Moving to **Work**

Annual Report

fiscal year | 2019

Housing Authority of the City of Reno

Submitted to HUD on September 24, 2019

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

Heidi McKendree
Director of Rental Assistance

April Lawson
Director of Administration

Brett Simerly
Director of Development

Maribel Martinez
Director of Asset Management

EQUAL HOUSING
OPPORTUNITY

CONTENTS

Section I

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. Following its creation, RHA was appointed as the Public Housing Authority (PHA) for both the City of Sparks and Washoe County.

Currently, RHA 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 identified funding sources, RHA was able to acquire over 160 scattered site properties throughout the local area. While some of these scattered site rental properties are leased to higher income families, the majority are specifically allocated to house 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 continues to lease each of these properties at levels that are lower than the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Fair Market Rents (FMR) for Washoe County.

RHA also operates several 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 federal 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 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." Participating in MTW does not provide PHAs with additional funding from HUD, but rather allows each agency to use their federal funding in a more flexible manner.

After receiving HUD's approval, PHAs participating in the MTW program can 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 the local needs of their

Moving to Work Statutory Objectives

- Increase housing choice 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

community. In doing so, each of the activities proposed or implemented by the PHA must address at least one of three MTW statutory objectives.

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 true for all PHAs currently participating in the MTW program. 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?

The MTW Annual Report highlights and details the MTW activities approved by HUD and implemented during the plan year. The report provides comparisons of actual outcomes to the benchmarks set in the FY 2019 MTW Annual Plan for each newly approved activity. It also provides an update on each of the ongoing activities that 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.

In FY 2019, the following activities were approved in the MTW Annual Plan:

- Redetermination of rent reasonableness as a result of a change in contract rent.
  RHA began waiving the requirement for rent reasonableness determinations provided that the new requested rent amount is a change of 10% or less.

- Provide incentives to $0 HAP households.
  RHA extended the HCV program eligibility for households receiving $0 Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) from six months to 12 months and began allowing participants at $0 HAP to self-certify income and accrue a program completion escrow.

In addition, RHA amended the following two activities in FY 2019 that had been previously approved by HUD:

- Expand Project Based Voucher (PBV) program.
  RHA expanded its PBV program to allow for the allocation of PBVs to privately owned properties in exchange for the owner's commitment to provide affordable housing to families who are actively involved in workforce development programs.
- Asset threshold to determine eligibility for admission.
  Cash assets are excluded for all elderly/disabled applicants when determining program eligibility. However, ownership interest in a property that the applicant has a legal right to reside in remains an eligibility criterion for all applicants.

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

RHA's MTW activities are focused around the principals set forth in the agency's mission statement as well as the goals outlined in its strategic plan. As a result, RHA identified the following four goals that continue to guide our MTW program: (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 activities that assist in the community's effort to house at risk families. In FY 2019, management and the agency's Board of Commissioners continued their execution of RHA's strategic plan which builds upon these core goals.

Short-term goals and objectives

RHA continuously works to ensure that all implemented and proposed activities are being successfully and accurately administered. In FY 2015, RHA began implementing a software conversion that ultimately became a lengthy and tedious process. Although the conversion took longer than expected to fully implement, it is now fully operational and expected to increase efficiencies in RHA's operations, assist the agency in meeting all federal reporting requirements, and allow for easy tracking and monitoring of many of RHA's MTW activities. Going forward, each technological upgrade that RHA undertakes will allow the entire housing process to run more effectively. In FY 2019, RHA began accepting applications for housing assistance online. It is anticipated that with online applications the intake process will increase and, over time, RHA's lease up rate in each of its housing programs will improve. With this upgrade fully integrated and in place, RHA is exploring other technologies, including the possibility of equipping each of RHA's Housing Inspectors with tablets to utilize while out in the field.

In FY 2017, staff began reviewing the agency's definition of self-sufficiency to determine whether it accurately captured if a household should be considered self-sufficient. After discussion and deliberation, staff determined that the agency should address 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.

To provide the necessary support to all families who wish to become self-sufficient, RHA expanded its Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program into a Workforce Development Program. The Workforce Development Program is designed to assist participating RHA families and youth in increasing their level of education, workforce skills, and earnings. The program provides participants with the necessary support to develop and achieve their educational and employment goals. RHA's Workforce Development Coordinators work closely with goal-oriented participants by providing guidance, assisting to overcome barriers and celebrating successes.

Workforce Development Program
Mission Statement

To improve the quality of life for RHA youth, seniors, and families by providing opportunities to increase their independence and stability through participant focused resources, workforce training, and employment services.

Workforce Development staff remain committed to working with RHA's community partners who also provide additional guidance and support to program participants who are working toward their career and educational goals. Through ongoing training, RHA continues to cultivate the agency's new definition of self-sufficiency.

Progress toward long-term goals and objectives

The City of Reno, the City of Sparks and Washoe County have experienced a strengthening housing market due in part to a "tech boom" which has brought some of Fortune's highest-ranked companies, including Tesla, Switch, Amazon, Google and Microsoft, to the area. While the arrival of these companies into the Truckee Meadows means higher wages for some, many residents have not seen a significant spike in pay. The minimum wage in Nevada remains at $8.25/hour, however, the living wage for one adult living alone in Washoe County in 2017 was $11.20/hour.[1] According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, a household would currently have to earn $19.94/hour to rent a modest two-bedroom apartment in Reno without paying more than 30% of the household's income on housing based on HUD's FY 2019 FMRs.

This increased demand for housing has tightened the community's rental market and, in some cases, made it harder for RHA's HCV participants to find units to lease. An overall lack of affordable housing has contributed to an increase in the number of families who are at risk of experiencing homelessness. Throughout FY 2019, RHA continued to collaborate with local community organizations to explore ways to overcome homelessness within our jurisdiction. PBVs have been assigned to existing affordable housing units where the owner commits to providing services and assistance to homeless individuals and families. In FY 2019, RHA expanded its PBV activity to address the lack of affordable housing for those participating in workforce development programs within Washoe County. RHA continues to reach out to community partners who can provide the case management necessary to make these future clients successful and plans to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for these PBV units in the coming months.

RHA's Mobility Demonstration (Activity 2014-02) was implemented after HUD's approval of the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan and continues to be an exciting program to offer to RHA's PH residents. Through this program, qualified PH families, who otherwise lack mobility options, are given opportunity to move to low poverty neighborhoods throughout the City of Reno, the City of Sparks and Washoe County. To date, 37 properties have been made available for the program and 41 former PH families have been given the opportunity to live in low poverty neighborhoods, 23 of whom are still active in the program.

With dwindling federal funding to address necessary repairs and improvements needed at PH properties across the country, single fund flexibility has proven to be vital in the improvement and conservation of RHA's PH complexes. RHA will continue to use the flexibility allowed for in Section B of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement to make additional improvements to its PH properties, specifically those focused on energy and water savings, to ensure long-term viability.

In FY 2016, RHA identified the need to replace inefficient appliances at six PH complexes with energy star rated, highly efficient, energy saving appliances. Planning and design for this project

[1] Based on the information provided by the Living Wage Calculator developed by Dr. Amy K. Glasmeier at MIT (http://livingwage.mit.edu/).

began in July of 2019 with advertisement concluding on August 23, 2019. The following table details the number and type of appliances scheduled to be replaced at the respective PH complex:

Locations where appliances are being replaced		
PH Complex	Refrigerators	Electric or Gas Ranges
Mineral Manor (NV39-P001-001)	12	11
Stead Manor (NV39-P001-006)	20	1
Hawk View Apartments (NV39-P001-007)	27	4
Essex Manor (NV39- P001-009)	34	14
Myra Birch Manor (NV39-P001-010)	11	2
Tom Sawyer Village (NV39-P001-102)	10	0
Totals:	**114**	**32**

Following approval by RHA's Board of Commissioners on August 27, 2019, a contract in the amount of $105,696 was awarded to The Washtub-Sargent's. Replacement of these dated appliances is anticipated to begin in early September and be fully complete by mid-October 2019.

RHA has recently identified landscaping and irrigation systems that should be replaced throughout Hawk View Apartments and Myra Birch Manor PH complexes. Current landscaping will be replaced with xeriscape materials and low use water saving irrigation systems will be installed. With an estimated budget of $114,403 for both sites, planning and design is anticipated to begin in December 2019.

Utilizing the flexibilities available through MTW to expand housing choice, streamline agency operations and develop creative solutions to meet the needs of low-income families in our community remains a long-term goal of RHA. New initiatives that further both the MTW statutory objectives and RHA's strategic plan continue to be explored and proposed. In future years, RHA will continue to explore activities that assist working families, partner with a local non-profit to provide emergency housing to at risk populations through the use of shallow subsidies, create a localized apprenticeship program, and leverage HCV reserves for future development of affordable housing. In addition, RHA is assessing its PH portfolio in consideration of HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program.

Non-MTW goals and objectives

In addition to the short-term and long-term goals and objectives previously identified, in FY 2019 RHA:

- Broke ground on the development of an affordable housing site with 44 dwelling units for seniors on May 21, 2019. The Willie J. Wynn Apartments have been designed to support seniors aging in place with one out of four apartments being dedicated to seniors who are transitioning from motels and/or shelters. The Willie J. Wynn Apartments will provide support to

Artist rendering of Willie J. Wynn Apartments.

help residents maintain financial and physical independence through on-site and off-site programs.

- Continued to work toward the goals outlined in the approved strategic plan which includes increasing RHA's housing portfolio through the development of affordable housing units, collaborating with community partners, advancing the education and economic opportunities of all program participants and continuing to utilize MTW flexibilities that assist RHA in addressing the needs of the local community.

- Updated the five-year plan for capital improvement expenditures.

- Completed the full integration of RHA's new software system. This new software will result in better management of all the agency's operations and programs. RHA recently implemented an online application portal for admission to its housing programs and continues to explore additional technological upgrades (i.e. tablets, inspection module, UPCS module) to increase the agency's overall efficiency.

Section II

General Operating Information

II. General Operating Information

Households Served

Throughout FY 2019, RHA served 3,214 households through its PH and HCV programs of which 345 households moved off for various reasons. Overall, this included 2,297 children, 1,853 people with disabilities and 1,441 elderly household members. At the end of FY 2019, the average income for households currently living in RHA's PH complexes was $16,936 and 67.75% of these households had annual incomes at or below 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). Similarly, the average income for households assisted through RHA's HCV program was $14,933 and 74.11% of these households had annual incomes at or below 30% of the AMI.

