

2015-04: Required Savings Plan for Earned Income Disallowance (EID) PH residents 72

2014-01: Assign PBVs to RHA owned/controlled units without competitive process 75

2014-02: Mobility Demonstration 78

2014-03: Rent Reform Controlled Study 86

2014-04: Expand self-sufficiency activities 97

2014-05: Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent 102

2014-06: Triennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes 110

2014-08: Partner with local nonprofits to provide housing to at risk families 113

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities 116

2016-03: Time limited vouchers and redesign of traditional FSS Program 116

C. Activities on Hold 118

D. Closed Activities 118

2014-07: Alternate HQS verification policy 118
V. Sources and Uses of Funds 121
A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds 121
B. Local Asset Management Plan 121
C. Commitment of Unspent Funds 122
VI. Administrative 124
VII. Attachment 126

1

Section One

INTRODUCTION

I. Introduction

About RHA

The Housing Authority of the City of Reno (RHA) was established on October 6, 1943 as a municipal corporation under Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 315. After its creation, RHA was appointed as the Public Housing Authority (PHA) for the City of Sparks and Washoe County.

Currently RHA owns and manages 751 units of Public Housing (PH) in eight different locations within the cities of Reno and Sparks that are leased to eligible low-income families, the elderly and persons with disabilities. Utilizing the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) and other funding sources, RHA acquired over 160 scattered site properties throughout the local area. The majority of these scattered site rental properties are designated specifically for very low-income households.

In addition to these PH and scattered site units, RHA owns nine unaided multi-family housing properties that provide an additional 332 affordable housing units. Working with a private property manager, RHA rents each of these properties at levels that are lower than the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Fair Market Rents for Washoe County.

RHA also operates a number of rental assistance programs created under Section 8 of the 1974 Federal Housing and Community Development Act. Through these programs, RHA provides housing subsidies to more than 2,500 low-income families and individuals residing in privately owned housing throughout Reno, Sparks and Washoe County.

What is MTW?

Moving to Work (MTW) is a demonstration program, established by Congress in 1996, that offers a limited number of "high performing" PHAs the opportunity to propose and test innovative, locally-designed approaches to administering housing programs and self-sufficiency strategies. The program also permits PHAs to combine federal funds from the PH operating fund, Capital Fund Program (CFP) and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program into a single, agency-wide funding source known as a "block grant." However, it is important to note that the MTW designation does not provide PHAs with additional funding from HUD, but rather allows each agency to use their federal funding in a more flexible manner.

With HUD's approval, PHAs participating in the MTW program are allowed to waive certain statutes and regulations in the United States Housing Act of 1937 in order to explore different and creative ways to improve their housing programs. These policy changes allow PHAs to address the challenges of low-income families that are unique to their local needs. In doing so, each of the activities proposed or implemented by the PHA must address at least one of three MTW statutory objectives:

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

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

RHA's designation as an MTW agency

After a national competition was held in 2012, RHA was selected and designated as one of four new MTW agencies in 2013. The MTW agreement between RHA and HUD, executed on June 27, 2013, was initially effective through RHA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2018. On December 18, 2015, President Obama signed the FY 2016 Consolidated Appropriations Act into law. Pursuant to Section 239 of Title II, Division L of the Act, RHA's MTW agreement was extended through FY 2028. This is also true for the other 38 MTW agencies currently participating in the demonstration. The Act also authorized HUD to expand the MTW demonstration program by an additional 100 PHAs over a seven year period.

What is the purpose of the MTW Annual Report?

RHA's FY 2017 MTW Annual Report highlights and details each of the activities approved by HUD on July 5, 2016 and implemented during the plan year. The report also provides a status update on ongoing MTW activities which were approved and implemented in previous plan years. Overall, the report describes RHA's accomplishments in the areas of housing choice, self-sufficiency and cost effectiveness. It is presented in the required outline and format established in Attachment B of RHA's executed MTW agreement with HUD.

The following two activities were approved in RHA's FY 2017 MTW Annual Plan:

- Increase verified application data for HCV applicants;

- Establish an asset threshold to determine eligibility for admission.

Overview of RHA's short and long term MTW goals and objectives

RHA identified the following four goals within its mission statement that it continually strives to achieve: (1) provide sustainable, quality housing in diverse neighborhoods; (2) offer a stable foundation for low-income families to pursue economic opportunities; (3) improve quality of life for our families; and (4) create MTW activities that assist in the community effort to address homelessness. In FY 2017, RHA's management and the agency's Board of Commissioners developed and executed a strategic plan that builds upon these core goals.

Short-term goals and objectives

Throughout FY 2017, RHA staff continued to work to ensure that all implemented activities were being successfully and accurately administered. In FY 2015, a software conversion was initiated that has taken longer to implement than expected. RHA's Administration Suite, the last portion of this conversion process, has recently been completed and it is anticipated that the system will be fully functional soon. Although this conversion process has been lengthy and quite tedious, RHA's investment in this new software system is expected to provide increased efficiencies in operations, allow the agency to meet all of its federal reporting requirements and, over time, allow for easy tracking and monitoring of RHA's MTW activities.

The use of single fund flexibility to implement necessary energy and water saving measures at RHA's eight PH complexes continues. In FY 2016, RHA identified the need to replace 900 aluminum framed windows throughout the Mineral Manor PH complex with energy star rated, highly efficient, thermal pane windows. On December 18, 2015, this job was advertised and bids were received in early February. Following approval by RHA's Board of Commissioners, a contract was awarded to Advance Installations on March 22, 2016 for $398,671. The windows at this complex began to be replaced on May 2, 2016 with the contractor completing the entire site on August 15, 2016.

In FY 2017, RHA proposed to use single fund flexibility to install tankless water heaters within the laundry facilities and community rooms at several of RHA's PH complexes. Upon further review of the proposed sites, staff found that the installation of a tankless water heater at some locations would prove to be cost prohibitive. On November 23, 2016, RHA advertised to replace six water heaters rather than the nine that were originally proposed. Bids were received in late December and a contract was awarded to Michael's Plumbing on February 16, 2017. Work commenced on March 13, 2017 and was completed on March 31, 2017.

The following table details the PH complexes where existing traditional style water heaters were replaced with a new tankless system.

Location where tankless water heaters were installed	
PH Complex	Location impacted
Silverada Manor (NV39-P001-003)	Community Room
McGraw Court (NV39-P001-118)	Community Room
Stead Manor (NV39-P001-006)	Laundry Room and Manager's Office
Hawk View Apartments (NV39-P001-007)	Laundry Room
Essex Manor (NV39-P001-009)	Community Room
Myra Birch (NV39-P001-010)	Laundry Room

Progress toward long-term goals

Reno, Sparks and Washoe County, like many other communities around the U.S., have members of its population who are experiencing homelessness. Throughout FY 2017, RHA continued to collaborate with local community organizations to explore different ways to overcome homelessness in our local area. In addition to establishing a local preference several years ago for homelessness on the application for admission to RHA's housing programs, staff work closely with the local Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) office to combat homelessness among veterans in our jurisdiction through the HUD-VA Supportive Housing (VASH) Program. Currently, RHA has 278 VASH vouchers and has recently applied for an additional 15 vouchers under PIH Notice 2017-17 (HA).

RHA staff continue to explore and propose additional ways to assist high risk families in overcoming homelessness. On January 27, 2016, an amendment to the FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan was submitted to HUD for approval. The amendment proposed a new activity to expand the use of Project Based Vouchers (PBVs) and allow for their award to privately owned properties (Activity 2016-08) within the community. After undergoing a competitive process, 25 PBVs were assigned to existing affordable housing units where the owner committed to provide services and assistance to homeless individuals and families in Washoe County. RHA is currently working with two local community partners, Northern Nevada HOPES and Washoe County Department of Social Services, to provide ongoing case management services to these individuals/families. As of June 30, 2017, 15 of the 25 PBVs have been leased to eligible individuals/families who had previously been experiencing homelessness.

RHA remains committed to expanding self-sufficiency opportunities through the use of the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Lite Program. RHA's two FSS Coordinators continue to work with all of the FSS Lite Program participants to provide them with the necessary guidance to achieve higher educational goals and any support needed to pursue career placement and/or advancement opportunities. As rents continue to rise in the cities of Reno and Sparks, the demand for RHA's housing programs also grows. Assisting all families in achieving their economic goals, becoming self-sufficient and successfully moving off of assistance allows RHA to assist additional low-income families. This approach continues to be a key goal of the FSS Lite Program.

RHA's Mobility Demonstration (Activity 2014-02) was implemented after HUD's approval of the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. The program continues to offer qualified PH families, who otherwise lack mobility options, the opportunity to move to low poverty neighborhoods throughout Reno, Sparks and Washoe County. When proposed, RHA had planned to purchase up to 50 properties using non-MTW funds for this program, but as the local housing market strengthens, the amount of available inventory has become extremely limited. RHA has now reduced the number of properties that will be utilized for this program to 40. To date, 37 properties have been made available for this program and 30 former PH families currently live in low poverty neighborhoods, 26 of whom are still active in the Mobility Demonstration.

In addition to the Mobility Demonstration, a Rent Reform Controlled Study (Activity 2014-03), that includes a study group and a control group, was also implemented by RHA in FY 2014. Currently, 145 families with children, who collectively make up the two groups, are housed under this MTW activity. Both groups have five year time limited vouchers, however, the fashion in which the rent is calculated varies. The control group uses the standard HUD rent calculation requirement while the rent for the study group is based on a predetermined TTP schedule.

In order to assist Rent Reform Study participants in achieving their self-sufficiency goals, RHA's FSS Coordinators meet with each family annually, at minimum, to develop their Individual Training and Service Plans (ITSPs). The FSS Coordinators offer Rent Reform participants assistance and outreach services through the FSS Lite Program.

As of June 30, 2017, FSS staff met with 137 Rent Reform Study participants; 91 of whom have signed FSS Lite agreements. With signed FSS Lite agreements and ITSPs in place, Rent Reform families are able to take advantage of everything the FSS Lite Program has to offer, including the Self-Sufficiency Fund. The $50,000 Self-Sufficiency Fund was established in FY 2015 using MTW single fund flexibility and provides assistance to all FSS Lite participants in overcoming some of the most common barriers hindering self-sufficiency. To add a further incentive for FSS Lite Program participants, RHA also established one time and/or ongoing rent credits in its FY 2017 MTW Annual Plan.

A questionnaire continues to be administered to Mobility Demonstration and Rent Reform Controlled Study participants annually to provide RHA and UNR with the data needed to evaluate the overall progress of these families. Examples of some of the information residents provide include family history, education and income, transportation, and neighborhood satisfaction. The University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) continues to document initial values and annual outcomes for program participants.

RHA remains committed to continuing to utilize the flexibilities available through MTW in ways that will expand housing choice, streamline agency operations and develop creative affordable housing solutions that meet the needs of low-income families in our community. New initiatives that will further the MTW statutory objectives and RHA's long-term goals and objectives are always explored.

Non-MTW goals and objectives

In addition to its planned short-term and long-term goals and objectives, RHA adopted a strategic plan, updated the five year plan for capital improvement expenditures, and continued to integrate a new software system to better manage all of the agency's operations.

Section Two

GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION

2

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

Throughout FY 2017, RHA served 3,273 households through its PH and HCV programs of which 357 households moved off for various reasons. Overall, this included 2,599 children, 1,860 people with disabilities and 1,259 elderly household members. At the end of FY 2017, the average income for households living in or having moved out of RHA's PH complexes was $15,550 and 63.6% of these households had annual incomes at or below 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). Similarly, the average income for households living with or having moved off of RHA's HCV program was $13,887 and 69.76% of these households had annual incomes at or below 30% of the AMI.

The following table shows demographic information for both PH residents and HCV participants as of June 30, 2017. The table includes current residents/participants as well as those who moved off of assistance throughout the course of the fiscal year. The table excludes households assisted through the VASH program.

Demographics of RHA Assisted Households in FY 2017				
	PH residents		**HCV participants**	
Total # households served	849	100%	2,424	100%
Income Level				
Extremely Low Income	540	63.60%	1,691	69.76%
Very Low Income	224	26.38%	582	24.01%
Low Income	64	7.54%	132	5.45%
Above Low Income	21	2.47%	19	0.78%
Family Type				
Elderly Disabled	149	17.55%	532	21.95%
Elderly Non-Disabled	126	14.84%	352	14.52%
Non-Elderly Disabled	184	21.67%	726	29.95%
Non-Elderly Non-Disabled	390	45.94%	814	33.58%
Race of Head of Household				
White	664	78.21%	1,929	79.58%
Black/African American	94	11.07%	354	14.60%
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	3.06%	53	2.19%
Asian	54	6.36%	75	3.09%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	11	1.30%	13	0.54%
Ethnicity of Head of Household				
Hispanic or Latino	244	28.74%	422	17.41%
Not Hispanic or Latino	605	71.26%	2,002	82.59%

A. Housing Stock Information

The following tables provide an overview of RHA's housing stock as of June 30, 2017.

New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year			
Property Name	**Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based ***	**Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based**	**Description of Project**
Mobility Demonstration & Opportunity properties	4	1	PH residents in good standing are being given the opportunity to move to RHA's scattered site rental properties on a two-year PBV. Additional PBVs will be assigned as properties are acquired or repurposed from other RHA programs.
Single Family Home Project Based Vouchers	5	3	RHA acquired many single family homes under NSP2 and other programs. RHA plans to assign additional PBVs as properties are acquired or become vacant.
Yorkshire Terrace	4	5	RHA is assigning PBVs to units in RHA's LIHTC project at Yorkshire Terrace. Through activity 2015-03, PBVs may be assigned to up to 100% of these units.
Partnerships	10	1	RHA is working with local community nonprofits to provide affordable housing while the nonprofit groups provide supportive services.
Privately owned properties	40	25	RHA will allocate PBVs to privately owned properties, through a competitive process in exchange for their commitment to provide affordable housing to individuals and/or families who are experiencing homelessness.

Anticipated Total # of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Total # of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Anticipated Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year *	Anticipated Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
		147	147

	63	35	Actual Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	Actual Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
			108	70

* From RHA's FY 2017 Annual MTW Plan

Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year

RHA continues to look for single family homes, duplexes and condominiums for use with PBVs. Scattered site properties located in low poverty neighborhoods may be identified for use in RHA's Mobility Demonstration. All other properties acquired will be used to provide additional housing choices for low-income families and individuals through RHA's opportunity and single family home PBVs.

Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures during the Plan Year

The CFP expenditures carried out in FY 2017 were as follows:

A. Mineral Manor:
   - CFP 2016 - tankless water heaters totaled $104,485
   - CFP 2015 - asphalt repair totaled $22,844

B. Tom Sawyer Village:
   - CFP 2014 - tankless water heaters totaled $62,902

C. Silverada Manor:
   - CFP 2013 - landscape improvements totaled $11,200
   - CFP 2016 - landscape improvements totaled $28,258

D. Essex Manor:
   - CFP 2016 - kitchen remodel totaled $24,974
   - CFP 2015 - drain line replacement totaled $36,361

E. Reno Housing Authority Main Office Building:
   - CFP 2014 - data cable replacement totaled $37,888
   - CFP 2014 - door locks totaled $22,875
   - CFP 2015 - truss reinforcement for HVAC totaled $19,553

Total expenditures for all CFP work completed during FY 2017: $371,340

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

Housing Program*	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Tax-Credit	30	Yorkshire Terrace is a LIHTC property which was fully conveyed to RHA from the limited partners on August 27, 2012. Several of these units have been assigned PBVs.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	16	Silver Sage Court is affordable housing for the elderly/disabled. The property was constructed using LIHTC and HOME funds through a joint venture agreement with Silver Sage Manor, Inc. The joint venture agreement was dissolved in 2014 after RHA paid off the remaining HOME loan balance.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	58	Sarrazin Arms Apartments was purchased by RHA in 1992; the down payment was funded through HOME funds.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	4	D&K Horizons was constructed in 1998 using HUD grant funds.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	164	RHA purchased several scattered site properties between November 25, 2008 and June 30, 2015 using NSP1, NSP2, and EDI grant funds, RHA funds, and HUD's Good Neighbor Program. Several of these properties have been assigned PBVs.
Locally Funded	156	Ala Moana Apartments was purchased by RHA in 1996 and funded by bonds.
Locally Funded	6	Carville Court was purchased in 1997 through a foreclosure sale. It is family housing.
Locally Funded	12	Colonial Court was purchased in 2008. It is family housing.
Locally Funded	34	Idlewild Apartments was a foreclosed bank owned property purchased by RHA in 2012. It is family housing. Several of these units have been assigned PBVs.
Locally Funded	16	Prater Way Apartments was a foreclosed bank owned property purchased by RHA in 2014. It is family housing.
Other (1)	7	Pilgrim Rest is owned by Pilgrim Rest Baptist Church and managed by RHA. It is affordable housing for the elderly/disabled.
Other (2)	7	Scattered site properties donated to RHA.
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	**510**	

If Other, please describe:	Other (1) refers to a property owned by a non-PH entity and managed by RHA. Other (2) refers to properties which were donated to RHA.

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

B. Leasing Information

Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served* Planned	Number of Households Served* Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	0
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	**0**	**0**

* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.

** In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.

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

RHA did not have anyone occupy or lease units through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs.

*** In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.

**** Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.

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

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory objective of "assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families" is being achieved by examining Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher family characteristics as submitted into the PIC or its successor system utilizing current resident data at the end of the agency's fiscal year. The PHA will provide information on local, non-traditional families provided with housing assistance at the end of the PHA fiscal year, not reported in PIC or its successor system, in the following format:

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017[1]	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	**0**	N/A
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	**0**	N/A
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	**0**	N/A

[1] RHA is not providing any housing assistance that is not reported in PIC.

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

In order to demonstrate that the statutory objective of "maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration" is being achieved, the PHA will provide information in the following formats:

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied # of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized # of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes*	Baseline # of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	284	1,307	0	1,591	50.56%
2 Person	207	433	0	640	20.34%
3 Person	115	290	0	405	12.87%
4 Person	76	192	0	268	8.52%
5 Person	40	107	0	147	4.67%
6+ Person	23	73	0	96	3.05%
Totals	**745**	**2,402**	**0**	**3,147**	**100%**

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized	**No baseline adjustments.**

* "Non-MTW adjustments to the distribution of family sizes" are defined as factors that are outside the control of the PHA. Acceptable "non-MTW adjustments" include, but are not limited to, demographic changes in the community's population. If the PHA includes non-MTW adjustments, HUD expects the explanations of the factors to be thorough and to include information substantiating the numbers used.

The following table reflects the current mix of family sizes served on June 30, 2017. It does not include those households who moved off of the program during the course of FY 2017.

Mix of Family Sizes Served							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	**Totals**
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained*	50.56%	20.34%	12.87%	8.52%	4.67%	3.05%	**100%**
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year**	1,614	535	288	252	145	82	**2,916**
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year***	55.35%	18.35%	9.88%	8.64%	4.97%	2.81%	**100%**
Percentage Change	4.79%	-1.99%	-2.99%	0.12%	0.30%	-0.24%	**0**

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages	RHA did not experience any family size variations of over 5% from the baseline percentages in FY 2017.

* The numbers in this row are the same numbers in the previous "Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served" chart listed under the column "Baseline percentages of family sizes to be maintained."

** The methodology used to obtain these figures will be the same methodology used to determine the "Occupied number of Public Housing units by family size when PHA entered MTW" and "Utilized number of Section 8 Vouchers by family size when PHA entered MTW" in the table immediately above.

*** The "Percentages of families served by family size this fiscal year" will reflect adjustments to the mix of families served that are directly due to decisions the PHA has made. HUD expects that in the course of the demonstration, PHAs will make decisions that may alter the number of families served.