The following table shows demographic information for active PH residents and HCV participants who were housed on June 30, 2019. The table includes residents/participants who were leased up under RHA's programs, but excludes households assisted through the Veterans Administration Supportive Housing (VASH) program.

Assisted households who were housed on June 30, 2019				
	PH residents		**HCV participants**	
Total # households	741	100%	2,128	100%
Income Level				
Extremely Low Income	502	67.75%	1,577	74.11%
Very Low Income	181	24.43%	454	21.33%
Low Income	41	5.53%	89	4.18%
Above Low Income	17	2.29%	8	0.38%
Family Type				
Elderly Disabled	158	21.32%	542	25.47%
Elderly Non-Disabled	120	16.19%	375	17.62%
Non-Elderly Disabled	144	19.43%	611	28.71%
Non-Elderly Non-Disabled	319	43.05%	600	28.20%
Race of Head of Household				
White	578	78.00%	1,689	79.37%
Black/African American	94	12.69%	320	15.04%
American Indian or Alaska Native	22	2.97%	46	2.16%
Asian	51	6.88%	71	3.34%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	8	1.08%	17	0.80%
Ethnicity of Head of Household				
Hispanic or Latino	208	28.07%	357	16.78%
Not Hispanic or Latino	533	71.93%	1,771	83.22%

A. Housing Stock Information

i. Actual New Project Based Vouchers

The following table includes tenant-based vouchers that RHA project-based for the first-time during FY 2019 and includes only those where an agreement to enter into a HAP contract was in place by the end of FY 2019.

Property Name	Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based		Status at End of Plan Year**	RAD?	Description of Project
	Planned*	Actual			
Mobility Demonstration/ Opportunity Properties	1	0	N/A	No	PH residents in good standing can move to RHA's scattered site properties on a two-year PBV based on meeting certain criteria.
Single Family Home Project-Based Vouchers	1	0	N/A	No	RHA owns several single-family homes acquired under NSP2 and other programs that are being shifted to PBVs as they become vacant.
Yorkshire Terrace	2	0	N/A	No	RHA is assigning PBVs to units at Yorkshire Terrace, a 30-unit LIHTC property. RHA plans to expand this to include more units if/when a unit becomes vacant.
Privately Owned Properties	50	0	N/A	No	Privately owned properties are being assigned PBVs through a competitive process in exchange for their commitment to provide affordable housing to individuals and/or families who are experiencing homelessness and/or participating in local workforce development programs.
	54	**0**	**Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based**		

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

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

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

RHA does not assign a PBV to any agency owned property unless that unit is or becomes vacant. Due to the tightening rental market in Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County, many of the properties that RHA staff would consider for the assignment of a PBV have remained occupied.

ii. Actual Existing Project-Based Vouchers

The following table includes tenant-based vouchers that RHA is currently project-basing in FY 2019 and includes only those where a HAP contract was in place by the beginning of FY 2019.

Property Name	Number of Project-Based Vouchers		Status at End of Plan Year**	RAD?	Description of Project
	Planned*	Actual			
Mobility/ Opportunity Properties	40	38	Leased/ Issued	No	PH residents in good standing are allowed to move to RHA's scattered site properties on a two-year PBV.
Single Family Home PBVs	18	16	Leased/ Issued	No	RHA owns several single-family homes acquired under NSP2 and other programs that are being shifted to PBVs.
Yorkshire Terrace	16	16	Leased/ Issued	No	RHA is assigning PBVs to units at Yorkshire Terrace, a 30-unit LIHTC property.
Partnerships	12	12	Leased/ Issued	No	RHA has formalized agreements with several nonprofit community partners to provide affordable housing to their clients. RHA works with each nonprofit partner to provide housing while the nonprofit partner provides case management services.
Privately Owned Properties	75	25	Leased/ Issued	No	Privately owned properties are being assigned PBVs through a competitive process in exchange for their commitment to provide affordable housing to individuals and/or families who are experiencing homelessness.
	161	**107**	**Planned/Actual Total Existing Project-Based Vouchers**		

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

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

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

RHA does not assign a PBV to any agency owned property unless that unit is or becomes vacant. Due to the tightening rental market in Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County, many of the properties that RHA staff would consider for the assignment of a PBV have remained occupied.

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

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

Actual Other Changes to MTW Housing Stock in the Plan Year
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. In FY 2019, there were no actual other changes to the MTW housing stock.

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

General Description of All Actual Capital Expenditures during the Plan Year

The CFP expenditures paid out in FY 2019 were less than normal due to contracts being executed by the end of the FY on several projects, however no payments had been made. As of June 30, 2019, the following CFP expenditures were carried out:

A. Silverada Manor:

• CFP 2016 – Appliance replacement	$56,531
• CFP 2017 – Boiler room replacement planning costs	$41,400

B. Stead Manor:

• CFP 2017 – Security improvements	$16,597
• CFP 2018 – Exterior paint	$13,840
• CFP 2018 – Asphalt repair/replacement	$9,720

C. Myra Birch Manor:

• CFP 2017 – Asphalt repair/replacement prep costs	$134,095
• CFP 2018 – Sewer line repairs prep costs	$3,093

D. Management Improvements:

• CFP 2017 – Web portal software development for online applications	$42,536

E. RHA Main Office:

• CFP 2016 – HVAC replacement with thermostats	$73,930
• CFP 2017 – Roof replacement, phase I	$70,000
• CFP 2018 – Roof replacement, phase II	$16,751

Total expenditures for all CFP work completed during FY 2019:	$478,493

B. Leasing Information

i. Actual Number of Households Served

Snapshot and unit month information on the number of households RHA served at the end of FY 2019.

Number of Households Served Through:	Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased*		Number of Households Served**	
	Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
MTW Public Housing Units Leased	9,012	8,892	751	741
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized	30,228	25,536	2,519	2,128
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership	0	0	0	0
Planned/Actual Totals	**39,240**	**34,428**	**3,270**	**2,869**

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

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

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

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

In its FY 2019 MTW Annual Plan, RHA indicated that lease up was not anticipated to drop below 97% of the MTW baseline of 745 in the PH program and 90% of the MTW baseline of 2,382 in the HCV program. At the end of FY 2019, RHA experienced increased vacancies coupled with longer leasing times at its PH family sites resulting in a slight decrease in the number of actual households served.

Local rental market conditions, including rising rents due to an extremely tight rental market within the City of Reno, City of Sparks and Washoe County, continue to significantly impact RHA's HCV program lease up. This is directly reflected in RHA's average lease up success rate for FY 2019, which sat at 58%.

Throughout FY 2019, RHA's Admissions Office referred 307 families to the HCV program. As of July 1, 2019, 154 standard vouchers have been issued to eligible HCV families who are actively looking for affordable units to rent in this tight market.

Baseline numbers for total households served set by HUD per PIH Notice 2013-2 is 3,127. On June 30, 2019, 2,869 households were housed or 91.74% of baseline. Throughout FY 2019, RHA averaged 2,855 households per month or 90.71% of baseline.

Local, Non-Traditional Category	MTW Activity Name/Number	Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased*		Number of Households to be Served*	
		Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
Tenant-Based	Name/#	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Property-Based	Name/#	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Homeownership	Name/#	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Planned/Actual Totals	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

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

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

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

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

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

Housing Program	Description of Actual Leasing Issues and Solutions
MTW Public Housing	Leasing issues are commonly due in part to preferences being requested, which if not provided, often result in the tenant's refusal to lease a unit. These preferences include the size of the unit available and being offered, the location of the property or the lack of desired amenities. Compounding the longer leasing times are the normal vacancy issues that delay the turn of the unit including tenant damage and the disposal of personal property in accordance with NRS. RHA continues to select applicants off the wait list based on preferences set forth in the Admission and Continued Occupancy Policies (ACOP) for Public Housing for referral to these vacant PH units.

MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Reno, Sparks and Washoe County continues to experience a strengthening housing market that has resulted in an overall shortage of affordable housing units. With limited inventory and an influx in population due to the relocation of several tech companies to the region, the need for additional housing stock continues to grow resulting in an extremely tight rental market and increased rents throughout the area. This strengthening market has led to an increase in the desire for many private landlords to make more of a profit than rent to HCV participants. To increase lease up numbers in this program, RHA continued to monitor its payment standards to ensure that they accurately reflect local market conditions, expanded upon its Landlord Incentive Program and continued to conduct initial admission interviews over the telephone. Conducting interviews over the telephone resulted in an increase in the initial admissions interview success rate to 46.74%, up from 40% in January of 2018. In FY 2019, based on feedback provided from the local HUD Field Office, RHA implemented a "lease in place" preference for applicants on the waiting list. This preference became effective on January 1, 2019 and resulted in RHA's lease up success rate increasing to 70%, up from 56% in July of 2018.
Local, Non-Traditional	RHA does not currently have any local, non-traditional programs.

C. Waiting List Information

i. Actual Waiting List Information

Snapshot information on the actual status of MTW waiting lists at the end of FY 2019 including detail on the structure of the waiting list and the population(s) served. The information reflected below is current as of September 4, 2019.

Waiting List Name	Description	Number of Households on Waiting List	Waiting List Open Partially Open or Closed	Was the Waiting List Opened During the Plan Year
Public Housing	1-4 Bedroom Units	655	Closed	Yes
Stead PH	2 & 3 Bedroom Units, located at Stead Manor	267	Closed	Yes
Elderly and Disabled PH	Studio, 1 & 2 Bedroom Units	326	Closed	Yes
Housing Choice Voucher	Section 8	3,682	Closed	Yes
Project Based Voucher	Unit Based Vouchers	602	Closed	Yes

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:

At the time of application, clients may apply for all open waiting lists. These numbers include some households that have applied for more than one program and/or bedroom size.

ii. Actual Changes to Waiting List in the Plan Year

Actual changes to the organizational structure or policies of the waiting list(s), including any opening or closing of a waiting list during FY 2019.

Waiting List Name	Description of Actual Changes to Waiting List
Housing Choice Voucher	During FY 2019, this waitlist was open from December 3, 2018 to December 31, 2018. It was recently reopened on August 1, 2019 and closed on August 23, 2019.
Public Housing	During FY 2019, the wait list for 2, 3, and 4-bedroom units was open from May 18, 2018 to July 6, 2018. It was reopened for 1, 2, 3, and 4-bedroom units on October 31, 2018 and remained open until December 31, 2018.