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

Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
Public Housing	RHA's Asset Management experienced an increase in vacancies coupled with longer leasing times at some of its PH family sites. Leasing issues were due in part to particular preferences being requested, which if not provided, often resulted in the tenant's refusal to lease the unit. Some of these preferences include the size of the unit, the location of the property or the lack of desired amenities. Compounding the longer leasing times are the normal vacancy issues that delay a turn of the unit including tenant damage and disposal of personal property in accordance with NRS. RHA continues to select applicants off of the wait list on the basis of preferences as set forth in the Admissions and Continued Occupancy (ACOP) for Public Housing for referral to vacant PH units. To help facilitate the processing of additional applicants and ultimately increase the number of referrals to these units, all PH waiting lists were opened on May 17, 2016. The waiting list remained open until May 6, 2017.
Housing Choice Vouchers	Reno, Sparks and Washoe County have experience a strengthening local housing market due in part to announcements of major expansions and relocations by several companies to the region. A tightening rental market has resulted in HCV participants having a difficult time finding and leasing units. RHA is working to strengthen relationships with landlords in an effort to try and increase lease up numbers, but with limited inventory and a population influx, the need for additional affordable housing has grown significantly. RHA continues to see the increased wariness of private landlords to rent to HCV participants. This is often made worse by the ongoing stigma within the local community regarding HCV participants and affordable multifamily properties in general. In response to the decline in the number of landlords willing to rent to HCV program participants, RHA adjusted its payment standards and conducted a survey of current HCV landlords to explore possible incentives to increase their participation. Based on survey results, RHA received approval for a Landlord Incentive Program in its FY 2018 MTW Annual Plan and continues to explore ways that this program may be expanded on.

In FY 2017, RHA staff began reviewing the agency's definition of self-sufficiency and whether or not it accurately captured whether or not a household was considered self-sufficient. After deliberation, RHA staff decided that moving forward, the agency will begin to look at self-sufficiency in two phases. The first phase occurs as household members maintain consistent employment for 12 months or when a reduction in subsidy results in the household being responsible for more than 50% of the rent. The final phase of self-sufficiency occurs automatically once the household is no longer receiving assistance or when the household voluntarily ends participation.

Throughout FY 2017, a total of 120 families voluntarily moved-off of the HCV program, 16 were determined no longer eligible due to increased income in the HCV program and 51 families voluntarily moved-off of the PH program.

The table below reflects only those households who (1) were affected by one of RHA's implemented MTW activities and (2) who meet RHA's definition of self-sufficiency as it relates to earned income.

Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End

Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned*	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Mobility Demonstration / 2014-02	2	RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient.
Rent Reform Controlled Study / 2014-03	22	
Expand self-sufficiency activities / 2014-04	21	
Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent / 2014-05	9	
Required savings plan for Earned Income Disallowance (EID) PH residents / 2015-04	2	
Disregard earned income of PH household members, age 18-20, who are not the head of household, co-head or spouse / 2016-06	6	

Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	18
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY	**44**

* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.

C. Wait List Information

The following table reflects RHA's wait list information as of July 31, 2017.

Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program(s)*	Wait List Type**	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community-Wide Family Public Housing	1,475	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site-Based Stead Manor Family Public Housing	650	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community-Wide Elderly and Disabled Housing	1,120	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide	1,799	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide Mod Rehab and SRO[2]	14	Closed	No
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units	Site-Based Project-based units owned by RHA	1,333	Closed	Yes

* *Select Housing Program:* Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program; Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units; Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.

** *Select Wait List Types:* Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described in the Rules for Program Participation), None (If the Program is a New Wait List, Not an Existing Wait List), or Other (Please Provide a Brief Description of this Wait List Type).

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

[2] This is per HUD's direction as Mod Rehab is not HCV.

If Partially Open Wait List, please describe:
N/A

If Local, Non-Traditional Housing Program, please describe:
N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:
N/A

If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative detailing these changes.
There are no changes to the organization structure of the wait list, however, Activity 2016-02 (Redefine near-elderly person) has been implemented. Applicants who are at least 55 years of age but below the age of 62, are now treated as "elderly" and allowed to be placed on RHA's Community-Wide Elderly and Disabled Housing wait list.

Section Three

PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES

3

III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested

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

Section Four

APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES

4

IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

A. Implemented Activities

The activities discussed in this section have been previously approved by HUD and implemented by RHA. The following table provides an overview of all approved MTW activities including the year it was implemented, the primary statutory objective(s) the activity is intended to impact and the authorization(s) cited.

Approved/Implemented MTW Activities				
Activity #	**Fiscal Year Implemented**	**Activity Name**	**Statutory Objective(s)**	**Authorization(s)**
2017-01	2017	Increase verified application data for HCV applicants	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.3.a.
2017-02	2017	Asset threshold to determine eligibility for admission	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Sections C.2., D.3.a., D.3.b., and D.4.
2016-01	2016	Simplification of medical deductions	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.11. and D.2.a.
2016-02	2016	Redefine near-elderly person	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Section C.2.
2016-04	2016	Allow HCV participants to lease units that exceed the 40% rent burden	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Section D.2.a.
2016-05	2016	Eliminate Earned Income Disallowance (EID)	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.11. and D.2.a.
2016-06	2016	Disregard earned income of PH household members, age 18-20, who are not the head of household or co-head	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section C.11.
2016-07	2016	Implement a $75 fee for each additional HQS inspection when more than two inspections are required	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.1.a.

Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	Activity Name	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
2016-08	2016	Expand Project Based Voucher Program	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C D.1.e. and D.4.
2015-01	2015	Elimination of all negative rents and simplification of HCV utility allowances	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections D.2.a. and C.11.
2015-02	2015	Allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.9.a. and D.5.
2015-03	2015	Assign PBVs to up to 100% of units in non-Public Housing RHA-owned properties	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness *and* increase housing choices for low-income families.	Attachment C Sections D.1.e., D.7., and D.7.a.
2015-04	2015	Required savings plan for Earned Income Disallowance (EID) PH residents	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section E.
2014-01	2014	Assign PBVs to RHA owned/controlled units without competitive process	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections D.2.b. and D.7.a.
2014-02	2014	Mobility Demonstration	Increase housing choices for low-income families *and* create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Sections D.1.b., D.4., D.7.a., and E.
2014-03	2014	Rent Reform Controlled Study	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work *and* reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections D.1.b., D.1.c., D. 2. a., and D.4.
2014-04	2014	Expand self-sufficiency activities	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section E.
2014-05	2014	Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.4., C.11, D.2.a., and D.3.b.

Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	Activity Name	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
2014-06	2014	Triennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.4. and D.1.c.
2014-08	2014	Partner with local nonprofit to provide special needs housing	Increase housing choices for low-income families *and* create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Sections B.4., D.1.b., and D.7.a.

2017-01: Increase verified application data for HCV applicants

Description:
RHA's Section 8 Administrative Plan and federal regulations require information submitted by each applicant to be verified for accuracy as this data is ultimately used to determine program eligibility, priority status, voucher size and the amount of HAP to be paid to the landlord. Per 24 CFR §982.201(e), RHA must receive information verifying that an applicant is eligible for the HCV program within the period of 60 days prior to the issuance of a voucher. Information that is subject to change, which was verified more than 60 days prior, must be re-verified prior to the certification of the applicant's file. If there is a delay after the file has been referred to the HCV program that causes the voucher to not be issued within 60 days, the voucher is suspended and the information is re-verified. If changes are reported after the file has been referred, but the changes took place prior to the issuance of a voucher, the file is referred back to Admissions staff to obtain written verification and determination as to whether or not the changes have any effect on eligibility, rent or unit size.

The amount of time RHA staff spend following up and tracking third party verification requests is significant and often results in information that is no more reliable than the documents provided by the applicants directly. To streamline the admissions process, reduce the amount of time required by staff, and decrease the time necessary to build a qualified applicant pool, RHA extended the length of time that all verified application data related to income is deemed valid for the HCV program to 120 days. Furthermore, stable income verifications, such as pensions and Social Security award letters, are now valid for all applicants for the curation of the current year.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by reducing the amount of duplicative work needed to re-verify applicant information that was previously deemed true and complete.

Implementation year:
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2017.

Status/schedule update:
This activity is ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Prior to implementation of this activity, RHA staff were sending out approximately 2,772 third party verifications for admission on an annual basis. Through implementation of this activity, the process has become streamlined and the number of verifications has been reduced by nearly 34% to 1,848. Allowing stable income verifications to be valid for current year rather than requiring applicants to obtain additional social security award letters or pension statements every 60 days has also helped to expedite applicants through the admissions process.

The following table reflects costs incurred by RHA for each verification for admission in FY 2017:

Cost for Processing Admission Verifications			
	Material	Time	Labor
Cost for Housing Specialist		.17 hrs @ $19.87 per hr.	$3.38
Cost for Office Clerk	$1.48	.23 hrs @ $17.52 per hr.	$4.03
Totals	$1.48		$7.41
		Total Cost per Verification:	**$8.89**

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To increase the length of time that verified application data is valid, section D.3.a. was cited and approved for this activity. The authorization allows RHA to increase the length of time that verified application data is considered valid within the HCV program.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2017-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars.	$24,643 (2,772*8.89 = 24,643.08)	$18,483	$16,429 (1,848*8.89 = 16,428.72)	Yes

2017-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours.	1,108.8 hours (2,772 * 0.17 = 471.24) (2,772 * 0.23 = 637.56) (471.24+637.56=1,108.80)	831.8 hours	739.2 hours (1,848 * 0.17 = 314.16) (1,848 * 0.23 = 425.04) (314.16 + 425.04 = 739.20)	Yes

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
Implementation of this activity has doubled the length of time that verified application data related to income is deemed valid from 60 days to 120 days within the HCV program. Benchmarks for this this activity were based on a decrease of approximately 25% in agency costs and time savings. In FY 2017, both the agency cost savings (*2017-01 CE #1*) and staff time savings (*2017-01 CE #2*) saw a decrease of 33.33%.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
The baselines and benchmarks for this activity's metrics were not identified or established in RHAs' FY 2017 MTW Annual Plan. RHA staff tracked the number of verifications and file referrals over the course of several months in order to accurately measure what the baseline and benchmark should be. Each of the baselines and benchmarks noted above were established by using the average number of file referrals based on three months of tracked data.

There are no additional changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2017-02: Asset threshold to determine eligibility for admission

Description:
Pursuant to 24 CFR §5.609, annual income is defined to include amounts derived (during the 12-month period) from assets to which any member of the family has access. Income resulting from any assets held by the family must be calculated and included when determining program eligibility and rent portions. Under HUD's current guidelines, there is no limit on the amount of assets a family may have access to prior to determination of eligibility.

In order to serve applicants with the greatest financial need, RHA established an asset threshold when determining initial eligibility for admission to its housing programs. If an applicant has combined assets with a cash value of more than $50,000, or ownership interest in a suitable dwelling unit that they have a legal right to reside in, they are now determined ineligible.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Increase housing choices for low-income families with limited financial resources.

Implementation year:
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2017.

Status/schedule update:
This activity is ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
In FY 2017, two applicants were withdrawn from the waitlist following implementation of this activity as both had ownership interest in a suitable dwelling unit.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To establish an asset threshold to determine eligibility to RHA's housing programs, sections C.2., D.3.a., D.3.b. and D.4. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to establish an asset threshold to determine eligibility through the creation of admission policies that differ from current mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metric was identified and tracked for this activity.

2017-02 HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average applicant time on wait list.	15.45 months	15.45 months	17.33 months	No

Comparison of Outcomes to Baseline and Benchmark:
There are several factors that influence the length of time an applicant will remain on the wait list which should be noted including, but not limited to, sequestration, local preferences, and the closure of the wait list. Due to these factors, it is nearly impossible to determine whether the length of time an applicant remains on the wait list has decreased as a direct result of this activity.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2016-01: Simplification of medical deductions

Description:
Under HUD regulations (24 CFR §5.611), if the head, co-head/spouse, or sole member of an applicant household is elderly (62 years of age or older) or disabled, the entire household may claim, as a deduction, medical expenses that are in excess of three percent (3%) of their annual income as long as the expenses are not compensated for or covered by insurance. As all deductions from income must be verified, gathering the required documentation often results in a substantial amount of time spent by households wanting to claim the deduction and, in many cases, the required documentation may include private information that some would rather not share.

Rather than use third party verifications and require residents to provide receipts showing out of pocket medical expenses, RHA established the following seven simplified medical deductions based entirely on the household's gross income:

Simplified Medical Deductions	
Gross Annual Income Range	Annual Medical Deduction
$1 - $5,499	$20
$5,500 - $7,199	$150
$7,200 - $10,899	$175
$10,900 - $14,499	$450
$14,500 - $16,999	$750
$17,000 - $20,699	$1,050
$20,700+	$1,200

Implementation of this activity resulted in the process becoming streamlined for RHA staff and the policy becoming easier for PH residents and HCV participants to understand. Initially, RHA anticipated an overall cost savings to the agency due to the amount of staff time being spent to verify all medical deductions becoming significantly reduced.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by reducing the amount of time staff spend verifying all medical deductions claimed during HCV and PH recertifications.

Implementation year:
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Status/schedule update:
Following HUD's approval of RHA's FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan on August 25, 2015, RHA began implementing the simplified medical deductions in the PH and HCV programs. These deductions became effective for all elderly and/or disabled households with annual recertifications occurring on or after January 1, 2016.

The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
On January 1, 2016, RHA began applying the simplified medical deductions to all PH and HCV elderly and disabled households regardless of whether or not their portion of total medical expenses exceeded 3% of their annual income. This resulted in a reduction in the number of verifications required, a simplified process for both staff and residents, and a decrease in overall administrative costs. However, RHA's rental revenue within PH and the amount of tenant contribution to rent within HCV continues to experience a significant decrease rather than the anticipated increase.

Prior to implementation, RHA incurred the following amount of time and cost on each medical expense verification:

Time and cost incurred for processing Medical Deductions per household							
PH program				**HCV program**			
	Material	Time	Labor		Material	Time	Labor
Cost for Asset/ Assistant Manager	$4.19	1.05 hrs @ $22.39 per hr *	$23.51	Cost For Housing Specialist		.325 hrs @ $18.33 per hr **	$5.96
				Cost for Office Clerk	$4.19	.73 hrs @ $16.62 per hr ***	$12.13
Total	$4.19		$23.51	Total	$4.19		$18.09
	Total Cost per Client:		**$27.70**		**Total Cost per Client:**		**$22.28**

* Hourly rate based on average Asset Manager salary ($20.41-$28.72/hr) and Assistant Asset Manager salary ($16.79-$23.63/hr)

** Hourly rate based on average Housing Specialist salary ($15.23-$21.43/hr)

*** Hourly rate based on average General Office Clerk salary ($13.81-$19.43/hr)

As of June 30, 2017, 412 PH residents and 1,420 HCV participants were receiving the simplified medical deduction with a few errors noted in both programs. However, the number of households receiving the simplified medical deduction within each program fluctuates continuously as PH residents and HCV participants move on and off of the two programs.

PH residents as of June 30, 2017				
Gross Annual Income Range	**# receiving simplified deduction**	**# claiming actual medical expense**	**Simplified Deduction Cost**	
			Per household/ per month	**Per month for all households**
1 - $5,499	10	0	$0.50	$5
$5,500 - $7,199	5	0	$3.75	$18.75
$7,200 - $10,899	157	0	$4.38	$686.88
$10,900 - $14,499	95	0	$11.25	$1,068.75
$14,500 - $16,999	43	1	$18.75	$806.25
$17,000 - $20,699	42	0	$26.25	$1,102.50
$20,700+	60	0	$30	$1,800

HCV residents as of June 30, 2017				
Gross Annual Income Range	# receiving simplified deduction	# claiming actual medical expense	Simplified Deduction Cost	
			Per household/ per month	Per month for all households
1 - $5,499	26	0	$0.50	$13
$5,500 - $7,199	10	0	$3.75	$37.50
$7,200 - $10,899	626	0	$4.38	$2,738.75
$10,900 - $14,499	357	2	$11.25	$4,016.25
$14,500 - $16,999	149	0	$18.75	$2,793.75
$17,000 - $20,699	132	0	$26.25	$3,465
$20,700+	120	2	$30	$3,570

Hardship policy:
In the event a participant wishes to have their portion of rent calculated based on unreimbursed medical expenses contrary to this activity, they must request a hardship. RHA has established a three person committee to review all requests for hardship; however, in order to be considered for a hardship and referred to the committee, participants must meet the following criteria: (1) household's monthly rent is no less than RHA's established minimum rent, and (2) third party documentation must be provided detailing all anticipated medical expenses including monetary amounts and frequency. Once submitted, the three person committee will review all of the detailed expenses provided and determine whether a hardship is warranted. If any part of the established criteria is not met, a hardship will not be granted.

Hardship requests:
During FY 2017, RHA received 40 hardship requests due to the implementation of this activity. These included one PH resident, two applicants for admission and 37 HCV participants. Each of the hardship requests were forwarded to the three person hardship committee for review. Upon consideration of all of the documentation provided by the requestors, eight of the hardship requests were granted, two were sent back for further information and 30 were denied. As of June 30, 2017, five households were continuing to receive a deduction based on actual medical expenses.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
With the announcement of an increase in Medicare premiums for 2017, staff began to review the seven income tiers established through this activity to determine their overall viability for program participants. After discussions with staff, PH residents and HCV participants, RHA amended this activity to restructure and further simplify the income tiers and associated deductions.

Following HUD's approval of RHA's FY 2018 MTW Annual Plan, the following amended income tiers/deductions will be implemented as of January 1, 2018:

Simplified Medical Deductions (to be implemented as of January 1, 2018)	
Gross Annual Income Range	Annual Medical Deduction
$1 - $12,199	$0
$12,200 - $16,289	$1,425
$16,290 +	$2,530

These income tiers and related deductions are based on income guidelines provided by the State Health Insurance Assistance Program (SHIP) in relation to 2017 Medicare coverage. In reviewing the data provided, staff's assumption is that participants within the first income tier will have their Medicare premiums, co-pays and deductions completely covered throughout the year. While unreimbursed prescription costs may be incurred by some, those costs will likely not exceed the percentage of annual income that must be met prior to receiving the medical deduction based on HUD's formula.

Upon the initial implementation of this activity on January 1, 2016, all elderly/disabled households began receiving the simplified deduction regardless of whether or not the household actually incurred any medical expense. To assist in alleviating some of the costs associated with this activity, RHA will soon require participants to self-certify that actual medical expenses are being incurred by the household prior to the simplified deduction being given. Implementation of the amended income tiers/deductions and the self-certification of actual expenses incurred will be required of all elderly and/or disabled households beginning with annual recertifications occurring on or after January 1, 2018.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

In order to simplify medical deductions for all elderly and disabled PH residents and HCV participants based on the household's gross income, sections C.11. and D.2.a. were cited and approved for this activity. The authorizations enable RHA to adopt and implement reasonable policies for calculating rents that differ from those in current statutes or regulations.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2016-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[3]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Costs associated with PH program calculations.	$5,040 (15.17*27.70 = 420.21) (420*12 = 5,040)	$0	$0	Yes

[3] Prior to implementation, medical deductions were verified for approximately 15.17 PH households and 76.34 HCV households per month. As reflected in the table titled "Time and cost incurred for processing Medical Deductions per household," baseline costs were estimated based on a total cost per client of $27.70 per PH verification and $22.28 for each HCV verification (see page 36).