Elderly and Disabled PH	Throughout FY 2019, the waitlist for 2-bedroom units was open from September 14, 2018 to October 29, 2018.
Stead PH	In FY 2019, the waitlist was open from May 18, 2018 to July 6, 2018. It was reopened for on October 31, 2018 and remained open until December 31, 2018.
Project Based Voucher	The waitlist for 3-bedroom units was open during FY 2019 from September 14, 2018 to October 29, 2018.
S8 Mod Rehabilitation	On January 4, 2019, RHA was notified that this property would be opting out of the Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation program following the expiration of their final contract on May 19, 2019. Each of the applicants on RHA's Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation waiting list were notified at that time and this waitlist was dissolved.

D. Information on Statutory Objectives and Requirements

i. 75% of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income

The following table provides data for the actual families housed upon admission during RHA's FY 2019 Plan Year. Families receiving "Local, Non-Traditional Services Only" are not included.

Income Level	Number of Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted in the Plan Year
80%-50% Area Median Income	0
49%-30% Area Median Income	0
Below 30% Area Median Income	0

Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted	0

ii. Maintain Comparable Mix

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory requirement that RHA continues to serve a comparable mix of families by family size by first assessing a baseline mix of family sizes served by RHA prior to entry into the MTW demonstration (or the closest date with available data) and compare that to the current mix of family sizes served during the FY 2019 Plan Year.

Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)					
Family Size	Occupied Public Housing Units	Utilized HCVs	Non-MTW Adjustments*	Baseline Mix Number	Baseline Mix Percentage
1 Person	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%
TOTAL	**745**	**2,402**	**0**	**3,147**	**100%**

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

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

No baseline adjustments given.

Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)				
Family Size	**Baseline Mix Percentage****	**Number of Households Served in Plan Year^**	**Percentage of Households Served in Plan Year^^**	**Percentage Change from Baseline Year to Current Plan Year**
1 Person	50.56%	1,691	58.94%	8.38%
2 Person	20.34%	495	17.25%	-3.08%
3 Person	12.87%	277	9.65%	-3.21%
4 Person	8.52%	210	7.32%	-1.20%
5 Person	4.67%	128	4.46%	-0.21%
6+ Person	3.05%	68	2.37%	-0.68%
TOTAL	**100%**	**2,869**	**100%**	**0%**

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

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

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

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

As of June 30, 2019, 1,582 or 93.5% of RHA's one person households were elderly and/or disabled. Once housed, these families are far more likely to remain in the unit. The average length of stay for the 25 one person households who moved out of RHA's PH complexes throughout FY 2019 was 120.44 months. Whereas, the average length of stay for the 109 households who ended their participation in the HCV program was 73.38 months. This stability accounts for RHA's slight variation of one person households between the plan year and the baseline year.

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

In FY 2017, RHA staff began reviewing the agency's definition of self-sufficiency and whether it accurately captured if a household should be 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. RHA acknowledges the challenges our clients face in successfully obtaining self-sufficiency. The cost of housing in the Truckee Meadows continues to climb while the obstacles to earning a living wage remain, making the objective of self-sufficiency difficult to attain.

Throughout FY 2019, a total of 97 families voluntarily moved-off of the HCV program, 14 were determined no longer eligible due to increased income in the HCV program and 52 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) met RHA's definition of the final phase of self-sufficiency.

MTW Activity Name/Number	Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency*	RHA's Definition of Self-Sufficiency
Expand Self-Sufficiency / 2014-04	9	Household is no longer receiving assistance or has voluntarily ended participation.
Rent Reform Controlled Study / 2014-03	10	
Mobility Demonstration / 2014-02	3	
Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent / 2014-05	33	
Provide incentive to $0 HAP households / 2019-02	8	
	13	*(Households Duplicated Across Activities)*
	50	**Total Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency**

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

Section III

Proposed MTW Activities

III. Proposed MTW Activities

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

Section IV

Approved MTW Activities

IV. Approved MTW Activities

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 and amended (if applicable), the primary statutory objective(s) the activity is intended to impact and the authorization(s) cited.

Approved/Implemented MTW Activities				
Activity #	**Activity Name**	**Fiscal Year Implemented/ Amended**	**Statutory Objective(s)**	**Authorization(s)**
2014-01	Assign PBVs to RHA owned/controlled units without competitive process	2014	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections D.2.b. and D.7.a.
2014-02	Mobility Demonstration	2014	Increase housing choice 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.
2014-04	Expand self-sufficiency activities	2014 amended 2015 amended 2017	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section E.
2014-05	Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent	2014	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.4., C.11, D.2.a., and D.3.b.
2014-06	Triennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes	2014 amended 2015 amended 2017 amended 2018	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.4. and D.1.c.
2014-08	Partner with local nonprofit to provide special needs housing	2014	Increase housing choice 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.
2015-01	Elimination of all negative rents and simplification of HCV utility allowances	2015	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections D.2.a. and C.11.

Activity #	Activity Name	Fiscal Year Implemented/ Amended	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
2015-02	Allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units	2015	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.9.a. and D.5.
2015-03	Eliminate caps on PBV allocations and allow for assignment of PBVs to 100% of RHA-owned, non-Public Housing properties	2015 amended 2017	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness *and* increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Sections D.1.e., D.7., and D.7.a.
2016-01	Simplification of medical deductions	2016 amended 2018	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.11. and D.2.a.
2016-02	Redefine near-elderly person	2016	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Section C.2.
2016-04	Allow HCV participants to lease units that exceed the 40% rent burden	2016	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Section D.2.a.
2016-05	Eliminate Earned Income Disallowance (EID)	2016	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Sections C.11. and D.2.a.
2016-06	Disregard earned income of PH household members, age 18-20, who are not the head of household or co-head	2016	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section C.11.
2016-07	Implement a $75 fee for each additional HQS inspection when more than two inspections are required	2016	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.1.a.
2016-08	Expand Project Based Voucher Program	2016 amended 2019	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C D.1.e. and D.4.
2017-01	Increase verified application data for HCV applicants	2017	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.3.a.
2017-02	Asset threshold to determine eligibility for admission	2017 amended 2019	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Sections C.2., D.3.a., D.3.b., and D.4.

Activity #	Activity Name	Fiscal Year Implemented/ Amended	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
2018-01	Landlord Incentive Program	2018	Increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Section D.1.a and D.1.d
2019-01	Redetermination of rent reasonableness as a result of a change in contract rent	2019	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness *and* increase housing choice for low-income families.	Attachment C Section D.2.c.
2019-02	Provide incentives to $0 HAP households	2019	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.a., D.1.b., and D.1.c.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Description:
Utilizing numerous funding sources, RHA acquired over 160 scattered site properties throughout the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, and Washoe County. To expand the housing choices of many low-income families, RHA is assigning PBVs to these 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 to be set by RHA if that rent is at or below the applicable low HOME rents.

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

Update/Status:
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 should the properties further the agency's mission. Once purchased, the properties will be reviewed to determine whether the use of a PBV is appropriate.

This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
This activity was initially intended to reduce costs by eliminating requirements of the competitive process, i.e. the requirement for legal advertisements. 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.

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 has saved the agency $9,750 since implementation in FY 2014.

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). With a limited number of affordable housing units available throughout the area, the ability to assign PBVs has proven to be an effective way to increase housing choice for several low-income households. By the end of FY 2019, RHA received HUD approval to assign PBVs to 84 units, two of which have since been removed. Although no additional PBVs were assigned in FY 2019, RHA will continue to utilize this approved flexibility should the opportunity present itself.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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

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.	.25 hours or 15 minutes per property	0 hours	0 hours	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
There were no challenges in achieving the benchmarks identified for this activity.

2014-02: Mobility Demonstration

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Description:
RHA's Mobility Demonstration allows low-income PH families with children to move to deconcentrated neighborhoods of opportunity. 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 a new PBV or the vacancy of an existing PBV unit that has been identified for this activity, PH families who meet the established requirements to participate in the Mobility Demonstration, are offered the opportunity to move into one of the 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) decrease 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.

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 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 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 will also be exempt from the required FSS Lite Program component of the Mobility Demonstration.

MTW Statutory Objective(s):
Increase housing choice 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.

Update/Status:
In order to determine whether moving from a high poverty census tract to a low poverty census tract changes the outcomes for these families, RHA will continue to collect data on each family who agrees to participate in the Mobility Demonstration. This data will be used by the University of Washington (UW) to evaluate the overall progress of these families. Examples of some of the information that is still being collected include education, income and neighborhood satisfaction.

The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
By the end of FY 2019, a total of 45 former PH families with children agreed to participate in the Mobility Demonstration and move to properties in low-poverty census tracts. To date, 13 of these families have become completely self-sufficient and moved off housing assistance, while nine families were removed from the program for various other reasons. There are currently 23 families participating in the Mobility Demonstration. Two additional families, who are currently active in the program, are now paying full contract rent and expected to transition off 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 Workforce Development Coordinators may initiate termination of the tenant's assistance under the HCV 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 eight heads of households who are unemployed and required to participate in the FSS Lite Program. Of these eight households, two have a verified disability statement on file, three have minors under the age of six and two are elderly. The final unemployed head of household leased up on June 1, 2019 and will be required to participate in the FSS Lite Program in the coming months if employment is not secured.

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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.	$24,020 FY 2018: $23,418 FY 2017: $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.	$1,606 8 Mobility Demonstration participants have a savings account with an average balance of $1,165 and 13 have a checking account with an average balance of $441. FY 2018: $1,521 FY 2017: $1,714 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.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome[2]**	**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%	8 or 35% (7 HOH, 1 Co-Head) FY 2018: 9 or 36% FY 2017: 10 or 38% FY 2016: 7 or 24% FY 2015: 10 or 31% FY 2014: 11 or 50%	Yes
Employed Part-Time	9 or 28% 9 of 32 head(s) of households employed part-time at time of admission.	24 or 61%	9 or 39% (8 HOH, 1 Co-Head) FY 2018: 8 or 32% FY 2017: 8 or 31% 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 2018: 2 or 8% FY 2017: 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%	10 or 43% FY 2018: 8 or 32% FY 2017: 0 or 0% FY 2016: 0 or 0% FY 2015: 12 or 38% FY 2014: no data	Yes[3]
Unemployed	14 or 44% 14 of 32 head(s) of households unemployed at time of admission.	2 or 5%	10 or 43% (8 HOH, 2 Co-Head) FY 2018: 12 or 48% FY 2017: 12 or 46% 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

[2] Throughout FY 2019, 27 households were leased up under the Mobility Demonstration program, however, as of June 30, 2019, 23 households were leased up. 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.

[3] Outcome information is based on fifth year data received from the annual survey/questionnaire administered to all Mobility Demonstration participants. It includes a count of participants who have participated in some form of job training program, not all participants are currently enrolled in such a program.

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	1 FY 2018: 2 FY 2017: 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**[4]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Mobility Demonstration households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	0	2	24 FY 2018: 21 FY 2017: 21 FY 2016: 16 FY 2015: 9 FY 2014: 2	Yes

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. Calculations: 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. Calculations: 561*1.125% = 6.31 561-6.31 = 554.69 554.69*40*12 = 266,251.20	$112,946 RHA paid an average of $348.60/per family in HAP payments or $9,412.20 per month for the 27 families who participated in the Mobility Demonstration throughout FY 2019. Calculation: 348.60*27*12 = 112,946.40 FY 2018: 122,160 FY 2017: $145,213 FY 2016: $145,464 FY 2015: $167,424 FY 2014: $124,872	Yes

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

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. Calculation: 724.03*40*12 = 347,534.40	$303,810 FY 2018: $292,554 FY 2017: $266,107 FY 2016: $251,700 FY 2015: $245,553 FY 2014: $73,058	No

2014-02 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**[5]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Mobility Demonstration households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	2	3 Outcome includes only those households who were active in in FY 2019, it does not include the ten families who moved off the program prior to FY 2019 FY 2018: 2 FY 2017: 2 FY 2016: 2 FY 2015: 4 FY 2014: 1 16 households leased up under the Mobility Demonstration program in FY 2019 met RHA's first phase of self-sufficiency	Yes

[5] In FY 2017, RHA changed its definition of self-sufficiency to 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. The outcome for this metric includes only those households who have met RHA's definition in regard to the final phase of self-sufficiency.

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.	45 FY 2018: 43 FY 2017: 39 FY 2016: 36 FY 2015: 32 FY 2014: 22	Yes

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.	45 FY 2018: 43 FY 2017: 39 FY 2016: 36 FY 2015: 32 FY 2014: 22	Yes

The following RHA Local Metric was identified and continues to be tracked for this activity.

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%.	20% 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.	14.76% Average percentage of people in the census tracts below the poverty line where Demonstration properties are located. This ranges from a low of 4.28% of people in the census tract below the poverty line to a high of 24.65%.	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 60%.

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	10	20.42	9.58, 16.03, 14.89, 9.79, 10.91, 13.17, 9.58, 24.65, 14.89, 14.89
Hawk View Apartments	12	44.06	22.21, 22.21, 22.21, 9.58, 9.58, 9.58, 14.89, 7.5, 7.5, 22.21, 4.28, 24.65
Mineral Manor	11	24.65	10.25, 22.21, 16.03, 19.31, 14.89, 24.65, 9.79, 10.91, 10.91, 22.21, 4.28
Myra Birch Manor	3	57.59	14.89, 22.21, 24.65
Stead Manor	9	34.73	10.25, 9.58, 9.58, 16.03, 10.91, 10.91, 4.28, 4.28, 10.91

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
As of June 30, 2019, 23 of 35 Mobility Demonstration properties are occupied and leased with a PBV; two of these families are currently paying full contract rent and expected to transition off assistance in the coming months. In addition, twelve families are paying full contract rent and have been removed from housing assistance, but they continue to occupy the property they originally leased under the Mobility Demonstration. Although this increased RHA's rental revenue (*2014-02 SS #7*) to $303,810, it limits the number of new families who can be given the opportunity to participate in the demonstration. While each of the benchmarks were not achieved for this activity in FY 2019, this continues to be a successful and exciting activity for RHA to offer to qualified PH residents.

2014-04: Expand self-sufficiency activities

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2014. It was amended in FY 2015 and FY 2017.

Description:
The FSS Lite Program, similar to the traditional FSS Program without an interest-bearing escrow account, was proposed 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 were encouraged to take advantage of the program as they prepared 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 Individual Training and Services Plans (ITSP), 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.

Update/Status:
In FY 2019, RHA began restructuring its entire FSS Program into a Workforce Development Program focused on job placement and job retention for all able-bodied participants in RHA's housing programs, including youth. RHA recruited additional Workforce Development staff who focus entirely on providing RHA's workable families with the tools, skills and support they often need to confidently seek, gain, and maintain employment. Through this restructuring, RHA began to provide a client focused approach to all facets of self-sufficiency at one location.

Through ongoing training and increased inner-department communication, RHA continues to cultivate the agency's new definition of self-sufficiency. Rather than simply refer workable HCV participants and PH residents to RHA's Workforce Development staff, the agency's management team encourages staff at all levels to motivate, support and assist each of the families in obtaining their self-identified self-sufficiency goals.

The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
Workforce Development staff continue to reach out to families who could benefit from participating in either the FSS Lite Program or the Traditional FSS Program. RHA's Workforce Development Newsletter is mailed out on a monthly basis and covers topics that include the benefits of obtaining an education, youth activities, apprenticeship opportunities and upcoming career fairs and/or hiring events.

At the end of FY 2019, 136 families are currently being assisted through the Workforce Development Program and/or the FSS Lite Program. This includes 85 Rent Reform Study participants, 11 Mobility Demonstration residents, 18 households with members who have recently been referred for delinquent community service hours, and 22 traditional FSS clients. Once these participants have a signed FSS Lite Agreement in place, they can take advantage of everything the FSS Lite Program has to offer, including the Self-Sufficiency Fund. Through the Self-Sufficiency Fund, RHA assists FSS Lite Program participants with some of the most common barriers hindering self-sufficiency. These barriers include transportation, certification fees, and job search assistance.

In FY 2019, RHA expended $2,669 through the Self-Sufficiency Fund to assist seven participants with the goals identified in their ITSPs. To date, RHA has not issued any rent credits through this activity.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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	$28,145 FY 2018: $29,055 FY 2017: $24,183 FY 2016: $6,733 FY 2015: $7,347	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	$2,127 FY 2018: $2,094 FY 2017: $1,106 FY 2016: $0 FY 2015: $0	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[6]**	**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.	41 or 43% 41 of 96 head(s) of households are employed full-time. (36 Rent Reform participants and 5 Mobility Demonstration households)	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.	22 or 23% 22 of 96 head(s) of households are employed part-time. (18 Rent Reform participants and 4 Mobility Demonstration household)	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 96 head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.	Yes

6 At the end of FY 2019, 96 households were actively participating in the FSS Lite Program (85 Rent Reform Participants, 11 Mobility Demonstration households). 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.

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 96 head(s) of households are enrolled in a job training program.	Yes
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.	37 or 39% 37 of 96 head(s) of households are unemployed. (33 Rent Reform participants, 4 Mobility Demonstration households)	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	3	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**[7]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	0	51 51 families will take part in the FSS Lite Program during the first year.	213 213 families signed an FSS Lite agreements; 114 are currently active.	Yes

[7] This number includes 137 Rent Reform Study participants, 24 Mobility Demonstration residents, and 52 families who are/were delinquent on their community service hours. All participants who signed an agreement to participate in the FSS Lite Program are included. It should be noted that not all families are currently housed and several of those who are/were delinquent on their community service hours have had multiple signed FSS Lite agreements.

2014-04 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**[8]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households with delinquent Community Service hours who have transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	4	9 9 of 96 families who signed an FSS Lite agreement transitioned to RHA's final phase of self-sufficiency. 53 households who have signed FSS Lite agreements have met RHA's first phase of self-sufficiency	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
The metric baselines and benchmarks for this activity were identified in FY 2015 and based entirely on PH residents who owed Community Service hours. Following implementation of this activity, RHA has expanded it to include not only this population, but also Rent Reform Controlled Study participants, Mobility Demonstration households and traditional FSS clients. All current households with active FSS Lite agreements are now included in the outcomes for each metric identified. Due to this addition, RHA anticipates meeting most metrics in the future although the benchmark for the number families on TANF (*2014-04 SS #4*) will continue to be a challenge.

[8] In FY 2017, RHA changed its definition of self-sufficiency to 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. The outcome for this metric includes only those households who have met RHA's definition in regard to the final phase of self-sufficiency.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This policy was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Description:
In order to reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness, RHA began excluding all educational financial aid from the 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. 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. RHA staff only calculate income from assets if the value of the assets total more than $10,000.

Implementation of this activity also raised RHA's minimum rent from $50 to $75. This increase not only saves significant HCV and PH operating subsidy but also provides a slight 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.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
Throughout FY 2019, a total of 150 PH residents and 274 HCV participants paid minimum rent. Of these, 82 PH residents and 166 HCV participants were housed paying the minimum rent amount on June 30, 2019. Since implementation, 128 PH residents and 270 HCV participants who had previously paid minimum rent, either moved off assistance or remain housed in 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 2019, seven HCV participants were approved to pay less than the minimum rent due to a requested hardship. While each of these participants had an approved hardship, it is not known whether the hardship was directly related to RHA's implementation of this activity.

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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.	$1,749 Across all 248 HCV participants and PH residents who are currently paying minimum rent. Of these, only 23 households 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.				
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.	0 or 0%	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.	21 or 8% 21 of 248 head(s) of households currently paying minimum rent are employed part-time. (15 HCV participants and 6 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%	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	No
Unemployed	309 or 82% 309 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are unemployed. (237 HCV participants and 72 PH residents)	82% No change.	227 or 92% 227 of 248 head(s) of households currently paying minimum rent are unemployed. (151 HCV participants and 76 PH residents)	No
Other	0	0	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)	7% No change.	9 or 4% 9 of 248 households currently paying minimum rent are receiving TANF. (4 HCV participants and 5 PH residents)	Yes

2014-05 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**[9]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households paying minimum rent who have transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	4	33 33 HCV participants and PH residents who paid minimum rent following implementation of this activity moved off assistance in FY 2019 having met the second phase of self-sufficiency. 119 households who paid minimum rent in FY 2019 have met RHA's first phase of self-sufficiency.	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. Calculation: 8.10*370 = 2,997	\$875 Student status verifications will be sent out for dependents only; approximately 108 households. Calculation: 8.10*108 = 874.80	\$1,588 Student status verifications were sent out for 196 dependents of HCV participants. Calculation: 8.10*196 = 1587.6	No

[9] In FY 2017, RHA changed its definition of self-sufficiency to 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. The outcome for this metric includes only those households who have met RHA's definition in regard to the final phase of self-sufficiency.