Costs associated with HCV program calculations.	$20,412 (76.34*22.28 = 1,700.86) (1,701*12 = 20,412)	$0	$201[4] (9*22.28 = 200.52)	No

2016-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[5]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Hours associated with PH program calculations.	191.14 hours PH Asset Managers/ Assistant Managers: (15.17*1.05 = 15.9285) (15.9285*12 = 191.142)	0 hours	0 hours	Yes
Hours associated with HCV program calculations.	966.47 hours Housing Specialists: (76.34*0.325 = 24.8105) (24.8105*12 = 297.726) Office Clerks: (76.34*0.73 = 55.7282) (55.7282*12 = 668.738) Combined hours spent: (297.73+668.74 = 966.47)	0 hours	9.50 hours Housing Specialists: (9*0.325 = 2.925) Office Clerks: (9*0.73 = 6.57) Combined hours spent: (2.925+6.57 = 9.495)	No

2016-01 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average error rate in completing task as a percentage (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[6]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome[7]**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rate associated with PH program calculations.	2%	0%	2% 7 of the 420 households were found to contain errors.	No

4 All HCV participants have transitioned to RHA's simplified medical deduction. Medical deductions were verified for six HCV participants approved by the hardship committee and one HCV household where additional committee approval is not required unless the family composition or circumstances change. Verification was also initiated for two additional households who received approval from the hardship committee on June 28, 2017.

5 PH Asset Managers/Assistant Managers spend approximately 1.05 hours per PH verification. Within the HCV program, each verification took Housing Specialists .325 hours and Office Clerks .73 hours.

6 RHA staff routinely conduct audits on PH tenant and HCV participant files to identify errors based on the number of variables used to calculate rent. Out of 225 audits conducted on PH tenant files, six were found to contain errors related to the calculation of medical deductions. Similarly, out of 72 audits conducted on HCV participant files, four were found to contain errors.

7 All of the households identified as receiving the incorrect medical deduction have been reviewed and corrected. They are now receiving the correct simplified medical deduction based on the household's gross income.

Rate associated with HCV program calculations.	5%	0%	3% 38 of 1,462 households were found to contain errors.	No

2016-01 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**[8]	**Outcome**[9]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue associated with PH program.	$0	$11,221 (308*3.036 = 935.08) (935.08*12 = 11,221)	($63,586) (1*218.66 = 218.66) (412*-13.554 = -5,584.07) (-5,584+219 = -5,365.41) (-5,365*12 = -64,384.92) (64,385-799 = 63,586)	No
Rental revenue associated with HCV program.	$0	$8,765 (1,094*.6677 = 730.46) (730.46*12 = 8,765)	($226,182) (4*63.67= 254.66) (1,420*-13.554 = -19,246) (-19,246+255= -18,991) (-18,991 *12 = -227,897) (227,897-1,714 = 226,182)	No

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
Throughout FY 2017, this activity affected 450 PH residents and 1,601 HCV participants, of which 169 have since moved off of assistance. The outcomes reported under this metric include only those families who were housed as of June 30, 2017. This included 420 PH residents of which 412 are receiving the correct simplified medical deduction, seven are receiving the incorrect deduction amount and one who was approved for a hardship. Similarly, 1,462 HCV participants of which 1,420 are receiving the correct simplified medical deduction, 38 are receiving incorrect deduction amount and four who have been approved for a hardship.

HUD approved RHA's FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan on August 25, 2015. Following HUD's approval and proper notification, RHA began implementing this activity with annual recertifications on or after January 1, 2016. As of June 30, 2017, all of the eligible PH residents and HCV participants have been transitioned to the simplified deduction. Although RHA met the benchmarks for the PH program, it did not meet the benchmarks set for HCV program (*2016-01 CE#1* and

8 Previously, RHA estimated that 308 PH residents will have their rent increased by an average of $3.04 per month, increasing PH rental revenue by $11,221 after implementation. Likewise, 1,094 HCV participants will have their portion of the rent increased by $0.67 per month, an increase in annual tenant contribution to rent of $8,765.

9 As of June 30, 2017, all PH residents and HCV participants were receiving the simplified medical deduction, except five households who were approved for a hardship. Analysis has shown that when comparing the overall cost for all households currently on the simplified medical deduction and those who are claiming the actual out of pocket medical expense due to a hardship, RHA incurred a loss of rental revenue of $13.16 per PH household per month and a loss of tenant contribution to rent of $11.83 per HCV household per month.

2016-01 CE#2). This is entirely due to the fact that nine households were approved for a medical hardship during FY 2017 and all eligible medical expenses related to the hardship were verified.

Implementation of this activity has not increased RHA's rental revenue as was anticipated when this activity was proposed (*2016-01 CE#5*), but rather it has resulted in a loss. As previously reported in the FY 2016 MTW Annual Report, RHA originally anticipated that this activity would affect approximately 308 PH residents and 1,094 HCV participants, however, upon further review it was discovered that several households were omitted from the baseline data during initial analysis. Realizing the overall loss of rental revenue and tenant contribution to rent that this activity is having on the agency, RHA amended this activity in the FY 2018 MTW Annual Plan. This amendment not only revises the income tiers and related deductions, but also requires households to self-certify that they do in fact have an ongoing medical expense rather than allowing each household to receive the deduction automatically.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
RHA's investment in a new software system is expected to provide increased efficiencies in operations, allow the agency to meet all of its federal reporting requirements and, over time, allow for easy tracking and monitoring of RHA's MTW activities. Ongoing tracking of this activity will be carried out in this new system.

2016-02: Redefine near-elderly person

Description:
24 CFR §945.105 defines a near-elderly person as a person who is at least 50 years of age but below the age of 62, who may be a person with a disability. Furthermore, the term near-elderly family includes two or more near-elderly persons living together, and one or more near-elderly persons living with one or more persons who are determined to be essential to the care of well-being of the near-elderly person or persons.

In FY 2016, RHA changed the definition of near-elderly for its PH program to limit it to persons who are at least 55 years of age but below the age of 62. These newly defined households are treated as "elderly" to allow for their admission from the waiting list to one of RHA's senior PH complexes. RHA anticipates that this activity will increase the number of eligible families for referral to these PH units without raising concerns with current residents regarding potential lifestyle conflicts.

Implementation of this policy change does not qualify the near-elderly family for the Elderly/Disabled Allowance, triennial recertification schedule or Simplified Medical Deduction.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Increase housing choices for low-income families by allowing RHA to change the definition of near-elderly for its Public Housing Program only and allowing RHA to treat these newly defined households as "Elderly" for admission to one of RHA's senior Public Housing complexes.

Implementation year:
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Status/schedule update:
RHA began implementing this activity with the opening of the wait list on May 17, 2016; the activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Since the implementation of this activity, 155 near elderly persons/families have been able to apply for RHA's senior PH complexes.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To develop and adopt policies and procedures for admission to RHA's senior PH complexes that differ from those in current regulations, section C.2. was cited and approved for this activity. The authorization allows RHA to change the definition of near-elderly within its PH program and treat these households as "elderly" to allow for their admission to one of RHA's senior PH complexes.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2016-02 HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Households who would lose assistance or need to move.	0	0	0	Yes

2016-02 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of near-elderly households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity.	0	0	0	Yes

2016-02 RHA Local Metric: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Number of housing units made available to households at or below 80% AMI.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**[10]	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of housing units made available to near-elderly households at or below 80% AMI.	0	17 New housing units made available: 55*0.30 = 16.5	8 New housing units made available: 27*0.30 = 1.8	No

[10] During CY 2014, RHA experienced 55 vacancies within its three senior PH complexes. The benchmark for this activity was established assuming that approximately 30% of these vacancies could have been offered/leased to near-elderly households.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
Implementation of this activity has not caused displacement or increased resident mobility (*2016-02 HC #4* and *2016-02 HC #5*). RHA only offers units to those applicants pulled from the PH waiting list if/when a unit becomes vacant. While there will not be an increase in resident mobility as RHA's three senior PH complexes are not located in low poverty/high opportunity neighborhoods, the affordable housing opportunities available for this population has increased.

Throughout FY 2017, RHA experienced 27 vacancies within these complexes (*2016-02 RHA Local Metric*). As the number of vacant units varies on an annual basis, RHA anticipates meeting this benchmark in future years. It is important to note that other factors, including preferences being claimed by individual applicants, will affect an applicant's wait list placement and lease up sequence.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks, and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks, and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2016-04: Allow HCV participants to lease units that exceed the 40% rent burden

Description:
Through the HCV program, rental subsidies are provided for standard-quality units that are chosen by the tenant in the private market. 24 CFR §982.508 limits tenant rent plus utilities to no more than 40% of monthly adjusted income for rent when the family first receives voucher assistance in a particular unit. However, this maximum rent burden requirement is not applicable at reexamination if the family stays in place. In many cases, tenancy is not approved because the tenant's portion of rent exceeds this maximum 40% rent burden by a relatively small amount.

In order to increase housing choices for several HCV participants, RHA began permitting these participants to lease units that exceed the 40% maximum rent burden in accordance with their individual financial circumstances. HCV participants can now choose housing that is more costly than otherwise permitted under HUD regulations as long as the initial maximum rent burden does not exceed 50% of their monthly adjusted income at the time of approving tenancy and executing a HAP contract.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Increase housing choices for low-income families by providing HCV participants with more of a choice at lease up.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved in FY 2016 and implemented beginning with vouchers issued on or after October 1, 2015.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Implementation of this activity allows HCV participants to lease units in lower poverty, higher opportunity neighborhoods with better schools and employment opportunities. It also empowers participants by allowing them to choose how they allocate their own resources.

During FY 2017, five families leased units that exceeded 40% of their monthly adjusted income including one prorated family.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To operate, adopt and implement a reasonable rent policy within RHA's HCV program that differs from current regulations, section D.2.a. was cited and approved for this activity. The authorization permits RHA to change its rent policy and allow HCV participants to lease units that exceed the 40% rent burden.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metric was identified and tracked for this activity.

2016-04 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**[11]	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity.	0	52	5	No

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
While this activity allows HCV participants to lease units that exceed 40% of monthly adjusted income, it is completely voluntary based on how participants choose to allocate their own resources. This activity is also influenced by several factors including, but not limited to, local conditions of the rental market and changes to the payment standards. Many of these factors make the number of participants taking advantage of this activity difficult to predict.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

[11] During January and February, 2014, RHA staff had 52 families who were residing in units that exceeded the 40% maximum rent burden. On average, these families had a rent burden of 58.24%.

2016-05: Eliminate Earned Income Disallowance (EID)

Description:
EID allows eligible tenants in the PH and HCV programs to increase their incomes through employment without triggering rent increases. Under HUD's guidelines (24 CFR §960.255), EID applies to a family member residing in PH whose annual income increases as a result of employment or increased earnings. Within the HCV program, EID applies to a family whose income increases as a result of employment or increased earnings of a family member who is a person with disabilities (24 CFR §5.617). The resulting income increase is fully excluded for 12 months and 50% excluded for an additional 12 months. As EID regulations are cumbersome to apply and only affected approximately three percent (3%) of the tenants in RHA's PH and HCV programs, RHA eliminated this HUD-mandated calculation of rent in FY 2016.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by saving the staff time necessary to track EID participants throughout their eligibility period.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented upon HUD's approval of the FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan on August 25, 2015. Upon approval, RHA stopped enrolling new households in EID and existing EID participants began to be phased off of the program through a transition period. During this transition, PH residents and HCV participants enrolled in EID prior to implementation of this activity were allowed to keep their benefits for one year from the date of plan approval. After this initial year, all participants will have their EID benefits eliminated upon their first annual recertification or immediately following the termination of employment income.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Throughout FY 2017, 27 individuals were enrolled in EID and benefiting from the EID calculation with only one PH resident remaining on the program on June 30, 2017. These existing/current EID participants, including those participating in the required savings plan through Activity 2015-04, have been allowed to keep their EID benefits until they transition off of the program. As of July 31, 2017, all existing EID participants will have transitioned off of the program.

RHA continued to incur the following amount of time and cost for each EID client:

Time and cost incurred for processing EID per client					
PH program – Based on cost for Asset Manager & Assistant Asset Manager			**HCV program – Based on cost for Housing Specialist**		
	Time	Labor		Time	Labor
Annual Recertification	0.8 hrs @ $22.39 per hr *	$17.91	Annual Recertification	0.8 hrs @ $18.33 per hr **	$14.66
Changes to Income (on average two changes requested per household)	1.6 hrs @ $22.39 per hr *	$35.82	Changes to Income (on average two changes requested per household)	1.6 hrs @ $18.33 per hr**	$29.33
	Total Cost per Client:	**$53.74**		**Total Cost per Client:**	**$43.99**

* Hourly rate based on average Asset Manager salary ($20.41-$28.72/hr) and Assistant Asset Manager salary ($16.79-$23.63/hr).

** Hourly rate based on average Housing Specialist salary ($15.23-$21.43/hr).

Hardship policy:
Current EID PH residents and HCV participants have been allowed to retain their benefits for a minimum of one year following plan approval. As a result, no hardship policy was established or required for this activity.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To operate, adopt and implement a reasonable rent policy for its PH and HCV programs that differs from current regulations, sections C.11. and D.2.a. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations permit RHA to implement a reasonable rent policy that can include the elimination of EID in both the PH and HCV program.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2016-05 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[12]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Costs associated with EID calculations in the PH program.	$2,553 Asset Manager & Assistant Asset Manager: 53.74*35 = 1,880.90 Regular monthly tracking: 25/60*6 = 2.5 2.5*22.39 = 55.975 55.98*12 = 671.76 Combined costs: 1,881+672 = 2,553	$2,553	$2,016 Asset Manager & Assistant Asset Manager: 53.74*20 = 1074.8 Regular monthly tracking: 20/60*6 = 2 2*22.39 = 44.78 44.78*12 = 537.36 Combined costs: 1,075+537 = 1,612	Yes
Costs associated with EID calculations in the HCV program.	$440 Housing Specialist: 43.99*10 = 440	$440	$308 Housing Specialist: 43.99*7 = 307.93	Yes

2016-05 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[13]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Hours associated with EID calculations in the PH program.	114 hours Asset Manager & Assistant Asset Manager: 35*0.8 = 28 35*1.6 = 56 2.5*12 = 30 28+56+30 = 114	114 hours	72 hours Asset Manager & Assistant Asset Manager: 20*0.8 = 16 20*1.6 = 32 2*12 = 24 16+32+24 = 72	Yes
Hours associated with EID calculations in the HCV program.	24 hours Housing Specialist: 10*0.8 = 8 10*1.6 = 16 8+16 = 24	24 hours	17 hours Housing Specialist: 7*0.8 = 5.6 7*1.6 = 11.2 6+11 = 17	Yes

[12] Based on 74 PH residents participating in EID (35 who were employed) and 25 HCV households participating in EID (10 who were employed). As reflected in the table titled "Time and cost incurred for processing EID per client" (see page 47), baselines were based on a cost of $53.74 per employed PH resident and $43.99 per employed HCV participant. Monthly tracking by six PH staff members (25 min per month) resulted in an additional cost of $55.98 per month.

[13] Based on 74 PH residents participating in EID (35 who were employed) and 25 HCV households participating in EID (10 who were employed). As reflected in the table titled "Time and cost incurred for processing EID per client" (see page 47), annual recertifications take staff 0.8 hours to complete while staff spend 1.6 hours on each change to rent calculation due to an increase in income. On average, each household also requested two changes to their rent calculation due to a change in income. Furthermore, PH staff tracked all 74 EID participants on a monthly basis. Similarly, EID rent calculations were conducted for 10 HCV households. On average, each of these households also requested two changes to their rent calculations due to a change in income.

2016-05 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[14]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Error rate associated with PH program calculations.	0%	0%	0%	Yes
Error rate associated with HCV program calculations.	0%	0%	0%	Yes

2016-05 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue associated with PH program.	$0	$28,171	$50,836	Yes
Rental revenue associated with HCV program.	$0	$4,747	$17,921[15]	Yes

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
Upon implementation of this activity, RHA stopped enrolling new households in EID and existing EID participants began to be phased off of the program through a transition period. During the transitional year, no agency cost savings or staff time savings were anticipated (*2016-05 CE #1* and *2016-05 CE #2*). All PH residents and HCV clients will have successfully transitioned off of the EID program by July 31, 2017. The increase in agency rental revenue (*2016-05 CE #5*) is a direct reflection of this income now being counted toward rent.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

---

14 Staff routinely conduct audits on tenant files to determine and identify errors based on the various variables to calculate rent in the PH and HCV programs. Out several audits conducted less than 1% have been found to contain errors associated with EID calculations within the PH program. Furthermore, the number of households enrolled in EID on the HCV program is less than 1% of the population. Both of these factors render the average error rate as negligible.

15 This is tenant contribution to rent, not an increase in rental revenue to RHA.

2016-06: Disregard earned income of PH household members, age 18-20, who are not the head of household, co-head or spouse

Description:
Current HUD regulations for the PH program require that all earned income of adult children, between the ages of 18 and 20, be factored into the household's rent. To provide an incentive to pursue employment and become economically self-sufficient, RHA revised the definition of countable income and began excluding all earned income for these young adults when determining rent for the entire household. This exclusion is only applicable if the young adult is not the head of household, co-head or spouse.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Create incentives for young adults to work, seek work, or prepare for work in order to become economically self-sufficient.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
During FY 2017, there were 39 adult children between the ages of 18-20 living in PH who were eligible to participate in this activity upon gaining employment. Of these young adults, 15 are currently employed, 16 are unemployed, and eight have moved off of the program.

Average earned income of adult children (ages 18-20) who are not the head of household or co-head	
	PH residents
Maximum Amount Earned	$30,258
Minimum Amount Earned	$536
Average Amount Earned	$11,921

Total earned income amount	
Total amount of income earned by adult children (ages 18-20) in the PH program who were not the head of household or co-head	$202,662

At the end of FY 2017, a total earned income of $202,662 was excluded due to the implementation of this activity.

As earned income for these young adults living in PH, who are not the head of household, co-head or spouse, has been completely excluded, RHA experienced a loss of $4,876 per month upon implementation. With the assumption that this remained consistent throughout the year, these PH households saved an average of $271 per month from their portion of the rent.

Hardship policy:
Although this is technically a rent reform activity, the benefit of the activity is going directly to the PH household. As a result, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To operate, adopt and implement a reasonable rent policy for its PH program that differs from current regulations, section C.11. was cited and approved for this activity. The authorization enables RHA to disregard the earned income of household members, age 18-20, who are not the head of household or co-head within the PH program.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2016-06 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars.	$0	$0	$0	Yes

2016-06 SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average earned income of adult children, ages 18-20, living in PH affected by this policy.	$11,481	$12,629	$11,921	No

2016-06 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency[16]				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	0	6	Yes

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
As income for adult children, ages 18-20, who are not the head of household, co-head or spouse has been excluded from rent calculations within the PH program, there is no increase in RHA's rental revenue (*2016-06 CE #5*). Furthermore, the average increase in household income is expected to continue to fluctuate due to the general nature of this particular age group (*2016-06 SS #1*). Several of these young adult members are expected to move out of the unit, become full-time students, etc.

While this activity was not designed to transition PH households to self-sufficiency, six have become self-sufficient based on income received from employment only (*2016-06 SS #8*). However, without the income from the young adults in the household, only one family would have become self-sufficient based on RHA's current definition.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

16 RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient. In the future, this definition will be updated to reflect RHA's updated approach to self-sufficiency.

2016-07: Implement a $75 fee for each additional HQS inspection when more than two inspections are required

Description:
RHA is required to conduct re-inspections on units that fail an HQS inspection to ensure that the owner/manager or tenant has corrected the noted violations. If the unit fails HQS, the owner/manager is notified in writing of the deficiencies and repairs that need to be made within 30 days. If the owner/manager does not take the required corrective action, RHA can abate the HAP payment beginning 30 days from the date of the first inspection until the required work is complete. Frequently, a third inspection is required to verify the completion of the noted deficiencies.

To encourage owners/managers to correct the noted violations quickly and provide RHA's clients with safer living conditions, RHA began charging the owner/manager a $75 fee for each additional HQS inspection when more than two inspections are required due to their failure to complete the necessary repairs. This fee does not remove the abatement of subsidy, but covers the administrative costs of conducting inspections.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by saving the staff time necessary to conduct more than two inspections on a single property due to the owner/manager's failure to complete the needed repairs.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
During FY 2017, RHA conducted 203 third inspections, 152 of which were due to the owner/manager's failure to correct the noted violations. As of June 30, 2017, RHA had charged four HCV landlords the third inspection fee of $75.

RHA continues to incur the following cost should a third inspection be required:

Cost incurred for third HQS inspection		
		Cost
Cost for HCV Housing Inspector	1 hr @ $24.57 per hr*	$24.57
Average roundtrip mileage per HQS inspection	15 miles @ $0.575 per mile	$8.63
	Total Cost per Inspection:	**$33.20**

* Hourly rate based on average HCV Housing Inspector salary ($20.41-$28.72)

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To allow RHA to set the term and content of HAP contracts with owners, section D.1.a. was cited and approved for this activity. The authorization enables RHA to implement a $75 fee for each additional HQS inspection when more than two inspections are required.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2016-07 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Cost to complete an HQS inspection after the second fail.	$3,353	$1,677	$5,046	No

2016-07 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Staff time to complete an HQS inspection after the second fail.	101 hours	50 hours	152 hours	No

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
During the period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017, four HCV landlord were assessed the $75 third inspection fee. As the rental market in Reno/Sparks continues to tighten, RHA does not want to burden or discourage landlord participation in the HCV program. Therefore, prior to the $75 fee being assessed, RHA staff review and consider all of the reasons a particular unit may have failed. RHA anticipates meeting these Benchmarks in the future once the rental market is less volatile. Should this activity be completely successful, the outcome for both metrics being tracked for this activity (*2016-07 CE #1* and *2016-07 CE #2*) will be zero.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2016-08: Expand Project Based Voucher Program

Description:
In FY 2016, RHA expanded its PBV program to include an allocation of up to 50 PBVs to privately owned properties in exchange for the owner's commitment to provide affordable housing to individuals and/or families who are experiencing homelessness. According to the requirements outlined in RHA's Administrative Plan, no project may set aside more than 25% of its total units for PBVs. However, depending on the size of the owner's complex, it is possible that 100% of the units within the complex will be project based. Therefore, this 25% requirement has been waived for properties applying for PBVs under this activity.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Increase housing choice for low-income families.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Status/schedule update:
On June 16, 2016, RHA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals from owners of existing affordable housing units to receive an allocation of PBVs to serve homeless individuals and/or families within the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, and Washoe County. The PBV allocation will provide suitable housing to individuals and/or families who are experiencing homelessness so that they can receive the necessary supportive services and transition to self-sufficiency.

RHA's initial plan was to allocate a minimum of 10 PBVs in the first year of implementation. With the growing homeless population in the Reno, Sparks and Washoe County community and the increasing need for affordable housing to serve this population, RHA solicited and awarded the following 25 PBVs to existing units owned by two local nonprofit housing organizations:

Project Based Homeless Property List				
Complex Name	# of units in complex	# of PBVs awarded	# of PBVs awarded per bedroom size	# leased with PBV
Lincoln Way Senior Apartments	45	5	(5) 1 bdrm	4
Aspen Village Apartments	43	2	(1) 1 bdrm (1) 2 bdrm	1
Park Manor Apartments	84	10	(10) Studio	3
Autumn Village	43	3	(2) 1 bdrm (1) 2 bdrm	2
Trembling Leaves	27	1	(1) 1 bdrm	1
Juniper Village Partners	41	3	(2) 1 bdrm (1) 2 bdrm	3
The Village at North Partners	25	1	(1) 1 bdrm	1

This activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
In FY 2017, two local nonprofit partners, Northern Nevada HOPES and Washoe County Department of Social Services, began providing all of the ongoing case management services for the homeless individuals and/or families referred to these PBV units. Each of the case managers assist RHA in conducting initial and ongoing eligibility appointments, as well as, providing assistance to the residents in filling out paperwork and gathering verification documents. All required documents are submitted to RHA for review, quality control, final determination, certification processing and HUD 50058 submission.

On November 15, 2016, the first homeless individual was housed under this activity. As of June 30, 2017, 15 of the 25 PBVs awarded were leased and occupied by an eligible family. RHA continues to work with both of the partnering agencies providing case management services and the two local housing organizations with units awarded PBVs to ensure the remaining 10 units are leased. In FY 2018, RHA plans to issue a second RFP to provide PBVs to an additional 25 privately owned units.

In the future, RHA anticipates this activity to be fully leased and 50 individuals and/or families, who were once formerly homeless, will have a permanent residence.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To determine basic operational policies and procedures within the HCV program, sections D.1.e. and D.4. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to waive the 25% per development cap for PBVs and allow for an alternate waiting list with direct referrals from applicant property owners.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2016-08 HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average time on wait list in months.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

2016-08 HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	0[17]	0	0	Yes

2016-08 RHA Local Metric: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of partnership.	0	50	15	No

2016-08 RHA Local Metric: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice as a result of partnership.	0	50	15	No

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
RHA implemented this activity on June 16, 2016 with the issuance of an RFP. As each of the applicants are referred directly from one of RHA's partnering agencies, there is no anticipated impact on RHA's wait list rendering this metric (*2016-08 HC#3*) not applicable.

[17] RHA has included a clause in the RFP for PBV assignment that specifically states that RHA will not consider proposals from owners of properties in which families or individuals are being or will be displaced.

RHA has included a clause in the RFP for PBV assignment that specifically states that RHA will not consider proposals from owners of properties in which families or individuals will be displaced. Therefore, RHA's benchmark for displacement prevention will continue to be met regardless of the number of households leased up (*2016-08 HC#4*).

RHA anticipates meeting all benchmarks once the activity is fully utilized.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2015-01: Elimination of all negative rents & simplification of HCV utility allowances

Description:
RHA's PH residents and HCV participants no longer receive negative rents due to utility allowances. Furthermore, RHA simplified the HCV utility allowances for all units by creating a flat utility allowance schedule based on four structure types and authorized voucher bedroom size.

Negative rents:
Due to HUD's rules regarding the calculation of income, PHAs may pay a utility reimbursement to the participant if the utility allowance (for tenant-paid utilities) exceeds the amount of the total tenant payment. As of December 18, 2013, less than 10% of RHA's PH residents and HCV participants were receiving utility allowance reimbursements. RHA staff reviewed each of these participants and determined that the majority of these families did have enough income to cover utilities; however, based on HUD's rules regarding calculation of income, this income was excluded and the participants received a check every month for utility reimbursement payments. Based on this information, RHA eliminated negative rents for all PH residents and HCV participants in FY 2015.

Utility allowance simplification:
Prior to FY 2015, RHA only had a simplified utility allowance schedule for designated highly energy efficient multifamily complexes. After the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan was approved, RHA simplified HCV utility allowances for all other units by creating the following flat utility allowance based on structure type and authorized voucher bedroom size.

Simplified HCV Utility Allowances					
Structure Type	**0-BR**	**1-BR**	**2-BR**	**3-BR**	**4-BR+**
EES	N/A	$56	$72	$87	$107
Apartment	$50	$70	$88	$107	$124
House/Duplex	$92	$113	$138	$162	$185
Mobile	N/A	$123	$131	$149	$162

The new allowances, as shown in the table above, are designed to cover the full cost of apartment utilities, but a lesser percentage proportionally for participants who choose single family homes, duplexes and mobile homes. This simplification is a significant change from the prior utility allowance schedule which had over 40 variables and paid based on unit bedroom size rather than voucher size. The new standardized HCV utility allowance schedule allows participants to know exactly what they will receive and encourages them to seek out energy efficient units and conserve energy and water.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by eliminating the amount spent each month on negative rents, reducing the amount of staff time needed to calculate utility allowances and encouraging participants to find a unit that matches their voucher size.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

In January of 2017, RHA contracted with The Nelrod Company to review current utility rates and usage to determine whether or not RHA's simplified utility allowance schedule was reflective of current market conditions. Based on Nelrod's review, the following utility allowances were approved by RHA's Board of Commissioners on August 22, 2017 to be effective October 1, 2017.

Simplified HCV Utility Allowances					
Structure Type	**0-BR**	**1-BR**	**2-BR**	**3-BR**	**4-BR+**
EES*	N/A	$53	$65	$67	$77
Apartment	$52	$64	$78	$105	$119
House/Duplex	$68	$75	$90	$105	$119
Mobile	N/A	$80	$88	$110	$132

*Energy Efficient System (EES) includes cooking, heating and all electrical

Impact:
Following HUD's approval of RHA's FY 2015 MTW Plan, RHA provided PH residents and HCV participants with a notice regarding the elimination of all negative rents effective October 1, 2014. There are currently no HCV participants or PH residents receiving a utility reimbursement payment.

RHA's simplified HCV utility allowance schedule became effective immediately for vouchers issued on or after August 7, 2014 and annuals and lease renewals on or after November 1, 2014. All HCV participants are receiving the simplified utility allowance. The new schedule allows HCV participants to know exactly what amount they will receive and encourages them to seek out units based on their authorized voucher size and energy efficiencies. Implementation of the simplified schedule has saved a significant amount of staff time and alleviated errors within the calculations.

Hardship policies:
<u>Elimination of all negative rents:</u> When a participant claims a hardship due to negative rent, RHA will refer them to the Financial Guidance Center (FGC) and the FSS Lite Program for assistance in managing their finances.

<u>Simplification of HCV utility allowances:</u> The utility allowances are set using current utility rates and reasonable expectations of use. RHA will not be allowing exemptions from the new utility allowances.

Hardship requests:
There have been no hardship requests related to this activity.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To allow RHA to adopt reasonable policies to calculate rent that differ from current regulations within the PH and HCV programs, sections C.11. and D.2.a. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to eliminate negative rents from the PH and HCV programs and simply the HCV utility allowance schedule.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

The following Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics relate to the elimination of negative rents:

2015-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Amount in negative rents issued to PH residents.	$13,180 Cost incurred January 2013 - December 2013	$660 5% of original cost based on probable hardship requests	$0	Yes
Amount in negative rents issued to HCV participants.	$198,785 Cost incurred January 2013 - December 2013	$9,940 5% of original cost based on probable hardship requests	$0	Yes

2015-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PH staff hours to complete task.	6 hours annually or 0.5 hours per month	0 hours	0 hours	Yes
HCV staff hours to complete task.	204 hours annually or 17 hours per month	0 hours	0 hours	Yes

The following Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics relate to the simplification of HCV utility allowances:

2015-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Cost of HCV utility allowances.	$263,371 per month[18]	$253,566 per month	$178,227 per month	Yes

2015-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Hours to calculate HCV utility allowances.	32.5 hours annually Approximate amount of time RHA staff spent calculating all utility allowances.	12 hours annually Approximate amount of time RHA staff will spend calculating all utilities under the simplified system.	10.7 hours annually	Yes

2015-01 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average error rate in completing task as a percentage (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing the HCV utility allowances.	2.6% Average error rate in 2013.	0.5%	0%	Yes

2015-01 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue after the simplification of HCV utility allowances.	$0	$117,760 Overall tenant contribution to rent will increase by $9,805 per month or $117,760 annually.	$281,485 $23,457 per month or approximately $281,485 annually.[19]	Yes

18 RHA's baseline for this Metric was estimated based on a sample of 372 HCV participants in January 2014 and assumed 100% voucher utilization with all participants receiving a utility allowance. The actual cost in October 2014 for 2,174 HCV participants who were leased up and receiving a utility allowance that month was $201,684 which in included 1,353 HCV participants who were still on the old utility allowance schedule.

19 This is overall tenant contribution to rent due to the implementation of this activity; it is not rental income to RHA.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
The elimination of negative rents has successfully been implemented in both the PH and HCV programs and continues to effectively save RHA approximately $211,965 and 210 hours of staff time (*2015-01 CE #1* and *2015-01 CE #2* as related to negative rents).

With all participants now on the simplified utility allowance schedule, the cost to the agency was $178,227 per month, a monthly savings of $23,457 (*2015-01 CE #1* as related to the simplified utility allowance). RHA has also seen a dramatic decrease in the amount of staff time required to calculate HCV utility allowances which has also decreased the error rate associated with the calculations (*2015-01 CE#2* and *2015-01 CE #3* as related to the simplified utility allowance).

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2015-02: Allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units

Description:
RHA owns a significant number of units which previously had to be inspected by third party contractors due to HUD's established rules. Under HUD's rules, a unit that is owned by the PHA that administers the HCV program (including a unit owned by an entity substantially controlled by the PHA) may not be inspected for HQS compliance by PHA staff. The PHA must obtain the services of a HUD approved independent entity to perform HQS inspections, which often results in longer lead times for a unit to become available for a tenant. In FY 2015, RHA staff began conducting inspections on all HCV and PBV units rather than using a third party contractor, regardless of ownership or property management status, including properties that are owned or managed by RHA.

RHA acknowledged that the possibility of fraud increases when PHAs are allowed to inspect their own units. To address this concern, RHA's Director of Asset Management began conducting quality control checks on the units inspected by HCV staff. These inspections are done at a rate of one unit per month or 5% of the units inspected in any particular month, whichever is greater.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by allowing RHA staff to inspect agency owned units rather than paying a contractor.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Prior to the implementation of this activity, RHA was required to hire outside inspectors to conduct all inspections on RHA owned units. RHA staff was required to accompany the inspector to each inspection to fill out any additional paperwork. Scheduling these inspections between RHA staff and the third party contractors often slowed down occupancy, which, over time, cost the agency more money based on the length of the vacancy. Implementation of this activity speeds up the vacancy turn by allowing RHA staff to inspect all agency owned units.

During FY 2017, RHA staff conducted 41 initial inspections, 149 annual inspections and 2 special inspections on agency owned units rather than using a third party contractor.

The following table shows the estimated amount of time RHA staff spent at each annual/initial HQS inspection. The total amount of time is based on the bedroom size of the dwelling unit. The times estimated are conservative and do not include travel to and from the property location.

Estimated FY 2017 staff time spent inspecting RHA owned units			
Bedroom Size	**Estimated amount of staff time per inspection**	**# of inspections performed**	**Staff time (in minutes)**
0	25 minutes	12	300
1	30 minutes	23	690
2	30 minutes	49	1,470
3	35 minutes	99	3,465
4	40 minutes	6	240
5	45 minutes	3	135
6	50 minutes	0	0
Total amount of staff time spent (in minutes):			6,300

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To simplify property management practices and certify that housing units meet the housing quality standards as established by HUD, sections C.9.a. and D.5. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to establish inspection frequencies and protocols in lieu of utilizing an outside agency to conduct the inspection as well as certify that a housing unit has met the required HQS standards.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2015-02 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total amount incurred to have RHA owned HCV units inspected by outside agencies.	$4,645	$0	$0	Yes

2015-02 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Hours spent inspecting HCV units owned by the Agency.	117.83 hours annually 10 minutes per contracted inspection to schedule and log the inspection, plus one hour for a staff member to accompany the inspector to fill out any additional paperwork for a total of 70 minutes. (70*101) / 60 = 117.83	75.75 hours annually RHA staff will spend approximately 45 minutes per inspection; a savings of 25 minutes per inspection or 42.08 hours annually. (45*101) / 60 = 75.75	105 hours annually RHA staff conducted 192 inspections in FY 2017. Each inspection took approximately 25-45 minutes based on bedroom size resulting in a savings of 119 staff hours. Calculations used for the savings in staff time are based on the Baseline of 70 minutes per inspection. (70*192) / 60 = 224 224-105 = 119	No

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
Beside the error noted in previous MTW Annual Reports, there are no additional changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
Although it would appear that the amount of staff time has not decreased enough to meet the set benchmark for staff time savings (*2015-02 CE#2*), implementation of this activity has allowed inspections to become more efficient and cost effective. During FY 2017, RHA staff conducted 192 inspections on agency owned properties at approximately 32.81 minutes per property; 12.19 minutes less than RHA's Benchmark of 45 minutes per property. As a result, RHA staff nearly doubled the number of inspections completed which renders this a successful activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2015-03: Assign PBVs to up to 100% of units in non-Public Housing RHA-owned properties

Description:
RHA owns non-PH dwelling units and complexes which have been assigned PBVs and utilized in various housing programs to help more households move off of the wait lists. Per 24 C.F.R. 983.56, PBV assistance for units in a project cannot exceed more than 25% of the number of dwelling units (assisted or unassisted) in the project. RHA recognized that assistance could be provided to more low-income families and rental revenue would increase, if the cap on the number of PBV units within each project was lifted.

In FY 2015, RHA waived the per project cap on RHA owned non-PH complexes allowing for the assignment of PBVs to up to 100% of these units; increasing both the rental revenue for RHA and housing choices for low-income families. In FY 2017, RHA requested and received approval for a waiver to lift the 20% limit on the amount of voucher funding that may be utilized under the PBV program.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures *and* increase housing choices for low-income families.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Approval of this activity has allowed RHA to lease units at Yorkshire Terrace more easily with no additional advertising necessary as applicants are pulled from an existing PBV wait list. Prior to implementing this activity, units at Yorkshire Terrace had been hard to lease due to the LIHTC income restrictions. During FY 2014, 12 units at Yorkshire Terrace were vacant for an average of 4.79 months; however, after implementation of this activity in FY 2015, six units at this same complex were vacant and successfully turned in 1.90 months. During FY 2017, seven units were vacant and successfully turned in 4.2 months.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To determine basic operational policies and procedures as well as establish a reasonable policy and process for project-basing Section 8 tenant-based leased housing assistance, sections D.1.e., D.7. and D.7.a. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to determine the percentage of housing voucher assistance it is permitted to project-base and to develop and adopt a reasonable rent policy and process for project-basing Section 8 tenant-based leased housing assistance.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metric was identified and tracked for this activity.

2015-03 HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Households at or below 80% AMI that lost assistance or needed to move.	0	0	0	Yes

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
RHA does not assign PBVs to any units until they are vacant; this activity will not cause displacement in any way.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2015-04: Required Savings Plan for Earned Income Disallowance (EID) PH residents

Description:
EID allows eligible residents in the PH program to increase their incomes through employment without triggering rent increases. When any assisted participant in the PH program, who is unemployed or under-employed, obtains a job or increases their wages, they are eligible for the EID benefit. The resulting increase in income is fully excluded for 12 months and 50% excluded for an additional 12 months.

While the goal of EID is to motivate people who qualify for the program to accept employment, PH EID participants are often unable to maintain steady employment and frequently have issues once the EID period runs out because they have not learned how to effectively manage their money. In order to encourage PH residents to think more about their finances and ultimately prepare for the end of the EID period, RHA began requiring that all EID PH residents participate in a savings plan through the FGC. The FGC is a HUD approved, consumer credit counseling agency that assists families in managing debt, increasing their credit scores, as well as providing advice on savings, money management, and homeownership preparation.

A minimum deposit of $50 per month must be established throughout the resident's participation in EID. RHA identified the following two choices for the EID savings plan: (1) Individual Development Account, which offers matching funds through the FGC to be used for education, homeownership, or small business development or (2) a savings account with no matching funds through a lending institution. If a savings account is selected by the tenant, the account is frozen by the FGC removing the ability for the participant to withdraw funds until the FGC authorizes the withdrawal at the end of the EID period.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remained ongoing throughout FY 2017. With the elimination of EID in RHA's FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan, this activity will be closed.