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. Calculations: 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. Calculations: 13.92*60 = 835.20 10.96*22 = 241.12	$965.84 Total cost to verify/process 56 HCV participants and 17 PH residents with assets over $10,000. Calculations: 13.92*56 = 779.52 10.96*17 = 186.32	Yes

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. Calculation: 0.4*336 = 134.4	43.2 hours Student status verifications sent for dependents only. Calculation: 0.4*108 = 43.2	78.4 hours Student status verifications were sent for 196 dependents of HCV participants. Calculation: 0.4*196 = 78.40	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. Calculations: 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. Calculations: 0.695*60 = 41.7 0.43*22 = 9.46	46.23 hours Verifications were sent to 56 HCV participants and 17 PH residents with assets over $10,000. Calculations: 0.695*56 = 38.92 0.43*17 = 7.31	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)	($7,274)	Yes
	$0	$154,200	$403,596 HCV: $21,641 per month (TTP for 185 HCV participants paying minimum rent) PH: $11,992 per month (TTP for 96 PH residents paying minimum rent)	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
In FY 2013, RHA established a baseline for increase in earned income (*2014-05 SS#1*) for this activity based on 379 HCV participants and PH residents paying minimum rent at that time. Although erroneous, this baseline number included the average earned income of families who were paying the minimum rent but participating in EID. In FY 2016, RHA eliminated EID resulting in the removal of the earned income of these participating households from the outcome.

The reported FY 2019 outcome for this metric is based on 248 HCV and PH households paying the established minimum rent on June 30, 2019. Of these 248 households, 91% had no earned income.

Based on the prior elimination of EID and the fact that a high percentage of minimum rent households typically have no earned income, RHA does not anticipate meeting this benchmark.

If the outcomes for this same metric are comprised of households who paid minimum rent for a period following implementation of the activity, the metric outcomes are quite different. At the end of FY 2019, 201 HCV participants and 93 PH residents, who previously paid minimum rent, had either moved off assistance or were still housed paying more than the minimum rent. Of these 294 households, 70 PH residents and 129 HCV participants reported an average earned income of $23,340. Based on the data from these households, the benchmark for increase in earned income would have been met (*2014-05 SS#1*). Furthermore, the employment status for these households would have increased enough to also meet the benchmarks set for this activity (*2014-05 SS#3*).

As family circumstances and composition changes frequently, the number of student status verifications (*2014-05 CE #2*) required each year will continue to be difficult to predict.

There are no additional challenges in achieving the benchmarks identified for this activity.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This policy was identified, approved and implemented as a biennial activity in FY 2014. It was expanded into a triennial activity in FY 2015, amended in FY 2017 to allow for the use of local forms to accommodate the triennial schedule and amended in FY 2018 to disregard Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) increases between recertifications.

Description:
Elderly and disabled PH residents and HCV participants with stable income sources now have recertifications on a triennial schedule as the amount of rent RHA receives from stable income households when the COLA is applied is completely negligible. Any COLA increases received between recertification dates are retained by the family and will not be counted towards rent until a "true" triennial recertification is processed.

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 as defined by HUD *and* the stable income definition, RHA performs a triennial recertification rather than an annual recertification; if not, the participant remains under the regular recertification schedule. 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 are required to have annual recertifications.

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

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
RHA continued to see staff time savings and cost savings although the number of recertifications remained relatively constant in FY 2019. These savings will be even more significant as elderly/disabled households with stable income transition to a "true" triennial recertification schedule with only requested annual recertifications occurring in FY 2021.

Hardship Policy:
RHA proposed no hardship policy as no additional burden was being placed on residents, however, residents can request an annual recertification should they experience a decrease in income. Throughout FY 2019, 15 HCV participants requested an annual recertification instead of waiting for the scheduled triennial recertification.

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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	$120,235 HCV: $97,867 PH: $22,368 Total annual savings: $20,699 FY 2018: $118,252 FY 2017: $120,161 FY 2016: $104,419 FY 2015: $113,713	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	3,510.56 hours HCV: 226.37 hours per month or 2,716.42 hours annually PH: 66.18 hours per month or 794.14 hours annually Total savings of 267.97 hours per month or 3,215.67 hours annually FY 2018: 3,570.99 FY 2017: 3,871.53 FY 2016: 3,202.27 FY 2015: 3,323.28	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	$0	$0	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
In FY 2018, RHA amended this activity to begin conducting "true" triennial recertifications that result in COLA increases being processed every third year. Agency cost savings (*2014-06 CE #1*) is expected to be reached in future years.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This policy was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2014.

Description:
RHA is providing PBV units to clients of its nonprofit partners including the Domestic Violence Resource Center (formerly CAAW), Casa de Vida, Washoe County Health and Human Services Agency, 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 City of Reno, the City of Sparks, and Washoe County community who are, or may soon become, homeless.

MTW Statutory Objective(s):
Increase housing choice 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.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
At the end of FY 2019 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, 2019, four properties are leased to two clients of Washoe County Health and Human Services Agency and two clients of Northern Nevada HOPES. Furthermore, five units are leased at 435 Moran Street with no supportive services.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be tracked for this activity.

2014-08 CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**[10]	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars by partnering with local non-profits.	$0	$13,260	$6,913	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 (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	0	No

[10] 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**[11]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice due to partnership.	0	2	9	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
Most of the properties identified and assigned PBVs under this activity are located in neighborhoods with a higher percentage of families living below the poverty line. Although this decreases the outcome for increasing resident mobility (*2014-08 HC #5*), the properties identified under this activity allow for easy delivery of services from RHA's nonprofit partners. Through continued outreach and communication with each of the community partners, RHA hopes to meet each of these benchmarks in the future.

[11] Outcome for this benchmark includes five PBV units leased at 435 Moran St without case management services.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2015.

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 TTP. In FY 2015, RHA eliminated negative rents for all PH residents and HCV participants.

Utility allowance simplification:
In FY 2015, RHA simplified HCV utility allowances for all units by creating a flat utility allowance based on structure type and authorized voucher bedroom size. This simplified utility allowance schedule continues to be reviewed based on current utility rates and usage to determine whether the schedule is reflective of current market conditions.

RHA recently contracted with The Nelrod Company to review RHA's utility allowance schedule. Based on their review, the following utility allowances were approved by RHA's Board of Commissioners on August 28, 2018 and became effective on October 1, 2018.

Simplified HCV Utility Allowances					
Structure Type	**0-BR**	**1-BR**	**2-BR**	**3-BR**	**4-BR+**
EES*	N/A	$60	$72	$70	$87
Apartment	$57	$62	$75	$86	$102
House/Duplex	$72	$76	$91	$116	$127
Mobile	N/A	$89	$93	$110	$137

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

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 the calculation was 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.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
Following HUD's approval of RHA's FY 2015 MTW Plan, RHA notified PH residents and HCV participants 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:
Elimination of all negative rents: When a participant claims a hardship due to negative rent, RHA will refer them to the FSS Lite Program for assistance in managing their finances.

Simplification of HCV utility allowances: 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.

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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 - 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 - 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**[12]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Cost of HCV utility allowances.	$263,371 per month	$253,566 per month	$133,155 per month FY 2018: $151,430 FY 2017: $178,227 FY 2016: $188,027	Yes

12 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.

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.	10.3 hours annually FY 2018: 10.4 FY 2017: 10.7 FY 2016: 11.1	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**[13]	**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.	$822,347 $68,529 per month or approximately $822,347 annually. FY 2018: $603,048 FY 2017: $281,485 FY 2016: $163,886	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
There were no challenges in achieving the benchmarks identified for this activity.

13 This is tenant contribution to rent, not an increase in rental revenue to RHA. Outcome reflects the total annual savings following implementation of this activity in FY 2014. For FY 2019 only, annual savings was $219,299 down slightly from FY 2018 where the annual savings was $321,563.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2015.

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 can inspect their own units. To address this concern, either RHA's Deputy Executive Director or Director of Rental Assistance conducts 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 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.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

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 2019, RHA staff conducted 27 initial inspections, 2 special inspections and 137 annual inspections on agency owned units rather than using a third-party contractor. Furthermore, 15 quality control checks on the units inspected by HCV staff were conducted.

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 2019 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	9	225
1	30 minutes	36	1,080
2	30 minutes	42	1,260
3	35 minutes	64	2,240
4	40 minutes	14	560
5	45 minutes	1	45
6	50 minutes	0	0
Total amount of staff time spent (in minutes):			5,410
Total amount of staff time spent (in hours):			90.17

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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	90 hours annually RHA staff conducted 166 inspections in FY 2019. Each inspection took approximately 25-45 minutes based on bedroom size resulting in a savings of 104 staff hours. Calculations used for the savings in staff time are based on the baseline of 70 minutes per inspection. (70*166) / 60 = 194 194-90 = 104 FY 2018: 102 FY 2017: 105 FY 2016: 96.83	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
Although 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 continued to allow inspections to become more efficient and cost effective. During FY 2019, RHA staff conducted 166 inspections on agency owned properties at approximately 32.59 minutes per property; 12.41 minutes less than RHA's benchmark of 45 minutes per property.

2015-03: Eliminate caps on PBV allocations and allow for assignment of PBVs to 100% of RHA-owned, non-Public Housing properties

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2015. The activity was amended in FY 2017.

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 CFR §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.

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 choice for low-income families.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

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 2019, two units became vacant and one successfully turned in 2.2 months.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metric was identified and continued to be 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

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
There were no challenges in achieving the benchmark identified for this activity.

2016-01: Simplification of medical deductions

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016. The activity was amended in FY 2018 to restructure and further simplify the income tiers and associated 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 simplified medical deductions based entirely on the household's gross income:

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.

Update/Status:
Following HUD's approval of RHA's FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan on August 25, 2015, RHA began implementing simplified medical deductions in the PH and HCV programs. On January 1, 2016, RHA began applying the simplified medical deductions to all PH and HCV elderly and disabled households regardless of whether 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 experienced a significant decrease rather than the anticipated increase.