Impact:
Following implementation of this activity, 48 PH residents were referred to the FGC and 14 or 30% had signed up for a savings plan. During FY 2017, 13 participants made some contribution amount to their savings plan.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
As reported previously, the response to this activity among PH residents has been relatively minimal. As current EID regulations are cumbersome to apply and only affect approximately 3% of families in the PH and HCV programs, RHA received approval for the elimination of the HUD-mandated EID from the calculation of rent in both the HCV and PH programs in the FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan. As a result, this activity was closed in the FY 2018 MTW Annual Plan. This is the last time it will be reported on.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To operate its existing self-sufficiency and training programs, including its FSS Program and any successor programs exempt from certain HUD program requirements, section E. was cited and approved for this activity. This authorization allows RHA to establish rent incentives and mandatory self-sufficiency participation requirements as well as establish relationships with local agencies to leverage expertise to assist with self-sufficiency.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2015-04 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of savings/escrow of PH households affected by this policy.	$0	$1,200 Expected household savings over the course of the two year EID eligibility period.	$1,498 Average savings among 13 households.	Yes

2015-04 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency[20]				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PH EID households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	0	2	Yes

20 RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient. In the future, this definition will be updated to reflect RHA's updated approach to self-sufficiency.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
A total of 48 PH residents have been referred to the FGC since implementation of this activity, of which only 14 signed up for a savings plan. Of the 14 PH EID participants, 13 made a contribution in FY 2017 to their savings plan although these contributions were not done continuously on a monthly basis. On average, these 13 participants increase their household savings by $68 per month (*2015-04 SS #2*).

While this activity is not expected to transition PH EID households to self-sufficiency (*2015-04 SS #8*), it is important to note that based on RHA's definition of self-sufficiency, two households transitioned to self-sufficiency in FY 2017. Throughout the implementation of this activity, six households transitioned to self-sufficiency based on the household's earned income.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology.

2014-01: Assign PBVs to RHA owned/controlled units without competitive process

Description:
Utilizing several funding sources, RHA has been able to acquire 165 scattered site properties throughout Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County. Although the housing market has strengthened and the amount of available inventory has become increasingly limited, RHA remains committed to purchasing additional single family homes, duplexes and condominiums if the properties further the agency's mission.

In an effort to expand housing choices for many low-income families, RHA requested and received approval from HUD to assign PBVs to agency owned/controlled units without going through a competitive process. A Technical Amendment to the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan followed that allows for initial contract rents at or below the applicable low HOME rents, to be set by RHA rather than contracting with a state-certified appraiser and a HUD-approved independent agency.

This activity was initially intended to reduce costs by eliminating requirements of the competitive process, i.e. the requirement for legal advertisements. However upon implementation of the Technical Amendment, costs were reduced further by allowing RHA to set rents at or below low HOME rents, which are below market rent, rather than hiring or paying a state-certified appraiser and a HUD-approved independent agency to set the rents.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Units being assigned a PBV through this activity are being used for several of RHA's programs, including RHA's Mobility Demonstration (Activity 2014-02). As affordable housing units within many of Washoe County's neighborhoods become increasingly limited, the ability to assign PBVs has proven to be an effective way to increase housing choices for several low-income households. By the end of FY 2017, RHA had received HUD approval to assign PBVs without a competitive process to 83 units. RHA will continue to utilize this approved flexibility to expand housing choices further for RHA participants.

Prior to implementation of the Technical Amendment, RHA paid a state-certified appraiser and a HUD-approved independent agency $75 each ($150 combined) to set the rents for each unit prior to a request to assign a PBV being sent to the local HUD field office for approval. As RHA staff can now set rents at or below low HOME rents, this portion of the activity saved the agency $1,500 in FY 2017 and $9,750 since implementation in FY 2014.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To develop and adopt a reasonable policy and process for project-basing Section 8 tenant-based leased housing assistance that differs from the currently mandated requirements, sections D.2.b. and D.7.a. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to establish an MTW Section 8 PBV Program which includes the commitment of PBVs to RHA owned units without a local competition and the ability to determine contract rents.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Cost of assigning PBVs to RHA owned/controlled unit without competitive process.	$720/property Cost incurred for a three-day legal advertisement.	$0	$0	Yes[21]

2014-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Amount of RHA staff hours required to complete task.	4 hours	0 hours	0 hours	Yes[22]

[21] In FY 2017, RHA submitted and received HUD approval to assign 10 additional PBVs without having to incur the three-day legal advertisement fee; an overall savings to the agency of $7,200.

[22] In FY 2017, RHA submitted and received HUD approval to assign 10 additional PBVs without having to place a legal advertisement; saving 2.5 hours of staff time.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
During FY 2017, RHA submitted and received HUD approval to assign 10 additional PBVs without having to incur the three-day legal advertisement fee. This resulted in a savings to the agency of $7,200 in advertising expense (*2014-01 CE #1*) and 2.5 hours of staff time (*2014-01 CE #2*). Since implementation of this activity in FY 2014, RHA has saved a total of $59,760 and 20.75 hours of staff time.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology related to this activity.

2014-02: Mobility Demonstration

Description:
RHA's Mobility Demonstration enables low-income PH families with children to move to deconcentrated neighborhoods where opportunities are much more abundant within the surrounding area. To facilitate this, RHA is assigning PBVs (Activity 2014-01) to single family homes, duplexes and condominiums within low-poverty census tracts throughout the cities of Reno and Sparks. Following HUD's approval of the PBV, PH families with children, who meet the established requirements to participate in the Mobility Demonstration, are offered the opportunity to move into one of these properties. RHA anticipates that the activity will (1) provide mobility options for families with children living in PH who otherwise lack mobility options, (2) enable families to move to neighborhoods with lower crime rates, (3) improve the poverty level of the surrounding area for these families, and (4) provide a program that can be used to supplement current knowledge on the impact of increased mobility and living in more poverty deconcentrated neighborhoods. In order to determine whether moving from a high poverty census tract to a low poverty census tract ultimately changes the outcomes for these families, UNR is collecting data on each participating family over the course of five years.

Each time a unit identified for the Mobility Demonstration is ready for occupancy, a family is chosen from a pool of qualified and interested PH families based on the family's approved voucher size. The family is then given the opportunity to move into a newly renovated property in a low-poverty area. Participation in the Mobility Demonstration is completely voluntary; should a family refuse one of the available units, they are simply placed back into the lottery pool for that bedroom size.

If a tenant is unemployed at the time of lease up or becomes unemployed at any time during their participation in the Mobility Demonstration, they are given 120 days to obtain employment. If employment is not secured within 120 days, they are required to participate in the FSS Lite Program unless they are otherwise determined to be exempt. RHA has established a criteria for exemption based on the same criteria for exemption from Community Service for PH residents. More specifically, a Mobility Demonstration tenant who would otherwise qualify for an exemption from required Community Service hours based on the exemptions established in RHA's ACOP (*Section 14.2.*) will also be exempt from the required FSS Lite Program component of the Mobility Demonstration.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Increase housing choices for low-income families *and* provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
By the end of FY 2017, a total of 39 former RHA PH families with children agreed to participate in the Mobility Demonstration and moved to properties in low-poverty census tracts. To date, seven of these families have become completely self-sufficient and moved off of housing assistance, while four families were removed from the program for various other reasons. There are currently 26 families participating in the Mobility Demonstration with another family expected to lease up as soon as the vacancy turn on the unit is complete. Two additional families, who are currently active in the program, are paying full contract rent and expected to transition off of housing assistance in the coming months.

Hardship policy:
For any issues pertaining to a tenant's inability to pay rent, the Housing Choice Voucher Program's hardship policy will be in effect.

For issues pertaining to an unemployed tenant's required participation in the FSS Lite Program, the tenant must request a temporary exemption within thirty (30) days that can be verified by a medical professional. If a tenant does not participate in the FSS Lite program and does not provide verifiable documentation of his/her inability to comply, the FSS Coordinators may initiate termination of the tenant's assistance under the Housing Choice Voucher program as allowed under 24 CFR §984.303(b)(5)(iii).

Hardship requests:
To date, there have been no hardship requests related to this activity.

There are currently 10 head of households who are unemployed and required to participate in the FSS Lite Program if they do not have a qualifying exemption. Of these 10 hosueholds, one has a verified disability statement on file and the remaining have minors under the age of six, exempting them from participation.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To determine basic operational policies and procedures within the HCV program that differ from current regulations and operate the FSS Lite Program exempt from certain HUD requirements, sections D.1.b., D.4., D.7.a, and E. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to determine the length of the lease period; determine Section 8 waiting list procedures and preferences; establish an MTW Section 8 Project-Based Voucher Program, including commitment of project-based vouchers to Agency-owned units without a local competition; and establish mandatory self-sufficiency requirements.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-02 SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of earned income of Mobility Demonstration households.	$15,007 Average earned income of households at time of admission to the Mobility Demonstration.	$15,757 5% increase in earned income or an increase of approximately $750.	$21,649 FY 2016 - $16,297 FY 2015 - $16,733 FY 2014 - No Change	Yes

2014-02 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of savings/escrow of participating Mobility Demonstration households.	$231 Average savings account balance of households at time of admission to the Mobility Demonstration is $124; average checking account balance is $107.	$531 Increase household savings by $25 per month or $300 per year.	$1,714 12 Mobility Demonstration participants have a savings account with an average balance of $1,512 and 13 have a checking account with an average balance of $202. FY 2016 - $925 FY 2015 - $410 FY 2014 - No Data	Yes

2014-02 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome[23]**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Employed Full-Time	8 or 25% 8 of 32 head(s) of households employed full-time at time of admission.	14 or 34%	10 or 38% (9 HOH, 1 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 7 or 24% FY 2015 - 10 or 31% FY 2014 - 11 or 50%	Yes

[23] At the end of FY 2017, 26 households were leased up under the Mobility Demonstration program. The percentage calculation for each employment status within this metric includes co-head members, where applicable. In these instances, the actual breakdown of the number of head of households and co-heads included in the count is clearly noted.

Employed Part-Time	9 or 28% 9 of 32 head(s) of households employed part-time at time of admission.	24 or 61%	8 or 31% (7 HOH, 1 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 9 or 31% FY 2015 - 8 or 25% FY 2014 - 5 or 23%	No
Enrolled in an Educational Program	0 or 0% 0 of 32 head(s) of households enrolled in an educational program at time of admission.	0 or 0%	1 or 4% FY 2016 - 1 or 3% FY 2015 - 1 or 3% FY 2014 - 2 or 9%	Yes
Enrolled in Job Training Program	0 or 0% 0 of 32 head(s) of households enrolled in job training program at time of admission.	0 or 0%	0 or 0% FY 2016 - 0 or 0% FY 2015 - 12 or 38% FY 2014 - no data	Yes
Unemployed	14 or 44% 14 of 32 head(s) of households unemployed at time of admission.	2 or 5%	12 or 46% (10 HOH, 2 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 12 or 41% FY 2015 - 13 or 41% FY 2014 - 6 or 27%	No
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2014-02 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Mobility Demonstration households receiving TANF assistance.	2	2	2 FY 2016 - 4 FY 2015 - 4 FY 2014 - 2	Yes

2014-02 SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency				
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Mobility Demonstration households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	0	2	21 FY 2016 - 16 FY 2015 - 9 FY 2014 - 2	Yes[24]

[24] To date, 21 Mobility Demonstration households have signed FSS Lite Agreements of which 11 are currently active.

2014-02 SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per Mobility Demonstration household.	$269,280 Baseline has been calculated based on the average ceiling rent for each PH complex ($776) less the average TTP at each PH complex based on the bedroom size ($235) of current Mobility Demonstration households at time of admission. (796-235 = 561) (561*40*12 = 269,280)	$266,251 RHA anticipates the average monthly HAP payment to decrease to $554.69. This is a decrease of 1.125% or $6.31 per family, per month for 40 Mobility Demonstration households. (561*1.125% = 6.31) (561-6.31 = 554.69) (554.69*40*12 = 266,251.20)	$145,213 RHA paid an average of $404/per family in HAP payments or $12,101 per month for the 30 families who participated in the Mobility Demonstration throughout FY 2017. (404*30*12 = 145,213) FY 2016 - $145,464 FY 2015 - $167,424 FY 2014 - $124,872	Yes

2014-02 SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Increase in RHA rental revenue.	$0	$347,534 On average, RHA receives rental revenue of $724 per Mobility Demonstration property leased or $23,169 per month for 32 properties. This Benchmark has been set using the total # of Mobility Demonstration properties expected overall, or 40. (724.03*40*12 = 347,534.40)	$266,107 FY 2016 - $251,700 FY 2015 - $245,553 FY 2014 - $73,058	No

2014-02 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency[25]				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Mobility Demonstration households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	2	2 This includes only Mobility Demonstration household who were active in the program in FY 2017, it does not include the five families who became completely self-sufficient and moved off of the program prior to FY 2017. FY 2016 - 2 FY 2015 - 4 FY 2014 - 1	Yes

2014-02 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Mobility Demonstration households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity.	0	40 Total # of Mobility Demonstration participants expected overall is 40.	39 FY 2016 - 36 FY 2015 - 32 FY 2014 - 22	No

2014-02 HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Mobility Demonstration households receiving services.	0	40 Total # of Mobility Demonstration participants expected overall is 40.	39 FY 2016 - 36 FY 2015 - 32 FY 2014 - 22	No

25 RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient. In the future, this definition will be updated to reflect RHA's updated approach to self-sufficiency.

2014-02 RHA Local Metric: Improvement in poverty level of census tract				
Improvement in poverty level of census tract for families participating in the Mobility Demonstration.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Improvement in census tract poverty level for participating families.	31.72% Average percentage of people in the census tracts below the poverty line where RHA's PH complexes are located. This ranges from a low of 11.46% of people in the census tract below the poverty line to a high of 42.73%.	Every family moving into a Mobility Demonstration property will also be moving into a census tract with a lower percentage of people below the poverty line.	5.23% Average percentage of people in the census tracts below the poverty line where Demonstration properties are located. This ranges from a low of 1.43% of people in the census tract below the poverty line to a high of 8.91%. FY 2016 - 4.95% FY 2015 - 4.90% FY 2014 - 5.23%	Yes

The following table provides the actual percentage of people living below the poverty line for each census tract where RHA's PH family complexes are located. It also provides the number of residents from each complex who have participated in the Mobility Demonstration and the improvement in percentage of households below the poverty line within the new neighborhoods chosen by Mobility Demonstration participants. On average, by participating in the Mobility Demonstration, these PH families have moved to neighborhoods where the poverty level has effectively been decreased by nearly 84%.

Improvement in neighborhood poverty lines for Mobility Demonstration participants			
PH complex	# of families in Mobility Demonstration from PH complex	% of people below poverty line in census tracts where PH complexes are located	% of people below poverty line in census tracts chosen by Mobility Demonstration participants from each PH complex
Essex Manor	7	11.46	4.06, 4.06, 6.01, 6.38, 7.23, 8.91, 7.12
Hawk View Apartments	12	39.97	2.71, 2.71, 2.71, 2.71, 3.73, 4.06, 4.06, 4.06, 6.29, 6.29, 6.38, 7.12
Mineral Manor	9	29.93	1.43, 2.71, 2.71, 6.01, 6.19, 7.12, 7.42, 7.42, 7.23
Myra Birch Manor	3	42.73	2.71, 6.38, 7.12
Stead Manor	8	34.50	1.43, 3.73, 4.06, 4.06, 6.01, 7.42, 7.42, 3.73

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
The Mobility Demonstration continues to be a successful and exciting activity for RHA to offer to qualified PH residents. In FY 2017, Mobility Demonstration households continued to experience an increase in earned income (*2014-02 SS #1*) resulting in the amount of household savings among participants nearly doubling again from $925 to $1,723 (*2014-02 SS #2)*. Full-time employment increased slightly, however, the number employed part-time and/or unemployed remained relatively consistent *(2014-02 SS #3)*.

On average, RHA paid $404/per family in HAP payments throughout FY 2017 or $12,120 per month for the 30 families who participated in the Mobility Demonstration. Overall, this amount decreased by $14 (*2014-02 SS #6*) per month. Based on RHA's HAP baseline of $561 per family per month, this is a monthly savings to the agency of $157 per family.

As of June 30, 2017, RHA had 26 of 34 Mobility Demonstration properties occupied and leased with a PBV and two families who were paying full rent. In addition, six families who are now paying full contract rent and have been removed from housing assistance, continue to occupy the property that they leased under the Mobility Demonstration. All of this combined has increased RHA's rental revenues (*2014-02 SS #7*) to $266,107. While the benchmark of $347,534 was not achieved for this particular metric, RHA believes it will be met in the future if/when the program is fully leased.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology related to this activity.

2014-03: Rent Reform Controlled Study

Description:
This activity's main objective is to rigorously promote self-sufficiency through a rent reform program that provides strong incentives to adult household members to seek and obtain employment. The Rent Reform Study is being tested by bringing at least 150 families with children off of the HCV waiting list, assigning them to one of two groups of participants based on when their name is pulled from the waiting list, and issuing them vouchers limited to five years. This activity does include elderly/disabled families with children.

For half of the families participating the study, rent is calculated as a standard HCV subject to the same policies and procedures as all other HCV participants. This group, also known as the control group, has rents set using RHA's current HCV policy, 30% of adjusted monthly income.

The study has been designed to test two of the strongest incentives for HCV participants to become self-sufficient: (1) the ability to increase income without affecting rent and (2) the knowledge that their housing assistance will end after five years. These two incentives are given to study group participants, the other half of the Rent Reform Study. Participants in this group have rents set in advance which do not change based on income or household size. Rents for the study group change only after the participant has been on the program for two years or if the required bedroom size of the unit changes based on additional members being added to the household. As a result, the disincentive for obtaining new income is removed as these families are allowed to keep any increase in earned income without worrying that 30% of this income increase will be calculated for rent.

For the first two years, rent for the study group has been set at 95% of the average Total Tenant Payment (TTP) when they enter the program. After the second year, the family's rent automatically increases to 105% of the same measure. This rent level remains in effect until the family has been on the program for five full years.

The following table shows current rents for study group participants entering the program on or after January 1, 2016:

Total Tenant Payment (TTP)			
	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms
Average TTP	$329	$390	$407
95% (Years 1-2)	$313	$371	$387
105% (Years 3-5)	$345	$410	$427

All families participating in the Rent Reform Study are required to meet with an FSS Coordinator on an annual basis, at minimum. During this meeting, they are encouraged to join and take advantage of the FSS Lite Program (Activity 2014-04) along with several other community events and partnerships available to assist them. To date, 124 Rent Reform households have signed an agreement to take full advantage of the FSS Lite Program of which 91 are currently active.

Through the FSS Lite Program, RHA offers supportive services to help guide families toward self-sufficiency and offers additional resources to participants available through multiple community partnerships in place. These partnerships include Charles Schwab Bank, Healthy

Families Foundation, JOIN, Job Connect, and the Children's Cabinet. FSS also has a strong partnership with FGC, a HUD approved consumer credit counseling agency, that helps families increase their credit scores and provides advice on savings, money management, and access to zero percent interest loans. RHA's FSS Coordinators have made over 225 referrals to partnering agencies for varying levels of assistance including, but not limited to, adult basic education, job retention/employment workshops, homeownership, financial literacy workshops, parenting/life skills and transportation.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient *and* reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

Implementation year:
This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains on schedule and ongoing for those families currently housed under the control and study groups. Although RHA is no longer issuing vouchers related to this activity, as of July 3, 2017, there were 14 vouchers issued to families who had not yet leased up. This includes ten control group vouchers and four study group vouchers.