With the announcement of an increase in Medicare premiums for 2017, RHA staff reviewed the original seven income tiers established in the FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan to determine their overall viability for program participants. RHA amended this activity in FY 2018 to restructure and further simplify the income tiers and associated deductions. These amended income tiers were based on income guidelines provided by the State Health Insurance Assistance Program in relation to the 2017 Medicare coverage. The following simplified medical deductions, as amended, became effective for annuals and vouchers issued on or after January 1, 2018:

Simplified Medical Deductions	
Gross Annual Income Range	Annual Medical Deduction
$1 - $12,199	$0
$12,200 - $16,289	$1,425
$16,290 +	$2,530

The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
As of June 30, 2019, 426 PH residents and 1,510 HCV participants were eligible to receive the deduction based on their household. Of those, 379 PH residents and 1,336 HCV participants were receiving the simplified medical deduction. As several of the households eligible to receive the simplified medical deduction are also on a triennial recertification schedule, there are currently 210 PH residents and 691 HCV participants who have not transitioned to the amended income tiers and their corresponding deductions.

Under RHA's revised income tiers, several households are currently, or will soon be, receiving a deduction of $0. After reviewing the data available, it was determined that participants within the first income tier have their Medicare premiums, co-pays and deductions completely covered throughout the year negating the need for an actual monetary deduction. To reduce the overall cost of this activity to the agency, in FY 2018, RHA began requiring all eligible households to self-certify actual medical expenses prior to receiving the deduction. Previously all participants received the simplified medical deduction regardless of whether the household actually incurred the expense.

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. A three-person committee was established by RHA to review all requests for hardship. Prior to being considered for a hardship and referred to the established committee, participants are required to meet all the criteria set forth in RHA's MTW Annual Plan and internal hardship procedure. These criteria include (1) the household's monthly rent can be 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 the hardship is submitted, the three-person committee will review all the detailed expenses provided and determine whether the requested hardship is warranted. If any part of the established criteria is not met, a hardship will not be granted.

Hardship Requests:
During FY 2019, RHA received seven hardship requests due to the implementation of this activity, six were participants of the HCV program and one PH resident. Each of the hardship requests were forwarded to the three-person hardship committee for review. Upon consideration of all the documentation provided by the requestors, two of the hardship requests were granted and five were denied. As of June 30, 2019, five households were receiving a deduction based on actual medical expenses due to an approved hardship.

If a hardship should be requested and approved, RHA incurs the following amount of time and cost associated with 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 @ $24.69 per hr*	$25.92		Cost for Housing Specialist		.325 hrs @ $19.88 per hr**	$6.46
					Cost for Office Clerk	$4.19	.73 hrs @ $18.04 per hr***	$13.17
Total	$4.19		$25.92		Total	$4.19		$19.63
	Total Cost per Client:		**$30.11**			**Total Cost per Client:**		**$23.82**

* Hourly rate based on average Asset Manager salary ($46,065.88 - $64,812.80) and Assistant Asset Manager salary ($37,898.51 - $53,331.20)

** Hourly rate based on average Housing Specialist salary ($34,375.07 - $48,360)

*** Hourly rate based on average General Office Clerk salary ($31,179.20 - $43,867.20)

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
Each of RHA's income tiers and associated medical deductions were amended in FY 2018. Following HUD approval, the new deductions became effective for annuals and vouchers issued on or after January 1, 2018. RHA will review the amended tier in FY 2021 to ensure that they still accurately reflect the costs that participating families may incur.

There are no additional actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be tracked for this activity.

2016-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[14]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Costs associated with PH program calculations.	$5,040 Calculations: 15.17*27.70 = 420.21 420*12 = 5,040	$0	$30 Calculation: 1*30.11 = 30.11 FY 2018: $30 FY 2017: $0 FY 2016: $2,136	No
Costs associated with HCV program calculations.	$20,412 Calculations: 76.34*22.28 = 1,700.86 1,701*12 = 20,412	$0	$119 Calculation: 1*23.82 = 23.82 FY 2018: $119 FY 2017: $201 FY 2016: $5,880	No

2016-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[15]	**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	1.05 hours PH Asset Managers/ Assistant Managers: 1*1.05 = 1.05 FY 2018: 1.05 hours FY 2017: 0 hours FY 2016: 80.89 hours	No
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	1.055 hours Housing Specialists: 1*0.325 = 0.325 Office Clerks: 1*0.73 = 0.73 FY 2018: 5.275 hours FY 2017: 9.50 hours FY 2016: 278.52 hours	No

14 Prior to implementation, medical deductions were verified for approximately 15.17 PH households and 76.34 HCV households per month. Baseline costs were estimated based on a total cost per client of $27.70 per PH verification and $22.28 for each HCV verification.

15 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.

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**[16]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rate associated with PH program calculations.	2%	0%	3.5% 15 of the 426 PH households were found to contain errors.	No
Rate associated with HCV program calculations.	5%	0%	1.5% 24 of the 1,510 HCV households were found to contain errors.	Yes

2016-01 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**[17]	**Outcome**[18]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue associated with PH program.	$0	$11,221 Calculations: 308*3.036 = 935.08 935.08*12 = 11,221	($32,767) Calculations: 1*72.70 = 72.70 210*(13.554) = (2,846.25) 72.70+(2846.25)=(2773.55) (2,773.55)*12 = (33,282.62) (33,283)+516 = (32,767) FY 2018: ($52,134) FY 2017: ($63,586) FY 2016: ($14,794)	No

16 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.

17 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.

18 As of June 30, 2019, 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 receiving 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 $12.27 per PH household per month and a loss of tenant contribution to rent of $10.06 per HCV household per month. This number is based on those who are still receiving the original deduction corresponding to the seven income tiers. It is slowly decreasing as participants are transitioning to the amended medical deduction tiers.

Rental revenue associated with HCV program.	$0	$8,765 Calculations: 1,094*.6677 = 730.46 730.46*12 = 8,765	($104,690) Calculations: 4*72.67 = 290.67 691*(13.554) = (9,365.52) (9,365.5)+290.7 = (9,074.8) (9,074.8)*12 = (108,898) (108,898)+4,208 = (104,690) FY 2018: ($183,759) FY 2017: ($226,182) FY 2016: ($97,615)	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
Throughout FY 2019, this activity affected 460 PH residents and 1,678 HCV participants, of which 202 have since moved off assistance. The outcomes reported under this metric include only those families who were housed on June 30, 2019 and eligible for the standard medical deduction. This includes 426 PH residents of which 210 are receiving the correct FY 2016 simplified medical deduction, 200 are receiving the correct FY 2018 medical deduction, 15 are receiving the incorrect deduction amount and one was approved for a hardship. Similarly, 1,510 HCV participants of which 691 are receiving the correct FY 2016 simplified medical deduction, 791 are receiving the correct FY 2018 medical deduction, 24 are receiving the incorrect deduction amount and four were approved for a hardship.

Although the benchmarks for Agency Cost Savings (*2016-01 CE #1*) and Staff Time Savings (*2016-01 CE #2*) were not met for either program, this is entirely due to approved medical hardships within both programs that required verification. RHA does not anticipate meeting either of these benchmarks if a hardship is requested and approved by the committee.

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 has resulted in an overall loss. As previously reported, 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, RHA amended this activity in FY 2018. The amendment was implemented on January 1, 2018. This amendment not only revised the income tiers and related deductions, but it also established a requirement that all households self-certify that ongoing medical expenses are actually incurred prior to receiving the deduction.

To date, RHA has transitioned 991 households to the updated FY 2018 simplified medical deduction schedule. As a result, the loss of agency rental revenue as of June 30, 2019 has continued to decrease. Staff will continue to monitor this activity and its overall influence on both the agency and its PH residents and HCV participants.

2016-02: Redefine near-elderly person

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Description:
In FY 2016, RHA modified HUD's definition of near-elderly as it relates to the PH program to limit it to persons who are at least 55 years of age but below the age of 62. These newly defined near-elderly 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 choice for low-income families by allowing RHA to change the definition of near-elderly for its PH program only and allowing RHA to treat these newly defined households as elderly for admission to one of RHA's senior PH complexes.

Update/Status:
This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
Since the implementation of this activity, 279 near-elderly persons/families have been able to apply for RHA's senior PH complexes. This includes 50 households in FY 2019.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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

The following RHA Local Metric was identified and continues to be tracked for this activity.

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**[19]	**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	6 New housing units made available: 20*0.30 = 6 FY 2018: 8 FY 2017: 27 FY 2016: 2	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
Throughout FY 2019, RHA experienced 20 vacancies within its elderly PH complexes (*2016-02 RHA Local Metric*). As the number of vacant units varies on an annual basis, it is impossible to determine whether this benchmark will be met 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 ultimately the lease up sequence.

19 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.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Description:
Through the HCV program, rental subsidies are provided for standard-quality units that are chosen by the tenant in the private market. Per 24 CFR §982.508, tenant rent plus utilities is limited to no more than 40% of monthly adjusted income when the family first receives voucher assistance in a 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 choice 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 if 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 choice for low-income families by providing HCV participants with more of a choice at lease up.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

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 2019, 35 families leased units that exceeded 40% of their monthly adjusted income. Of these, 17 leased units that were in low poverty neighborhoods where on average, only 10.5% of households were below the poverty line.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
Following implementation of this activity, RHA determined that mixed families should have been excluded from this policy change. A mixed family is defined as a family whose members include those with citizenship or eligible immigration status, and those without citizenship or eligible immigration status.

There are no additional actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metric was identified and continues to be 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**[20]	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity.	0	52	35 FY 2018: 35 FY 2017: 5 FY 2016: 1	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
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 rental market conditions and changes to the HCV payment standards. Many of these factors make the number of participants taking advantage of this activity difficult to predict.

[20] 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)

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

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.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
As of July 31, 2017, all existing EID participants have transitioned off the program.

Hardship Policy:
EID PH residents and HCV participants who were enrolled in the program upon implementation on August 25, 2015 could 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.

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be tracked for this activity.

2016-05 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[21]**	**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	$0 FY 2017: $1,612 FY 2016: $2,016	Yes
Costs associated with EID calculations in the HCV program.	$440 Housing Specialist: 43.99*10 = 440	$440	$0 FY 2017: $308 FY 2016: $396	Yes

2016-05 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[22]**	**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	0 hours FY 2017: 72 hours FY 2016: 90 hours	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	0 hours FY 2017: 17 hours FY 2016: 21 hours	Yes

[21] Based on 74 PH residents participating in EID (35 who were employed) and 25 HCV households participating in EID (10 who were employed). 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.

[22] Based on 74 PH residents participating in EID (35 who were employed) and 25 HCV households participating in EID (10 who were employed). 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**[23]	**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	$28,171 FY 2017: $50,836 FY 2016: $10,459	Yes
Rental revenue associated with HCV program.	$0	$4,747	$4,747 [24] FY 2017: 17,921 FY 2016: $0	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
Upon implementation of this activity, RHA stopped enrolling new households in EID and existing EID participants began to be phased off the program through a transition period. As all PH residents and HCV participants have successfully transitioned off the EID program, the outcomes for agency cost savings and staff time savings (*2016-05 CE #1* and *2016-05 CE #2*) will remain at zero. Furthermore, the outcomes for error rate and increase in agency rental revenue (*2016-05 CE #3* and *2015-05 CE #5*) will continue to show RHA's initial benchmark going forward.

---

23 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.

24 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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

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.

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

Impact:
During FY 2019, there were 45 adult children between the ages of 18-20 living in PH who were eligible to participate in this activity upon gaining employment. Of these 45 young adults, 22 are currently employed, 19 are unemployed, and four moved off 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	$40,388
Minimum Amount Earned	$8,658
Average Amount Earned	$21,081

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	$463,789

At the end of FY 2019, a total earned income of $463,789 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 $11,595 per month. With the assumption that this remained consistent throughout the year, these PH households saved an average of $527 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.

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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	$21,081 FY 2018: $18,122 FY 2017: $11,921 FY 2016: $11,543	Yes

2016-06 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome** [25]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	0	0 FY 2018: 2 FY 2017: 6 FY 2016: 8 17 households affected by this policy have met RHA's first phase of self-sufficiency	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
There were no challenges in achieving the benchmarks identified for this activity.

[25] In FY 2017, RHA changed its definition of self-sufficiency to 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. The outcome for this metric includes only those households who have met RHA's definition in regard to the final phase of self-sufficiency.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

Description:
RHA is required to conduct re-inspections on units that fail a Housing Quality Standards (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.

Update/Status:
The activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
During FY 2019, RHA conducted 167 third inspections, 72 of which were due to the owner/manager's failure to correct the noted violations. As of June 30, 2019, RHA had charged 17 HCV landlords the third inspection fee of $75, six of whom were charged for multiple HCV units.

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 @ $26.65 per hr*	$26.65
Average roundtrip mileage per HQS inspection	15 miles @ $0.545 per mile	$8.18
	Total Cost per Inspection:	**$34.83**

* Hourly rate based on average HCV Housing Inspector annual salary ($46,065.88 – $64,812.80)

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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	$2,508 FY 2018: $4,284 FY 2017: $5,046 FY 2016: $4,615	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	72 hours FY 2018: 79 hours FY 2017: 152 hours FY 2016: 139 hours	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Solutions:
During FY 2019, 17 HCV landlords were assessed the $75 third inspection fee, six of these landlords incurred a third inspection for multiple units. As of June 30, 2019, 23 units had incurred the $75 third inspection fee.

As the rental market in the City of Reno, the City of Sparks and Washoe County remains tight, RHA does not want to burden or discourage landlord participation in the HCV program. Therefore, prior to the $75 fee being assessed, staff review and consider all the reasons a unit may have failed the required inspection. If this activity were to be completely successful, the outcome for both metrics being tracked (*2016-07 CE#1* and *2016-07 CE#2*) would be zero.

2016-08: Expand Project Based Voucher Program

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2016.

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.

Update/Status:
This activity was expanded upon in FY 2019 to address the lack of affordable housing options for families who are actively participating in workforce development programs within Washoe County.

On October 13, 2017, RHA issued a second RFP to solicit proposals for the remaining 25 homeless PBVs under this activity. On November 13, 2017, the solicitation closed with zero responses. To date, RHA has not reissued an RFP for these remaining vouchers or for the recent expansion to address housing options for workforce development participants.

This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
On June 16, 2016, RHA issued an 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.

The following table provides an overview of the 25 PBVs that are currently in place for 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	5
Aspen Village Apartments	43	2	(1) 1 bdrm and (1) 2 bdrm	2
Park Manor Apartments	84	10	(10) Studio	10
Autumn Village	43	3	(2) 1 bdrm and (1) 2 bdrm	3
Trembling Leaves	27	1	(1) 1 bdrm	1
Juniper Village Partners	41	3	(2) 1 bdrm and (1) 2 bdrm	3
The Village at North Partners	25	1	(1) 1 bdrm	1

Throughout FY 2019, two local nonprofit partners, Northern Nevada HOPES and Washoe County Health and Human Services, continued providing ongoing case management services for the homeless individuals and/or families referred to these PBV units. Each of the case managers assists RHA in conducting initial and ongoing eligibility appointments, and they also help the residents in filling out paperwork and gathering required documentation. All required documents are submitted to RHA for review, quality control, final determination, certification processing and HUD 50058 submission.

As of June 30, 2019, all 25 PBVs awarded were leased and occupied by an eligible family. RHA will continue to work with both partnering agencies providing case management services and the two local housing organizations with units awarded PBVs to ensure the units remain leased.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no additional actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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**[26]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	0	0	0	Yes

The following RHA Local Metrics were identified and continue to be tracked for this activity.

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	25 FY 2018: 21 FY 2017: 15 FY 2016: 0	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	25 FY 2018: 21 FY 2017: 15 FY 2016: 0	No

26 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.

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:

RHA implemented this activity on June 16, 2016 with the issuance of an RFP and the assignment of 25 PBVs to two local nonprofit housing providers. RHA issued a second RFP on October 13, 2017, which was unsuccessful. RHA anticipates advertising for the additional RFP allotments in the coming months. As this activity targets two very specific populations and each of the applicants are referred directly from one of RHA's partnering agencies, it is difficult to predict when this activity will be fully leased at 75.

2017-01: Increase verified application data for HCV applicants

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2017.

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 duration 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.

Update/Status:
This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
Prior to implementation of this activity, RHA staff sent out approximately 2,772 third party verifications for admission on an annual basis. Following implementation of this activity, the process has become streamlined and the number of third-party verifications has been reduced by nearly 80% to 579. 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 2019:

Cost for Processing Admission Verifications			
	Material	Time	Labor
Cost for Housing Specialist		.17 hrs @ $19.89 per hr*	$3.38
Cost for General Office Clerk	$1.48	.23 hrs @ $18.04 per hr**	$4.15
Totals	$1.48		$7.53
		Cost per Verification:	**$9.01**

* Hourly rate based on average Housing Specialist salary ($34,375.07 - $48,360)

** Hourly rate based on average General Office Clerk salary ($31,179.20 - $43,867.20)

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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 Calculation: 2,772*8.89 = 24,643.08	$18,483	$5,217 Calculation: 579*9.01 = 5,216.79 FY 2018: $9,046 FY 2017: $16,429	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 Calculations: 2,772*0.17 = 471.24 2,772*0.23 = 637.56 471.24+637.56 = 1,108.80	831.8 hours	231.6 hours Calculations: 579*0.17 = 98.43 579*0.23 = 133.17 98.43+133.17 = 231.60 FY 2018: 401.62 hours FY 2017: 739.2 hours	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
No challenges were experienced in achieving the benchmarks identified and established for this activity. Benchmarks for this activity were originally based on a decrease of approximately 25% in agency cost and time savings. In FY 2019, both the agency cost savings (*2017-01 CE #1*) and staff time savings (*2017-01 CE #2*) saw a decrease of nearly 80% of baseline.

2017-02: Asset threshold to determine eligibility for admission

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2017.

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 choice for low-income families with limited financial resources.

Update/Status:
In FY 2019, this activity was amended to exclude cash assets when determining eligibility for elderly/disabled HCV and PH households. Ownership interest in a property that the applicant has a legal right to reside in will remain in place for all applicants when determining eligibility for RHA's housing programs.

This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
In FY 2019, three applicants exceeded the applicant threshold on the wait list. One had a property in pre-foreclosure and two elderly/disabled households had cash assets valued over $50,000. All three applicants remain on the waiting list.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metric was identified and continues to be 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	19.02 months FY 2018: 16.06 months FY 2017: 17.33 months	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
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 implementation of this activity.

2018-01: Landlord Incentive Program

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2018.

Description:
Reno, Sparks and Washoe County have experienced a strengthening housing market resulting in private landlords refusing to participate in the HCV program. While this is due in part to the myriad of regulations that must be adhered to prior to leasing to a family participating in the HCV program, it is made worse when some landlords would rather demand a higher rent than lease to an HCV participant. Complicating matters further is that, in some cases, proper notification of a family's intent to move is not always provided which, in the HCV program, can result in the landlord having to pay back a portion of the HAP that they may have already received.

Based on a survey of participating HCV landlords, RHA implemented a Landlord Incentive Program in FY 2018. The program allows landlords to receive their contracted HAP payment through the end of the month for units occupied by HCV participants who vacate under the following conditions: (1) deceased, (2) eviction, (3) skip, or (4) family responsibility violation. Furthermore, an additional HAP payment equal to one month may be received for these same units regardless of the actual move-out date of the participant, if the request is made in writing by the landlord. Landlords can then utilize the additional HAP toward damages incurred within the unit or as compensation for a vacancy loss.

Current market conditions within Reno, Sparks and Washoe County have resulted in some private and tax credit properties carrying wait lists to fill new vacancies. In an effort to ensure that landlords in our area are able to maintain equal housing opportunities and follow existing procedures, RHA does not require landlords to rent to another voucher holder in order to qualify for this incentive.

MTW Statutory Objective(s):
Increase housing choice for low-income families by providing an incentive for private landlord participation within the HCV program.

Update/Status:
RHA implemented this activity on October 1, 2017. Following implementation RHA received feedback from current HCV landlords, and amended this activity in its FY 2020 MTW Annual Plan to include a fifth condition for payment under RHA's Landlord Incentive Program. This additional condition will be based entirely on damages to the unit caused by the tenant, beyond normal wear and tear, that are proven to cost more than the tenant's security deposit. Should an HCV participant end their tenancy at a unit for any reason and leave the unit with damages that are documented to cost more than the required security deposit, the landlord may be eligible for an additional HAP payment through the Landlord Incentive Program.