UNR continues to collect data on the families participating in both groups of the Rent Reform Controlled Study. A questionnaire has been developed that is being administered to participants annually. This survey will provide the data needed to evaluate the progress of participants. Examples of some of the information being tracked include family history, job training, income, neighborhood and overall satisfaction of their children's education, friends and surroundings.

Impact:
Since implementation in FY 2014, 312 vouchers have been issued of which 211 have leased up. Overall, 35 participants in the study group and 31 participants in the control group were removed from the program for reasons that include family violations, skips, evictions and voluntary move offs. At the end of FY 2017, 145 households remain housed under the activity, 71 in the control group and 74 in the study group.

Hardship policy:
A committee of three staff persons will be established to review hardship requests based on the inability to pay rent once the hardship has lasted more than 30 days. If the hardship documentation is accepted by the committee, rents may be set as low as the greater of $75 or utility costs. There will be no negative rents. The committee will determine the length of the exemption, up to a maximum of six months.

The hardship policy for the end of the Rent Reform Controlled Study is very limited. Should the head or co-head of the family become disabled and require continued housing assistance, the three-person panel will review the request and decide whether an unrestricted voucher should be issued. Beyond that, there will be no hardship exemptions from the five year limitation.

Hardship requests:
No hardship request were received or reviewed by the established Rent Reform Hardship Committee in FY 2017.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
While 91 families have joined the FSS Lite Program and are currently taking advantage of the opportunities provided to assist them in becoming self-sufficient, 46 families have refused to participate or seek any guidance in preparing for the loss of their housing assistance. Furthermore, eight families have not yet met with an FSS Coordinator.

In its FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, RHA established a hardship policy for participants of the Rent Reform Controlled Study based on a participant's inability to pay rent. Rent Reform participants continue to be reminded that their housing assistance will end after five years and that the hardship policy is very limited. Hardship requests will only be reviewed by the established committee in accordance with the criteria set forth in RHA's internal hardship procedure for the Rent Reform Study. This criteria requires all participants requesting a hardship to have a signed contract with and ongoing participation in the FSS Lite Program for consideration.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To determine basic operational policies and procedures within the HCV program that differ from current regulations exempt from certain HUD requirements, sections D.1.b., D.1.c., D.2.a, and D.4. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to determine the length of the lease period; define, adopt, and implement a new Housing Choice Voucher Program reexamination schedule; adopt and implement any reasonable policy to calculate the tenant portion of the rent and determine HCV waiting list procedures, tenant selection procedures and criteria, and preferences.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-03 SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average earned income of households participating in the Rent Reform Study.	Control Group $15,258	$600 annual increase	Control Group $23,046 FY 2016 - $20,614 FY 2015 - $15,192 FY 2014 - No Data	Yes
	Study Group $17,494		Study Group $30,439 FY 2016 - $26,773 FY 2015 - $20,999 FY 2014 - No Data	

2014-03 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of savings/escrow of households participating in the Rent Reform Study.	Control Group $43	$50 annual increase	Control Group $641 FY 2016 - $945 FY 2015 - $267 FY 2014 - No Data	No
	Study Group $118		Study Group $1,181 FY 2016 - $1,382 FY 2015 - $380 FY 2014 - No Data	

2014-03 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome[26]**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Employed Full-Time	Control Group 25 or 30% 25 of 82 head(s) of households employed full-time at time of admission.	Control Group 25 or 33% 25 of 75 head(s) of households employed full-time.	Control Group 16 or 23% (14 HOH, 2 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 15 or 20% FY 2015 - 20 or 26% FY 2014 - 18 or 33%	Benchmark was not achieved for the control group, but was achieved for the study group.
	Study Group 27 or 35% 27 of 78 head(s) of households employed full-time at time of admission.	Study Group 25 or 33% 25 of 75 head(s) of households employed full-time.	Study Group 33 or 45% (24 HOH, 9 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 26 or 34% FY 2015 - 23 or 32% FY 2014 - 22 or 42%	
Employed Part-Time	Control Group 16 or 20% 16 of 82 head(s) of households employed part-time at time of admission.	Control Group 44 or 58% 44 of 75 head(s) of households employed part-time.	Control Group 14 or 20% (13 HOH, 1 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 18 or 24% FY 2015 - 18 or 23% FY 2014 - 13 or 24%	No
	Study Group 19 or 24% 19 of 78 head(s) of households employed part-time at time of admission.	Study Group 44 or 58% 44 of 75 head(s) of households employed part-time.	Study Group 27 or 36% (23 HOH, 4 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 18 or 24% FY 2015 - 19 or 26% FY 2014 - 8 or 15%	
Enrolled in an Educational Program	Control Group 0 or 0% 0 of 82 head(s) of households enrolled in an educational program at time of admission.	Control Group 0 or 0%	Control Group 4 or 6% FY 2016 - 8 or 11% FY 2015 - 1 or 1% FY 2014 - 0 or 0%	Yes[27]
	Study Group 0 or 0% 0 of 78 head(s) of households enrolled in an educational program at time of admission.	Study Group 0 or 0%	Study Group 9 or 12% FY 2016 - 9 or 12% FY 2015 - 0 or 0% FY 2014 - 0 or 0%	

[26] At the end of FY 2017, 145 households were leased up under the Rent Reform Controlled Study (71 control group and 74 study group). The percentage calculation for each employment status includes co-head members, where applicable.

[27] Outcome information is based on third year data received from UNR's survey/questionnaire administered to all Rent Reform Study participants.

Enrolled in Job Training Program	Control Group 0 or 0 % 0 of 82 head(s) of households enrolled in job training program at time of admission.	Control Group 0 or 0%	Control Group 27 or 38% FY 2016 - 30 or 39% FY 2015 - 24 or 31% FY 2014 - 0 or 0%	Yes[28]
	Study Group 0 or 0% 0 of 78 head(s) of households enrolled in job training program at time of admission.	Study Group 0 or 0%	Study Group 25 or 34% FY 2016 - 28 or 37% FY 2015 - 24 or 33% FY 2014 - 0 or 0%	
Unemployed	Control Group 41 or 50% 41 of 82 head(s) of households unemployed at time of admission.	Control Group 24 or 32% 24 of 75 head(s) of households unemployed.	Control Group 52 or 73% (44 HOH, 8 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 43 or 57% FY 2015 - 39 or 50% FY 2014 - 23 or 43%	No
	Study Group 32 or 41% 32 of 78 head(s) of households unemployed at time of admission.	Study Group 24 or 32% 24 of 75 head(s) of households unemployed.	Study Group 37 or 50% (27 HOH, 10 Co-Head) FY 2016 - 32 or 42% FY 2015 - 30 or 42% FY 2014 - 22 or 42%	
Other	0	0	0	N/A

2014-03 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of Rent Reform Study households receiving TANF assistance.	Control Group 14 14 of 82 households were receiving TANF at time of admission.	Control Group 5 5 of 75 households receiving TANF.	Control Group 4 FY 2016 - 11 FY 2015 - 14 FY 2014 - 10	Yes
	Study Group 13 13 of 78 households were receiving TANF at time of admission.	Study Group 5 5 of 75 households receiving TANF.	Study Group 5 FY 2016 - 6 FY 2015 - 6 FY 2014 - 7	

[28] Outcome information is based on third year data received from UNR's survey/questionnaire administered to all Rent Reform Study participants. It includes a count of participants who have participated in some form of job training program, however not all participants are currently enrolled in such a program.

2014-03 SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per Rent Reform Study household.	Control Group $517,500 On average, RHA paid $43,125 per month in HAP payments for Control Group households at lease up or $575 per family, per month. (575*75*12 = 517,500)	Control Group $512,100 The average monthly HAP payment is expected to decrease to $568.53. This is a decrease of 1.125% or $6.47 per family, per month for 75 households. (575*1.125% = 6.47) (569*75*12 = 512,100)	Control Group $536,521 On average, RHA paid $44,710 per month in HAP payments for 71 control group households or $629.72 per family, per month. (629.72*71*12 = 536,518) FY 2016 - $551,496 FY 2015 - $546,624 FY 2014 - $378,972	No
	Study Group $553,500 On average RHA paid $46,125 per month in HAP payments for Study Group households at lease up or $615 per family, per month. (615*75*12 = 553,500)	Study Group $547,200 RHA expects the average monthly HAP payment to decrease to $608.08. This is a decrease of 1.125% or $6.92 per family, per month for 75 households. (615*1.125% = 6.92) (608*75*12 = 547,200)	Study Group $575,264 On average, RHA paid $47,939 per month in HAP payments for 74 study group households or $647.82 per family, per month. (647.82*74*12 = 575,264) FY 2016 - $589,560 FY 2015 - $559,872 FY 2014 - $378,540	

2014-03 SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Control Group $324,900 On average Control Group households pay $27,075 per month towards rent and utilities or $361 per family at time of admission. (361*75*12 = 324,900)	Control Group $328,500 RHA anticipates the average monthly TTP to increase to $365.06. This is an increase of 1.125% or $4.06 per family, per month for 75 households. (361*1.125% = 4.06) (365*75*12 = 328,500)	Control Group $282,744 On average, the 71 control group households pay $23,562 per month towards rent and utilities or $331.86 per family. (331.86*71 = 23,562.27) (23,562*12 = 282,744) FY 2016 - $332,868 FY 2015 - $358,488 FY 2014 - No Data	Benchmark was not achieved for the control group, but was achieved for the study group.[29]
	Study Group $294,300 On average Study Group households pay $24,525 per month towards rent and utilities or $327 per family. (327*75*12 = 294,300)	Study Group $297,900 RHA anticipates the average monthly TTP of Study Group participants to increase to $330.68. This is an increase of 1.125% or $3.68 per family, per month for 75 households. (327*1.125% = 3.68) (331*75*12 = 297,900)	Study Group $310,440 On average, the 74 study group households pay $26,770 per month towards rent and utilities or $349.59 per family. (349.59*74 = 25,869.88) (25,870*12 = 310,440) FY 2016 - $321,240 FY 2015 - $284,256 FY 2014 - No Data	

29 This is an increase in tenant contribution to rent, not an increase in rental revenue to RHA.

2014-03 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency[30]				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of Rent Reform Study households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	Control Group 0	Control Group 5	Control Group 4 FY 2016 - 2 FY 2015 - 3 FY 2014 - 0	Benchmark was not achieved for the control group, but was achieved for the study group.[31]
	Study Group 0	Study Group 5	Study Group 18 FY 2016 - 12 FY 2015 - 12 FY 2014 - 0	

2014-03 HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average Rent Reform Study applicant time on wait list.	15.45 months	No change.	25.37 months FY 2016 - 26.57 months FY 2015 - 29.08 months FY 2014 - 29.50 months	No

2014-03 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars.	$8,445 Average cost of an HCV interim ($33) * expected number of interims required to be processed (10% of 150, or 15) + average cost of an annual ($53) * 150 (33*15 = 495) (53*150 = 7950)	No change.	$13,428 Interims were logged and tracked for 166 participants and 150 annuals were completed. (33*166 = 5478) (53*150 = 7950) FY 2016 - $13,343 FY 2015 - $10,673 FY 2014 - $231	No

30 RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient. In the future, this definition will be updated to reflect RHA's updated approach to self-sufficiency.

31 Per RHA's definition of self-sufficiency, 22 households participating in the Rent Reform Study transitioned to self-sufficiency.

2014-03 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours.	445.5 hours Prior to implementation staff spent 1.7 hours for an interim and 2.8 hours for each annual. (1.7*15 = 25.5) (2.8*150 = 445.5) (25.5+420 = 445.5)	No change.	702 hours Interims were logged and tracked for 166 participants and 150 annuals were completed. (1.7*166 = 282.2) (2.8*150 = 420) FY 2016 - 698.1 hours FY 2015 - 559.3 hours FY 2014 - 12 hours	No

2014-03 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing a task.	6% On average 4 of 72 HCV files audited contained errors related to the processing of files under the HCV program.	0%	0% FY 2016 - 0 % FY 2015 - 0% FY 2014 - No Data	Yes

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
The average amount of earned income has increased overall for both control group and study group participants (*2014-03 SS #1*), however, this increase does not include all active Rent Reform Study participants. At the end of FY 2017, only 56 study group households and 30 control group households had earned income from actual employment.

Participants in the Rent Reform Study experienced an increase in the average amount of savings/escrow (*2014-03 SS #2*), however, this increase is not all inclusive. Twenty four households participating in the control group have an active checking account with an average account balance of $449, and 14 households have an active savings account with an average account balance of $192. Similarly, 45 households participating in the study group have an active checking account with an average account balance of $466, and 27 households have an active savings account with an average balance of $1,181.

Overall, applicants who leased up under the Rent Reform Study averaged 29.50 months on the wait list (*2014-03 HC #3*). This has slowly decreased since this activity was implemented. In FY 2017, the average wait list time was 25.37 months and in FY 2016 it was 26.57 months. As stated in the FY 2017 Annual MTW Plan, there are several factors that influence the length of time an applicant will remain on the wait list which should be noted including sequestration, local preferences, the closure of the wait list, etc.

While interims are no longer being fully processed for study group participants, any change in employment and income continues to be tracked and logged in order to accurately assess the overall effectiveness of the study. This tracking takes approximately the same amount of staff time and varies annually based on the status of each of the participants. If RHA should realize any agency cost savings or staff time savings (*2014-03 CE #1* and *2014-03 CE #2*) on interims it would be completely negligible. Similarly, annuals are also being processed for all participants in the Rent Reform Study.

Study group participants have rents set for five years based on voucher size rather than household income. Rents for this group will only change after the family has been on the program for two years or if the family size increases resulting in the requirement of a larger unit. Implementation of set rents for the study group renders the overall error rate for this activity as negligible *(2014-03 CE #3)*. Furthermore, interims and annuals are no longer being processed to determine rents for study group participants, but rather tracked for reporting purposes only.

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks, and/or metrics related to this activity.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology related to this activity.

2014-04: Expand self-sufficiency activities

Description:
The FSS Lite Program, similar to the traditional FSS Program without an interest-bearing escrow account, was prosed and implemented in FY 2014. Upon implementation, the FSS Lite Program, designed to promote self-sufficiency through streamlined FSS service delivery, became mandatory for PH residents who are delinquent in completing their Community Service hours. Mobility Demonstration households who are unemployed without a qualifying exemption are also required to participate in the FSS Lite Program and Rent Reform Controlled Study participants are encouraged to take advantage of the program as they prepare for the end of their housing assistance after five years.

By utilizing single fund flexibility, RHA expanded the FSS Lite Program in FY 2015 and established a Self-Sufficiency Fund. The Self-Sufficiency Fund is designed to cover specific costs associated with self-sufficiency activities and is used whenever possible to assist program participants in achieving their self-sufficiency goals.

In FY 2017, RHA re-proposed this activity to allow for the establishment of one-time and/or ongoing rent credits to serve as an incentive to FSS Lite Program participants to complete the goals identified in their ITSPs, as well as, increase participation in the FSS Lite Program overall.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

Implementation year:
This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
FSS staff continue to reach out to families who could benefit from participating in the FSS Lite Program. RHA's Family Self-Sufficiency Newsletter is mailed out on a monthly basis and covers topics that include the benefits of obtaining an education, tax return preparation, and upcoming career fairs. In addition, RHA has partnered with several local organizations such as Nevada JobConnect, Applied Staffing and Rise Academy for Adult Achievement to create an "Opportunity Seekers Job Club." The job club is open to all FSS participants and meets monthly to discuss topics that include local job fairs and hiring events, how to dress for success, finding employment with a criminal history, etc.

By the end of FY 2017, 212 families have been assisted through the FSS Lite Program. Of these, 106 families are currently being assisted. This includes 91 Rent Reform Study participants, 11 Mobility Demonstration residents, and four families who are delinquent on their community service hours. With signed FSS Lite Agreements in place, these families are able to take advantage of everything the FSS Lite Program has to offer, including the Self-Sufficiency Fund. To date, RHA has assisted 40 FSS Lite Program participants with some of the most common barriers hindering self-sufficiency. These barriers include bus passes, testing and certification fees, job search assistance and gas vouchers. Of these 40 FSS Lite Program participants who have received assistance through the Self-Sufficiency Fund, 14 have been assisted on multiple occasions.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To operate existing self-sufficiency and training programs exempt from certain HUD program requirements, section E. was cited and approved for this activity. This authorization allows RHA to establish mandatory self-sufficiency program requirements, provides the ability to change the size of the program, and whether to establish escrow accounts.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-04 SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of earned income of households owing Community Service.	$337 per month or $4,404 annually	$200 increase in household earned income per year	$2,015 per month or $24,183 annually	Yes

2014-04 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of savings/escrow of households owing Community Service.	$0	$25 increase in household savings per year	$1,106	Yes

2014-04 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome[32]**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Employed Full-Time	1 or 3% 1 of 29 head(s) of households are employed full-time.	7% 7% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will become employed full-time.	45 or 42% 45 of 106 head(s) of households are employed full-time. (37 Rent Reform participants, 7 Mobility Demonstration households and 1 PH family with delinquent Community Service hours)	Yes
Employed Part-Time	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are employed part-time.	7% 7% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours become employed part-time.	32 or 30% 32 of 106 head(s) of households are employed part-time. (27 Rent Reform participants and 5 Mobility Demonstration households)	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.	3% 3% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will enroll in an educational program.	0 or 0% 0 of 106 head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are enrolled in a job training program.	3% 3% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will enroll in a job training program.	0 or 0% 0 of 106 head(s) of households are enrolled in a job training program.	No

[32] At the end of FY 2017, 106 households were actively participating in the FSS Lite Program (91 Rent Reform Participants, 11 Mobility Demonstration households and four PH families with delinquent Community Service hours). The percentage calculation for each employment status covers only active program participants who have signed an FSS Lite agreement and includes co-head members, where applicable.

Unemployed	28 or 97% 28 of 29 head(s) of households are unemployed.	83% 83% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will be unemployed.	56 or 53% 56 of 106 head(s) of households are unemployed. (51 Rent Reform participants, 3 Mobility Demonstration households and 2 PH families with delinquent Community Service hours)	Yes
Other	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	N/A

2014-04 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households with delinquent Community Service hours who are receiving TANF assistance.	1 One household was receiving TANF when they signed an FSS Lite Agreement due to delinquent Community Service Hours.	1	5	No

2014-04 SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency				
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	0	51 families will take part in the FSS Lite Program during the first year.	212 families have signed FSS Lite agreements of which 106 are currently active.[33]	Yes

2014-04 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency[34]				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**

[33] This number includes 137 Rent Reform Study participants, 21 Mobility Demonstration residents, and 54 families who are/were delinquent on their community service hours. This number reflects all participants who signed an agreement to participate in the FSS Lite Program, not all of these families are currently housed.

[34] RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient. In the future, this definition will be updated to reflect RHA's updated approach to self-sufficiency.

Number of households with delinquent Community Service hours who have transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	4	20 20 of 106 families who signed an FSS Lite agreement transitioned to self-sufficiency.	Yes

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
The metric baselines and benchmarks for this activity were identified in FY 2015 and based entirely on PH residents who owed Community Service hours. Since its inception in FY 2014, RHA has expanded this activity to include Rent Reform Controlled Study participants, Mobility Demonstration households, traditional FSS clients, and future HCV participants who will be issued a five-year time-limited voucher. Beginning with this report, all current households with active FSS Lite agreements are included in the outcomes for each metric identified. Due to this addition, RHA anticipates meeting most metrics in the future.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology related to this activity.

2014-05: Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent

Description:
In order to reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness, RHA began excluding all educational financial aid from income calculations and allowing self-certification of assets under $10,000.

The full amount of student financial assistance paid directly to the student or to the educational institution is now excluded from income calculations for HCV participants. RHA's HCV participants can now benefit from being able to attend an institution of higher education without being penalized with an increase in rent due to any financial assistance that they may secure. Furthermore, households with assets less than $10,000 can now submit a self-certification as to the value of the asset and the amount of expected income. At the time of application, applicants are asked to provide a well-documented baseline asset value. RHA staff only calculate income on assets if the value of the assets total more than $10,000.

In FY 2014, RHA also raised the minimum rent from $50 to $75 to not only save significant HCV and PH operating subsidy, but provide an incentive to participants to seek employment due to the higher participant contribution to rent.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

Implementation year:
This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
Throughout FY 2017, a total of 113 PH residents and 340 HCV participants paid minimum rent. As of June 30, 2017, 80 PH residents and 225 HCV participants continue to pay the minimum rent amount. In contrast, at the end of FY 2017, 82 PH residents and 170 HCV participants who previously paid minimum rent following the implementation of this activity, have either moved off of assistance or remain housed paying more than RHA's minimum rent.

Hardship policy:
Although the change in student status verification is technically a rent reform activity, the benefit of the activity is going directly to the HCV household. As a result, no hardship policy was established or required.

RHA's standard hardship policy for an exception to minimum rent will be in place and can be requested if the family experiences one or more of the following qualifying events:

a. The household has lost eligibility or is awaiting an eligibility determination for Federal, State or local assistance, including a household with a member who is a noncitizen lawfully admitted for permanent residence under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and who would be entitled to public benefits but for Title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996.

b. The household would be evicted as a result of the imposition of the minimum rent requirement.

c. The income of the household has decreased because of changed circumstances, including loss of employment or death of a household member. "Loss of employment" is defined as being laid off or terminated through no fault of the employee. Loss of employment does not, for the purposes of exemption to minimum rent, include voluntarily quitting employment. "Death in the family", for the purposes of exemption to minimum rent, includes head of household or spouse, or any household member.

d. Other circumstances as determined by RHA or HUD.

RHA will review all household requests for exception from the minimum rent due to financial hardships. If RHA determines that the hardship is temporary (defined as a duration of less than 90 consecutive days), a minimum rent will not be imposed for a period of up to ninety days from the date of the household's request. At the end of the temporary suspension period, a minimum rent will be imposed retroactively to the time of suspension.

If RHA determines that there is a qualifying long-term financial hardship, RHA must exempt the household from the minimum rent requirements for as long as the hardship continues. The exemption from minimum rent shall apply from the first day of the month following the household's request for exemption.

Hardship requests:
During FY 2017, 14 HCV participants paid less than the minimum rent due to a hardship. While each of these participants had an approved hardship, it is not known whether or not the hardship was directly related to RHA's implementation of this activity.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To restructure the initial, annual and interim review process and determine rent policies in both the PH and HCV programs, sections C.4., C.11, D.2.a., and D.3.b. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allows RHA to adopt a local system of Public Housing resident income verification in lieu of the current HUD system, to adopt reasonable policies to set Public Housing rents, to adopt reasonable policies to calculate HCV tenant rents, and to adopt and implement a reasonable policy for verifying HCV family income.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-05 SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average earned income of households affected by increasing the minimum rent.	$7,450 $7,450 is the average earned income for all 379 HCV and PH participants paying minimum rent in FY 2013. It is important to note that this number also includes the average earned income of families on EID who are paying the minimum rent. Average earned income of 270 HCV participants paying minimum rent is $5,014; average earned income of 109 PH residents is $9,886.	$500 annual increase In FY 2014, RHA raised the minimum rent by $25. This $500 expected increase in average earned income is set to reflect half of the annual amount of income needed to compensate for the $25/month increase.	$571 $571 is the average earned income across all 305 HCV and PH participants who are currently paying minimum rent. Of these, only 36 households actually had earned income.	No

2014-05 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Employed Full-Time	20 or 5% 20 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are employed full-time. (10 HCV participants and 10 PH residents)	7% of head(s) of households paying the minimum rent will be employed full-time.	2 or 0% 2 of 305 head(s) of households currently paying minimum rent is employed full-time. (1 PH resident and 1 HCV participant)	No
Employed Part-Time	37 or 10% 37 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are employed part-time. (16 HCV participants and 21 PH residents)	7% of head(s) of households paying the minimum rent will be employed part-time.	28 or 9% 28 of 305 head(s) of households currently paying minimum rent are employed part-time. (17 HCV participants and 11 PH residents)	Yes

Enrolled in an Educational Program	13 or 3% 13 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are enrolled in an educational program. (7 HCV participants and 6 PH residents)	3% of head(s) of households paying the minimum rent will enroll in an educational program.	0 or 0% 0 of 305 head(s) of households currently paying minimum rent are enrolled in an educational program.	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	Yes
Unemployed	309 or 82% 309 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are unemployed. (237 HCV participants and 72 PH residents)	No change.	275 or 90% 275 of 305 head(s) of households currently paying minimum rent are unemployed. (207 HCV participants and 68 PH residents)	No
Other	0	0	0 or 0%	N/A

2014-05 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households paying minimum rent who are receiving TANF assistance.	25 or 7% 25 of 379 households paying minimum rent are receiving TANF assistance. (18 HCV participants and 7 PH residents)	No change.	6 or 2% 6 of 305 households currently paying minimum rent are receiving TANF assistance. (5 HCV participants and 1 PH resident)	Yes

2014-05 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency[35]				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households paying minimum rent who have transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	4	9 households who were paying minimum rent transitioned to self-sufficiency. (6 HCV participants and 3 PH residents)	Yes

2014-05 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of rent simplification tasks (student status verifications).	$2,997 On average 370 student status verifications were sent for 336 individuals; a total cost to the agency of $8.10 per HCV participant. (8.10*370 = 2997)	$875 Student status verifications will be sent out for dependents only; approximately 108 households. (8.10*108 = 874.80)	$1,426 Student status verifications were sent out for 176 dependents of HCV participants. (8.10*176 = 1717.20)	No
Total cost of rent simplification tasks (self-certification of assets).	$28,265 Verification/processing of assets cost RHA approximately $20,044.80 for 1,440 HCV households and $8,220 for 750 PH households. (13.92*1,440 = 20,044.80) (10.96*750 = 8,220)	$1,076 Total cost to verify/process approximately 60 HCV households and 22 PH households with assets over $10,000. (13.92*60 = 835.20) (10.96*22 = 241.12)	$919 Total cost to verify/process 55 HCV participants and 14 PH residents with assets over $10,000. (13.92*55 = 765.60) (10.96*14 = 153.44)	Yes

35 RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient. In the future, this definition will be updated to reflect RHA's updated approach to self-sufficiency.

2014-05 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total staff hours to complete the rent simplification tasks.	134.4 hours On average staff spend 0.4 hours per student status verification. (0.4*336 = 134.4)	43.2 hours Student status verifications sent for dependents only. (0.4*108 = 43.2)	70.4 hours Student status verifications were sent for 176 dependents of HCV participants. (0.4*176 = 73.6)	No
	1,323.3 hours On average staff spend 0.695 hours to process and verify assets in the HCV program and 0.43 hours in the PH program. (0.695*1,440 = 1,000.8) (0.43*750 = 322.50)	51.16 hours Verifications will need to be sent to 60 HCV participants and 22 PH residents with assets over $10,000. (0.695*60 = 41.7) (0.43*22 = 9.46)	44.27 hours Verifications were sent to 55 HCV participants and 14 PH residents with assets over $10,000. (0.695*55 = 38.25) (0.43*14 = 6.02)	Yes

2014-05 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing rent simplification tasks.	6% - HCV 3% - PH On average 4 of 72 HCV files audited contained errors related to the processing of files. Furthermore, 7 of 217 or 3% of audited PH resident files contained problems related to the processing of assets.	0.5%	0%	Yes

2014-05 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Increase in rental revenue in dollars due to excluding financial aid from income calculations and increasing the minimum rent.	$0	($7,274)	The estimate of ($7,274) is reasonable.[36]	Yes
	$0	$154,200	$495,996 HCV: $27,090 per month (Total TTP for 253 HCV participants paying minimum rent. PH: $14,243 per month (Total TTP for 102 PH residents paying minimum rent.)	Yes

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
On June 30, 2017, RHA had 305 PH residents and HCV participants paying the established $75 minimum rent. Of these only 23 HCV participants and 13 PH residents had earned income within the households. Although the benchmark for increasing earned income was not met across all households (*2014-05 SS#1*), the average earned income for those 36 families who had earned income was $4,839.

At the end of FY 2017, 170 HCV participants and 82 PH residents, who had previously paid minimum rent following implementation of this activity, had either moved off of assistance or were still housed paying more than the minimum rent. Of these 252 households, 68 PH residents and 109 HCV participants reported an average earned income of $19,622. Based on the data from households who, while no longer paying the minimum rent had paid minimum rent following implementation of this activity, the benchmark would have been met (*2014-05 SS#1*). Similarly, the employment status for these households would have increased enough to meet the benchmarks set for this activity (*2014-05 SS #3*).

RHA experienced an increase in agency rental revenue of $341,796 (*2014-05 CE#5*) in FY 2017 despite the fact that these households are paying minimum rent. This increase is due to the fact that several of these households paid minimum rent for only a portion of the year. In fact, only 29 PH residents and 108 HCV participants paid the minimum rent throughout FY 2017.

---

36 RHA's software system cannot calculate the exact cost amount due to student status income being excluded. Therefore, each file would have to be tracked and calculated outside of the system on a case by case basis. In FY 2015, RHA began an upgrade to its software system and once it is fully functional, it should be able to calculate the amount of tenant contribution to rent that is being excluded based on this activity.

Agency rental revenue increased by an additional $740,782 when comparing those families who had previously paid minimum rent following implementation of this activity. In FY 2017, the total TTP for these 102 PH residents was $27,494 per month or $329,923 annually. Similarly, the total TTP for the 170 HCV participants was $47,088 per month or $565,059 annually.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology related to this activity.

2014-06: Triennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes

Description:
Elderly and disabled PH residents and HCV participants on fixed incomes now have recertifications on a triennial schedule rather than annually as the amount of rent RHA receives from these households on stable income is completely negligible. Cost of Living (COLA) increases for certain programs are automatically applied.

An elderly household is defined by HUD as a family whose head (including co-head), spouse, or sole member is a person who is at least 62 years of age; or two or more persons who are at least 62 years of age living together; or one or more persons who are at least 62 years of age living with one or more live-in aides. A disabled family is defined as a family whose head (including co-head), spouse, or sole member is a person with disabilities; or two or more persons with disabilities living together; or one or more persons with disabilities living with one or more live-in aides.

Stable income sources include and are limited to: Social Security benefits, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security Disability (SSD), and pensions. There can be no earned income in the household.

If a participant meets both the elderly or disabled definition *and* the stable income definition, RHA performs a triennial recertification rather than an annual recertification; if not, the participant remains under the regular recertification process. For those years when a triennial recertification is not processed, RHA will automatically increase tenant rent based on the COLA.

Any elderly/disabled household with additional income sources other than the above-defined stable income sources, or households with minors (even if the head of household is elderly or disabled), will not be considered to have only stable income; these households will be required to have annual recertifications.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

Implementation year:
This policy was approved and implemented as a biennial activity in FY 2014; it was expanded as a triennial activity in FY 2015.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
RHA realized staff time savings and cost savings as the number of recertifications decreased. These savings are even more significant as elderly/disabled households with stable income transitioned to a triennial recertification schedule.

Hardship policy:
RHA proposed no hardship policy as no additional burden was being placed on residents, however,

residents can request an interim recertification if they experience a decrease in income. This activity has been extremely positive for all affected residents.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To restructure the initial, annual and interim review process in both the PH and HCV programs, sections C.4. and D.1.c. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to adopt a local system of Public Housing resident income verification in lieu of the current HUD system and define, adopt, and implement a new Housing Choice Voucher Program reexamination schedule.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-06 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost for recertification of elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes.	$140,933 HCV: $112,291 PH: $28,642	$113,887 HCV: $91,989 PH: $21,898 Total savings: $27,046 annually	$120,161 HCV: $96,307 PH: $23,854 Total savings: $20,772 annually	No

2014-06 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total amount of staff time to complete recertification of elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes.	6,726.23 hours HCV: 468.02 hours per month or 5,616.23 hours annually PH: 92.5 hours per month or 1,110 hours annually	5,625.94 hours HCV: 401.49 hours per month or 4,817.86 hours annually PH: 67.34 hours per month or 808.08 hours annually Total savings of 91.69 hours per month or 1,100.28 hours annually	3,871.53 hours HCV: 245.47 hours per month or 2,945.67 hours annually PH: 77.16 hours per month or 925.86 hours annually Total savings of 237.89 hours per month or 2,854.70 hours annually	Yes

2014-06 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	$0	No change	No Change	Yes

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
In FY 2015, elderly and disabled PH residents and HCV participants on fixed incomes began having recertifications on a triennial schedule rather than annually. For those years when a triennial recertification is not processed, RHA automatically increases tenant rent based on any Cost of Living (COLA) increase. During the years when a triennial recertification is not carried out, PH residents and HCV participants are asked to fill out the paperwork necessary to conduct a "mini annual" which is mailed in and processed by RHA staff. In FY 2017, these mini annuals resulted in in a slight increase in agency costs (*2014-06 CE #1*) and staff time (*2014-06 CE #2*) when compared to FY 2016.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology related to this activity.

2014-08: Partner with local nonprofits to provide housing to at risk families

Description:
RHA is providing PBV units to clients of its nonprofit partners including CAAW, Casa de Vida, Washoe County Department of Social Services, Northern Nevada Hopes, Safe Embrace and Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS). These PBVs are for two years and each of the nonprofit partners provide supportive services.

RHA also worked with Silver Sage Manor, Inc. to assign five PBVs for units at their NSP3 property located at 435 Moran Street. This property was completely rehabilitated using NSP3 funds provided by the City of Reno. Although Silver Sage Manor, Inc. does not provide any supportive services, their property houses elderly individuals in the Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County community who are, or may soon become, homeless.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Increase housing choices for low-income families *and* provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

Implementation year:
This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Status/schedule update:
The activity remains ongoing and on schedule.

Impact:
At the end of FY 2017, the impact of this activity remains minimal, however, RHA feels that it is still beneficial to the local community and will continue to reach out to its nonprofit partners.

As of June 30, 2017, four properties continue to be leased to clients of Washoe County Department of Social Services.

Hardship policy:
As this activity is not considered a rent reform activity, no hardship policy was established or required.

Challenges and/or potential new strategies:
No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

Previously approved authorization(s):
All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

To provide PBVs to clients of one of RHA's nonprofit partnering agencies, sections B.4., D.1.b. and D.7.a. were cited and approved for this activity. These authorizations allow RHA to operate transitional or conditional housing programs with supportive services in collaboration with local community-based organizations, to determine the length of the lease period, and the establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 Project-Based Voucher Program, including commitment of project-based vouchers to Agency-owned units without a local competition.

No changes to the authorizations were made in FY 2017.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-08 CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars by partnering with local non-profits.	$0	$13,260[37]	$5,092	No

2014-08 HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	0	0	0	Yes

2014-08 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
# of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).				
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 partnership.	0	2	1	No

[37] Benchmark is set assuming full lease up of five units with CAAW, RHA's longest partnership. CAAW has estimated approximately $221 per month per client in additional resources.

2014-08 HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice due to partnership.	0	2	4	Yes

Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:
There are no changes to the baselines, benchmarks and/or metrics related to this activity.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:
Washoe County Department of Social Services estimates that their agency spends an average of $106.08 per month per client for case management services. Based on this estimate, RHA leveraged $5,092 in resources (*2014-08 CE #4)*.

Through ongoing outreach and communication with each of the community partners, RHA hopes to meet these benchmark in the future.

Changes to data collection methodology:
There are no changes to the data collection methodology related to this activity.

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

The activities discussed in this section have been previously approved by HUD, but not yet implemented by RHA. The following table provides an overview of each activity including the year it was approved, the primary statutory objective(s) the activity is intended to impact and the authorization(s) cited.

Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities				
Activity #	**Fiscal Year Approved**	**Activity Name**	**Statutory Objective(s)**	**Authorization(s)**
2016-03	2016	Time limited vouchers and redesign of traditional FSS Program	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work *and* reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness *and* increase housing choice for low-income families	Attachment C Sections D.1.b., D.1.c., D.2.d., E *and* Attachment D Use of MTW Funds

2016-03: Time limited vouchers and redesign of traditional FSS Program

Description:
In FY 2016, RHA proposed and received approval to establish a five-year time limit for all new non-elderly/non-disabled applicants participating in the HCV program with the goal of promoting self-sufficiency and increasing housing opportunities. Furthermore, to better serve existing HCV and PH FSS participants and all new non-elderly/non-disabled HCV participants with time limited vouchers, RHA received approval to redesign the traditional HCV and PH FSS Program.

Time limited vouchers:
In an effort to assist more families in need an promote self-sufficiency, work-able non-elderly/non-disabled households receiving subsidies will be given an impetus to become self-sufficient and cycle off of the program through the implementation of five-year time limited vouchers. Prior to being issued a time limited voucher, all new non-elderly/non-disabled applicants will be required to attend an in depth, eight hours financial literacy class conducted by the FGC. Should a family choose not to participate in the class, they will be removed from the HCV wait list entirely and will need to reapply.

In addition to the mandatory financial literacy class, all new non-elderly/non-disabled HCV participants will meet with an FSS Coordinator within three months of lease up to create an ITSP. The ITSP will outline the family's goals to achieve self-sufficiency within five years. All time limited voucher holders will also be required to meet annually, at minimum, with an FSS Coordinator to review the ITSP and track their progress.

Redesign of traditional FSS Program:
In order to better serve existing HCV and PH FSS participants and all new non-elderly/non-disabled HCV participants with time limited vouchers, the traditional HCV and PH FSS Program will be redesigned. The redesign will eliminate the escrow accrual for all new HCV participants while

allowing PH FSS participants to continue to participate in FSS with the traditional escrow accrual; however, upon successful completion of the FSS Program, the PH resident will only receive their escrow balance upon forfeiture of their housing assistance. Should the family choose to forfeit the balance of the accrued escrow, they will be allowed to maintain their PH unit. All current/existing HCV and PH FSS participants will be allowed to continue their escrow accrual through the expiration of their FSS contracts and maintain housing assistance under current FSS Program guidelines.

Actions taken toward implementation:
In FY 2014, RHA began issuing vouchers limited to five years as part of a Rent Reform Controlled Study (Activity 2014-03) within the HCV program. RHA continues to work with UNR to evaluate the continuing effects and changing statuses of families participating in the Rent Reform Controlled Study. Several of the participants leased up under the Study Group will be transitioning into their third year on the program, at which time, they will experience their first rent increase. To properly gauge whether increases in income that do not affect a household's rent and whether or not limiting vouchers to five years is incentive enough for families to become self-sufficient, implementation of this activity on all non-elderly/non-disabled HCV participants has been postponed.

An exact date for implementation of this activity is not known at this time.

C. Activities on Hold

RHA does not have any MTW activities on hold.

D. Closed Activities

The activities discussed in this section have been previously approved by HUD, but closed by RHA. The following table provides an overview of each activity including the year it was approved, the primary statutory objective(s) the activity is intended to impact and the authorization(s) cited.

Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities				
Activity #	Fiscal Year Approved	Activity Name	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
2014-07	2014	Alternate HQS verification policy	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.5.

2014-07: Alternate HQS verification policy

Description:
HCV units that pass the HQS inspection on the first visit will not be inspected until two years following the last passed inspection, as long as both the landlord and HCV participant sign a certification that the unit is in good repair. If the landlord and HCV participant do not each certify or agree on the condition of the unit, an annual HQS inspection is conducted. The year following a successful self-certification, RHA will conduct a standard HQS inspection.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

Implementation year:
This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Year of close out:
This activity was closed out in FY 2017.

Reason for close out:
As HUD is now allowing for biennial HQS inspections through Section 220 of the 2014 Appropriations Act, RHA requested that this activity be closed in its FY 2017 MTW Annual Plan.

Activity Metrics:
The following metrics were identified and tracked for this activity.

2014-07 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of completing HQS inspections.	$169,213.76 annually 2,656 (# of annual inspections) * $63.71 (RHA's cost to complete an inspection)	$80,019.76 annually 1,256 annual inspections will be completed at a cost of $63.71 per inspection 1,256*63.71 = 80,019.76	2014 - $56,512 annually 2015 - $80,975 annually 2016 - $104,421 annually Annual inspections were completed at a cost of $63.71 per inspection.	No

2014-07 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total amount of staff time to complete HQS inspections.	2,656 hours	1,256 hours	2014 - 883 hours 2015 - 1,271 hours 2016 - 1,639 hours	No

2014-07 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in conducting an HQS inspection as a percentage.	0%	No change	2014 - No change 2015 - No change 2016 - No change	Yes

Final outcomes and lessons learned:
Following implementation of this activity, the number of HQS inspections conducted by RHA staff steadily decreased. This steady decrease allowed RHA to realize staff time savings and cost savings. By the end of FY 2016, 53.44% of eligible HCV participants and landlords chose to sign a certification that the unit was in good shape and opt-out of their annual HQS inspection. As HUD is now allowing for biennial inspections without using MTW flexibility, RHA opted to close this activity out.

Section Five

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

5

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system.

Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

On May 2, 2016, RHA began to replace 900 aluminum frame windows throughout the Mineral Manor complex with energy star rated, highly efficient, thermal pane windows. The total obligated expenditure for the energy improvement project was $398,671. As of July 1, 2016, the project was approximately 55% complete. Work completed in FY 2017 and the remaining $186,388 obligation was paid.

RHA also began the process of replacing older, inefficient water heaters with energy saving tankless water heaters in the laundry rooms and other common areas at various PH complexes in FY 2017. The estimated cost for the installation of the new tankless water heaters across all sites was approximately $36,000. As of June 30, 2017, RHA had expended $25,089.78 toward the project.

The Rent Credit Incentive Program was estimated to cost $20,000 during FY 2017. However, as of June 30, 2017, no FSS Lite participants had been approved for or received any of these estimated credits. No funds have been obligated or expended toward this program.

B. Local Asset Management Plan

Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?	**YES**	or	No
Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?	Yes	or	**NO**

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?	Yes	or	**NO**

RHA is not implementing a LAMP so the narrative is not required.

C. Commitment of Unspent Funds

In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.

Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
MTW PH Improvement	Replace Water Heaters with Tank-less Energy efficient water heaters at various sites	$10,910.22	$10,910.22
Personnel	Salaries and Benefits Payable at 06-30-17	$10,345.05	$10,345.05
Administrative Assistance	UNR Interns to assist in self-sufficiency services	$18,128.82	$18,128.82
MTW Self-Sufficiency	Self-sufficiency program	$27,350.16	$27,350.16
MTW Evaluation	UNR Study	$24,000.00	$24,000.00
MTW Agreement	Financial Literacy class through the FGC	$32,000.00	$32,000.00
	Total Obligated or Committed Funds:	**$122,734.25**	**$122,734.25**

During FY 2017, RHA completed the installation of the energy efficient windows at the Mineral Manor PH complex and expended the balance of those funds in the amount of $186,388. Work began on the replacement of aged water heaters in common areas within the PH complexes, such as the laundry and community rooms. The estimated cost for this project was $36,000, of which $25,089.78 had been paid as of June 30, 2017.

In addition, RHA also obligated $376,462.38 for various MTW related activities including the FSS Program specifically focusing on job interviewing techniques and preparation as well as empowerment classes for participants, UNR's ongoing analysis of Rent Reform Controlled Study and Mobility Demonstration Study participants, and personnel expenditures for administration. As of June 30, 2017, RHA has spent $253,728.13 on these programs.

Note*: Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of obligations and commitments, MTW agencies are not required to complete this section.*

Section Six

ADMINISTRATIVE

6

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 actions required from any reviews, audits, or physical inspections.

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

RHA is working with UNR to administer and conduct an annual analysis for Rent Reform and Mobility Demonstration participants. This questionnaire began being administered annually to program participants in September 2014 and to date, UNR has compiled three years of data.

C. Certification that the PHA has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; 2) continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and 3) maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

1) At the end of FY 2017, 2,756 households out of a total of 2,916 households or 94.51% were very low-income (<50% AMI).
   a) Public Housing: 687 out of 742 or 92.59%
   b) Housing Choice Vouchers: 2,069 out of 2,174 or 95.17%
2) Baseline numbers show total households served were 3,147; as of June 30, 2017, 2,916 households were served or 92.66% of baseline.
3) RHA is maintaining a comparable mix of families by family size, as seen below.

Mix of Family Sizes Served							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained	50.56%	20.34%	12.87%	8.52%	4.67%	3.05%	**100%**
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year	1,614	535	288	252	145	82	**2,916**
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year	55.35%	18.35%	9.88%	8.64%	4.97%	2.81%	**100%**
Percentage Change	4.79%	-1.99%	-2.99%	0.12%	0.30%	-0.24%	**0**

7

Section Seven

ATTACHMENT

Housing Authority of the City of Reno

VII. Attachment

2018 Survey Summary Statistics of clients participating in Housing Authority of the City of Reno's (RHA) Moving to Work Mobility Demonstration and Rent Reform Controlled Study programs

Prepared by Professor Kimberly Rollins, Department of Economics, University of Nevada, Reno
krollins@unr.edu; (775) 784-1677

I. Background

1. Brief description of the two RHA mobility programs

Mobility Demonstration Program: In FY 2014, RHA began a Mobility Demonstration that enables qualified Public Housing families, who otherwise lack mobility options, to move to de-concentrated settings with more economic opportunities throughout the neighborhood and surrounding areas. The program allows these Public Housing households to reside in low-poverty census tracts, effectively increasing the availability of higher-income positions in the neighborhood and surrounding areas. The number of families in the Mobility Demonstration Program is limited by the number of residential units that Reno Housing Authority has available. The control group for the Mobility Demonstration consists of qualified families with children who opted not to participate in the Mobility Demonstration but rather stay in one of RHA's Public Housing complexes.

Rent Reform Controlled Study: The Rent Reform Controlled Study, also implemented in FY 2014, was put in place to determine the incentive for self-sufficiency created when rents are not tied directly to income levels. Households in the study group have a set, unchanging rent, and the control group has rent calculated under standard Housing Choice Voucher guidelines. Through the Rent Reform Program, RHA provides families in the study group with two of the strongest incentives in becoming self-sufficient: (1) the motivation to increase household income when income no longer affects rent and (2) the awareness that their housing assistance will end after five years.

More information about RHA's Moving to Work program and activities is available at: http://www.renoha.org/index.php?id=MTW.

2. Purpose of the questionnaire and data collection

The study includes a component designed to track outcomes of the two programs, based on data from four groups: the set of clients and a control group for each program. The control groups consist of client households who would have qualified to be in the program groups, but are not. Ideally, the control groups should be statistically similar to their corresponding treatment groups at the outset of the five year observation period. The outcomes are tracked with data from two sources. The first is the information that RHA collects for each household, recording when incomes and household changes, rent paid, when clients leave the program, and if possible, the reason for leaving. The second source of data is from a Questionnaire developed specifically for this study, to provide more in-depth information about characteristics of households, and factors that might be expected to change over time due to participation in the study groups (i.e., households in the Mobility Study group may report greater satisfaction with children's progress, safety in their neighborhood, access to community opportunities and employment). The questionnaire was repeated annually over five years. Changes over time within households, and deviations in these changes between the treatment and control groups, will be evaluated to determine whether they are statistically significant and can be attributed to the programs.

The questionnaire is as extensive as it is with many questions being intensely personal for two main reasons. First, the sample sizes are small – the number of participants in the Mobility Demonstration is restricted by the numbers of houses purchased by RHA for use in this program. Small sample sizes pose issues for statistical estimation. While there may be anecdotal evidence that clients in these programs transfer out of subsidized housing faster, it is likely that the small sample sizes and variations among different people's circumstances, experiences, abilities, and backgrounds may result in insufficient statistical power to make a case that program participation was the cause. Taking into account reduced statistical power for what would seem to be an obvious metric for evaluating the programs (rate of transferring out of subsidized housing, for example), it was decided that a comprehensive set of metrics would be developed to generate a combined picture to describe observable differences over 5 years among treatment and control groups.

Secondly, underlying differences among clients (e.g. education, work experience, mental health problems, abilities, numbers and ages of children) may vary to such an extent that they mask differences in outcomes from program participation. The questionnaire collects variables that will be used to control for these variations.

This document summarizes five years of data from the questionnaire for both programs and their control groups. While the overall purpose of this study is to compare deviations between control and treatment groups over the five years, this report focuses on summary statistics for selected questionnaire items (not the full set of data, which includes 705 variables) for the five years of the questionnaire, with broad differences in the means and standard deviations between the groups for each year.

II. Numbers of Participants over Five Years and Duration by Households

Heads of Households were interviewed once each year. Up through the end of April, 2018, a total of 269 participating heads of households completed the questionnaire, broken down as follows, Where MOB indicates the Mobility study group, MOB-C the Mobility Control groups; RRS indicates the Rent Reform Study group, and RRC the Rent Reform Control group:

MOB	38	RRS	106
MOB-C	21	RRC	104

Individual households entered the study in the first three years, no new households were entered after that. This means that the longest any one household may be in the study is 5 years, for up to 5 survey observations for that household. There are a total of 850 observations over the 5 years, with the breakdown of the number of household years in each of the four groups shown in Table 1. Table 1 shows, for example, that 50 households were included for the entire 5 years. Broken down by study groups, there are 7 and 0 in the Mobility study and Control groups, respectively; and 25 and 18 in the Rent Reform Control and Study groups.

Table 1: Total participation by study group and numbers of participation years

	client_year					
Group	1	2	3	4	5	Total
MOB	38	35	24	17	7	121
MOB-C	21	9	3	1	0	34
RRC	104	96	79	47	25	351
RRS	106	92	76	52	18	344
Total	269	232	182	117	50	850

Households in the study for fewer than 5 years may have started in years 2 or 3 of the study, and continued through to 2018; or they may have started in years 1, 2, or 3 and dropped out of the study. They may have dropped out because they were no longer in need of housing assistance, because they moved out of the region, because they were asked to leave (evicted), or other reasons. We have no way to know why they may have left, for certain, other than if the reasons are recorded in the monthly tracking sheets, identified by Client ID number.

Table 1 indicates that 52 households were in the Rent Reform Study for 4 years, of these, 18 remained for a 5th year. Thus, a total of 34 households were in this study group for 4 years only. Similarly, 106 households were in the rent reform study group for 1 year, and of these, 92 went on to a second year. Thus, 14 households were in this group for only 1 year. Tables 2 through 5 break this down more completely, with each table representing a study group, with totals reported in Table 6.

Table 2: Mobility Study Group - number of households, by years of participation

Pgm_year	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	30	0	0	0	0	30
2	5	30	0	0	0	35
3	3	3	22	0	0	28
4	0	2	2	17	0	21
5	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total	38	35	24	17	7	121

Table 3: Mobility Control Group – number of households, by years of participation

Pgm_year	1	2	3	4	Total
1	21	0	0	0	21
2	0	9	0	0	9
3	0	0	3	0	3
4	0	0	0	1	1
Total	21	9	3	1	34

Table 4: Rent Reform Study Group - number of households, by years of participation

Pgm_year	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	71	0	0	0	0	71
2	16	66	0	0	0	82
3	19	13	60	0	0	92
4	0	13	10	46	0	69
5	0	0	6	6	18	30
Total	106	92	76	52	18	344

Table 5: Rent Reform Control Group - number of households, by years of participation

Pgm_year	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	74	0	0	0	0	74
2	19	71	0	0	0	90
3	11	16	59	1	0	87
4	0	9	15	44	0	68
5	0	0	5	2	25	32
Total	104	96	79	47	25	351

Table 6: Numbers of households, by years of participation by household - Totals

Pgm_year	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	196	0	0	0	0	196
2	40	176	0	0	0	216
3	33	32	144	1	0	210
4	0	24	27	108	0	159
5	0	0	11	8	50	69
Total	269	232	182	117	50	850

III. Demographics

On the **first year** the household entered the study (years 1 through 3 of the program), the head of household was:

	female	male	married	divorced	widowed	single	Unmarried living with partner	Age Ave	Age Std.Dev	Age Min /Max
MOB	34	4	7	7	1	21	2	41.6	11.5	27/72
MOB-C	18	3	8	2	1	8	2	47.9	9.0	30/64
RRS	96	10	22	21	3	55	5	40.4	10.6	24/70
RRC	88	16	20	24	1	55	4	40.1	9.9	24/70

When asked if they lived with other people on the **first year** they participated in the study:

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	1	37	38
MOB-C	1	20	21
RRS	2	104	106
RRC	1	103	104
Total	5	264	269

In each of their program participation years, heads of households were asked about their employment status. These results are reported in Table 7.

Table 7: Head of Household Employment Status

During Household's **first** year in Study:

Group	Yes	No, and not looking	looking	Total
MOB	18	11	8	37
MOB-C	9	10	2	21
RRC	51	24	29	104
RRS	60	20	26	106
Total	138	65	65	268

During Household's **second** year in Study

Group	Yes	No, and: not looking	looking	Total
MOB	22	5	8	35
MOB-C	1	4	4	9
RRC	51	25	20	96
RRS	52	21	19	92
Total	126	55	51	232

During Household's **third** year in Study

Group	Yes	No, and: not looking	looking	Total
MOB	17	5	2	24
MOB-C	0	3	0	3
RRC	37	23	19	79
RRS	47	10	19	76
Total	101	41	40	182

During Household's **fourth** year in Study

Group	Yes	No, and: not looking	looking	Total
MOB	15	2	0	17
MOB-C	0	1	0	1
RRC	19	18	10	47
RRS	36	10	6	52
Total	70	31	16	117

During Household's **fifth** year in Study

Group	Yes	No, and: not looking	looking	Total
MOB	6	1	0	7
RRC	14	7	4	25
RRS	13	2	2	17
Total	33	10	6	49

Heads of households were asked in each year that they participated in the study whether they were currently in school, with results reported in Table 8.

Table 8: Head of Household Currently in School

During Household's **first** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Part time	Total
MOB	31	4	2	37
MOB-C	21	0	0	21
RRC	92	12	0	104
RRS	94	9	3	106
Total	238	25	5	268

During Household's **second** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Part time	Total
MOB	31	3	1	35
MOB-C	9	0	0	9
RRC	88	3	5	96
RRS	78	9	5	92
Total	206	15	11	232

During Household's **third** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Part time	Total
MOB	23	1	0	24
MOB-C	3	0	0	3
RRC	72	4	3	79
RRS	70	6	0	76
Total	168	11	3	182

During Household's **fourth** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Part time	Total
MOB	15	2	0	17
MOB-C	1	0	0	1
RRC	41	2	4	47
RRS	49	3	0	52
Total	106	7	4	117

During Household's **fifth** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Part time	Total
MOB	6	1	0	7
RRC	22	2	1	25
RRS	17	0	0	17
Total	45	3	1	49

Each year, heads of households were asked if they had ever participated in any job training programs in Washoe County. These results are reported in Table 9.

Table 9: Head of Household participation in Washoe County job training programs

During Household's **first** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	26	11	37
MOB-C	13	8	21
RRC	68	36	104
RRS	70	36	106
Total	177	91	268

During Household's **second** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	23	12	35
MOB-C	5	4	9
RRC	65	31	96
RRS	63	29	92
Total	156	76	232

During Household's **third** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	13	11	24
MOB-C	2	1	3
RRC	46	33	79
RRS	49	27	76
Total	110	72	182

During Household's **fourth** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	9	8	17
MOB-C	1	0	1
RRC	34	13	47
RRS	36	16	52
Total	80	37	117

During Household's **fifth** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	3	4	7
RRC	19	6	25
RRS	11	6	17
Total	33	16	49

IV. Indicators of Self Sufficiency

For each of their program participation years, heads of households were asked whether they had savings accounts, and if so, about their household savings at the time. These results are reported in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10: Household with savings accounts by group and participation year

During Household's **first** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	15	22	37
MOB-C	9	12	21
RRC	56	48	104
RRS	38	68	106
Total	118	150	268

During Household's **second** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	14	21	35
MOB-C	3	6	9
RRC	55	41	96
RRS	41	51	92
Total	113	119	232

During Household's **third** year in Study

Group	No	Yes	Total
MOB	10	14	24
MOB-C	2	1	3
RRC	46	33	79
RRS	33	43	76
Total	91	91	182

```
During Household's fourth year in Study
     Group |          No          Yes|     Total
-----------+----------------------+----------
       MOB |           5           12 |        17
     MOB-C |           0            1 |         1
       RRC |          27           20 |        47
       RRS |          21           31 |        52
-----------+----------------------+----------
     Total |          53           64 |       117
```

```
During Household's fifth year in Study
     Group |          No          Yes|     Total
-----------+----------------------+----------
       MOB |           2            5 |         7
       RRC |          12           13 |        25
       RRS |           5           12 |        17
-----------+----------------------+----------
     Total |          19           30 |        49
```

Looking at the Rent Reform groups on the last two panels of Table 11, we see a trend for increasing mean savings over time in the study groups as compared with the control group. Savings rates increased for both groups over time, but the rate of increase and the amounts are greater for the study group, is was expected. Looking at the Mobility groups, the sample sizes are too small to be able to make any conclusions, particularly the sizes in the control group. This does not mean there is not a treatment effect – it simply means that the limitation of the numbers of available homes was such that the numbers are too small to make any statistical conclusions on this variable.

Table 11: Amounts of Money in Household savings accounts by group and participation year

Mobility Study Group Total savings by participation year:

Participation year	Number Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
1	35	1534.10	8786.434	0	54256
2	35	1643.37	8785.704	0	52100
3	24	2759.01	10414.15	0	50110
4	17	3529.55	11643.69	0	48115.91
5	7	434.54	874.1374	0	2398

Mobility Control Group total savings by participation year:

Participation year	Number Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
1	21	691.48	1601.85	0	6070
2	9	856.44	1619.89	0	5000
3	3	476.67	825.61	0	1430
4	1	4370.76	na	na	na
5	0	na	na	na	na

Rent Reform Study Group total savings by participation year:

Participation year	Number Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
1	106	263.01	958.59	-150	7000
2	92	419.16	982.48	0	5199
3	76	522.1478	1269.869	0	7117
4	52	1576.492	6474.416	-257	45000
5	18	985.3194	2044.093	0	6800

Rent Reform Control Group total savings by participation year:

Participation year	Number Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
1	104	46.83	146.58	0	1150
2	96	205.55	779.16	0	6600
3	79	148.34	445.11	0	2730
4	47	105.92	247.32	0	1200
5	25	251.52	736.62	0	3200