Per NRS 118A.242, a landlord may claim only amounts that are reasonably necessary to repair damages to the premises caused by the tenant other than normal wear of which the landlord must provide the tenant with an itemized written accounting of the disposition of the security deposit. In order to qualify for an additional HAP payment under this condition, the landlord must provide

RHA with a copy of the itemized written account of charges that was provided to the HCV participant upon termination of tenancy. Following receipt of documentation, RHA may pay the landlord an amount in excess of the participant's security deposit, but this amount will not exceed the value of one additional month's HAP payment.

Under RHA's Landlord Incentive Program, landlords will only be able to qualify for one-month additional HAP payment utilizing one of the five conditions. At no time will they be allowed to claim more than one month's HAP payment by using a combination of more than one of five conditions identified.

This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
The Landlord Incentive Program was designed to facilitate lease ups and increase landlord participation resulting in an increase in housing choice for RHA's low-income families. As private landlords are now provided with additional assurances should they rent to HCV participants that they otherwise would not have, RHA expects this activity to facilitate the retention of landlord participation within the HCV program.

As of June 30, 2019, RHA experienced 425 move outs within its HCV program (excluding VASH) for the following reasons:

Move Out Reason	Number
Moved to Other Section 8 Unit	173
Porting Out to Other PHA	35
End of Participation: Termination – Fraud	1
End of Participation: No Longer Eligible	14
End of Participation: Voluntary Move Out	97
End of Participation: Absorbed Port	1
End of Participation: Family Responsibility Violation	58
End of Participation: Deceased	44
End of Participation: Skipped	1
End of Participation: Eviction	0
Temporary Move Out	1

Based on the criteria set forth in RHA's Landlord Incentive Plan, 101 of these move outs would have been eligible for an additional HAP payment under the Landlord Incentive Program. In FY 2019, RHA made payments on behalf of 109 tenants to 69 separate landlords for a total of $43,755[27]. This includes 11 payments, totaling $3,478, made on behalf of VASH voucher holders.

[27] This total represents landlords who were paid in FY 2019 and excludes those who were processed in FY 2019 with a payment made in FY 2020.

Landlord Incentive Program: HCV Program	
Move Out Reason	**Amount Paid**
End of Participation: Family Responsibility Violation	$15,229
End of Participation: Deceased	$12,937
End of Participation: Skipped	$1,446
End of Participation: Eviction	$10,665
Total Amount Paid:	$40,277

Landlord Incentive Program: VASH Program	
Move Out Reason	**Amount Paid**
End of Participation: Family Responsibility Violation	$0
End of Participation: Deceased	$1,360
End of Participation: Skipped	$802
End of Participation: Eviction	$1,316
Total Amount Paid:	$3,478

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metric was identified and tracked for this activity.

2018-01 HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved				
Number of housing units preserved that would otherwise not be available (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI.	19	31	15	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
RHA implemented its Landlord Incentive Program on October 1, 2017. Following implementation, staff began promoting the program to both new and current landlords through its website, quarterly landlord newsletters, landlord briefings and word of mouth. In FY 2019, 12% of landlords who received the incentive payment leased their unit to another HCV family. Through ongoing outreach, RHA hopes to meet this benchmark in the future.

2019-01: Redetermination of rent reasonableness as a result of a change in contract rent

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2019.

Description:
Reno, Sparks and Washoe County have continued to experience a strengthening housing market that has resulted in an overall shortage of affordable housing units. With limited inventory and an influx in population the need for additional housing stock has continued to grow resulting in an extremely tight rental market and increased rents throughout the area. This strengthening market has resulted in private landlords becoming wary or simply refusing to rent to HCV participants. This is due in part to the desire of private landlords to make more of a profit but made worse by the myriad of regulations that must be adhered to when leasing to a family participating in the HCV program. These burdensome regulations included mandatory inspections and the requirement to determine whether a contract rent increase (CRI) request is reasonable. In the past, RHA's landlords had expressed dissatisfaction in having to complete a rent reasonableness determination when requesting a rent increase and many openly disagreed with the comps used if the amount requested was determined to be unreasonable.

Based on this information and the current rental market conditions, RHA began waiving the requirement for a rent reasonableness determination if the new requested rent amount represented a change of 10% or less.

MTW Statutory Objective(s):
Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by reducing the amount of time it takes to process rent change requests of 10% or less. Providing some flexibility from regulation is expected to increase housing choice through the retention of landlords who are leasing to HCV program participants.

Update/Status:
RHA implemented this activity on October 1, 2018. To ensure this policy change remains a viable option for waiving the required rent reasonableness determination following a CRI request, RHA will conduct a general analysis of the local rental market once the market stabilizes. Based on this analysis, RHA may adjust this percentage to accommodate the current conditions.

This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
During FY 2019, RHA processed 1,085 rent change requests of which 645 or 59% sought a change of 10% or less.

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

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

2019-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost to redetermine reasonable rent as a result of a CRI request.	$5,451	$1,854	$2,067	No

2019-01 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 redetermine reasonable rent as a result of a CRI request.	254.03 hours	86.40 hours	145.13 hours	No

2019-01 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution[28]				
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate when determining reasonable rent as a result of a CRI request.	0%	0%	0%	Yes

[28] RHA utilizes GoSection8 for all rent reasonableness determinations, therefore, the agency has not experienced an error rate in task execution.

2019-01 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Increase in rental revenue following the determination of reasonable rent as a result of a CRI request.	$212,665	$232,952	$197,969	No

2019-01 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?**
Total number of households at or below 80% AMI who would lose assistance or need to move should landlords no longer participate in the HCV program.	1,129	24	15	Yes

2019-01 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
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?**
Total number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of landlords continuing to participate in the HCV program.	1,105	2,382	2,128	No

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
Throughout FY 2019, RHA received 1,258 CRIs of which 173 were requests from landlords who were not eligible to receive one. Although not included in the reporting metrics, 141 landlords from the VASH program requested CRIs of which 21 were deemed ineligible.

In FY 2019, nearly 40% of CRI requests processed by RHA were from landlords who requested more than a 10% increase. This is 7% higher than what was requested in CY 2017 and explains the challenge in meeting the established benchmarks for agency cost savings (*2019-01 CE #1*) and staff time savings (*2019-01 CE #2*). Once the rental market in Reno/Sparks begins to stabilize, RHA anticipates meeting both benchmarks.

2019-02: Provide incentives to $0 HAP households

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2019.

Description:
Many of RHA's families who increase their household earnings and begin to pay full contract rent also experience the "benefits cliff." For several of these families, an increase in earned income results in a loss of eligibility for certain public benefits such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), childcare subsidy and housing. As a result, it is not uncommon for households approaching the end of their housing assistance within the HCV program to elect to reduce their income or lose employment in order to keep their housing assistance. Although these families have successfully increased their household earnings enough to pay the full contract rent, many remain fearful of no longer having the safety net offered through assistance eligibility.

To ease this fear and increase the success rate of RHA's HCV households in becoming economically self-sufficient, RHA adopted a new policy that extends the length of time a household can remain on the HCV program while receiving zero assistance. By lengthening the period from six months to 12 months, RHA expects to provide an additional level of security and confidence. Participants can continue to increase their earned income while at the same time eliminating the incentive to terminate employment or reduce working hours. The new policy aims to remove the choice many participants face between becoming more self-sufficient and maintaining housing assistance.

As an additional incentive to HCV participants on their way to self-sufficiency, RHA began to allow households at $0 HAP to accrue a "program completion escrow" account for up to 12 months and alleviated the administrative burden placed on staff by self-certification of income for these households. Using single-fund flexibility, RHA began setting aside 15% of each household's contracted rent monthly in an escrow account while the household remains on the program receiving zero assistance. This escrow accrues beginning the first month that the family reaches $0 HAP, accumulates monthly for up to 12 months and is provided to the family once the HAP contract has been terminated by RHA and the family has successfully transitioned off the HCV program.[29]

MTW Statutory Objective(s):
This activity provides incentives to families with children where the head of households 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. Allowing qualifying households to self-certify annual income also reduces cost and achieves greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

[29] All escrow accruals are subject to funding availability and limited to one per lifetime for all adults living in the household at the time of move-off. Should the escrow accrual program cease due to funding restraints, HCV participants will receive any amounts accumulated prior. All households must be moved off of housing assistance at $0 HAP in order to receive the accumulated escrow funds and will only be able to reapply for assistance following a three year sit out period.

Update/Status:
RHA implemented this activity on August 1, 2018. This activity remains ongoing.

Impact:
The following table provides an overview of the number of HCV clients who are currently housed or who moved off the program at $0 HAP in FY 2019:

HCV households at $0 HAP within FY 2019		
	# of households	Cost of 12 Month Escrow Accrual
EOP - full contract rent for 12 months	5	$6,836
EOP - full contract rent, moved off prior to 12 months	3	$2,289[30]
Full contract rent, but within 12-month $0 HAP period	41	$59,958[31]
Full contract rent within the FY, but remain on HCV program	32	$0
Lost employment just prior to EOP at 12 months	2	$0
	Estimated annual cost:	$69,083
	Actual FY 2019 cost:	**$9,125**

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

Actual Non-Significant Changes:
There are no actual non-significant changes.

Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection:
There are no actual changes to the metrics/data collection methodology.

Actual Significant Changes:
There are no actual significant changes.

Activity Metrics:
The following HUD Standard Metric was identified and tracked for this activity.

30 These three households moved off HCV assistance in FY 2019 but were not paid their Program Completion Escrow funds until FY 2020. To accurately reflect RHA's move-out activity as it relates to this activity, they are included in the metrics for FY 2019.

31 Estimated cost is calculated based on the assumption that these 41 clients will remain on the HCV program at $0 HAP and accumulate an escrow account for 12 months. These clients are currently accumulating escrow funds, but to date have not moved off the HCV program.

2019-02 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 earned income of households receiving $0 HAP (increase).	$16,198	$41,675	$53,391	Yes

2019-02 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 households receiving $0 HAP (increase).	$81	$2,484	$1,699	No

2019-02 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Employed Full-Time	12	41	39 (31 HOH, 8 Co-Head)	No
Employed Part-Time	20	6	9 (7 HOH, 2 Co-Head)	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Enrolled in Job Training Program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unemployed	20	8	18 (11 HOH, 7 Co-Head)	No
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2019-02 SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency				
Households assisted by services that increase self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving $0 HAP and assisted by services that increased self-sufficiency.	7	21	16	No

2019-02 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**[32]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households who were receiving $0 HAP and successfully transitioned to self-sufficiency.	25	42	8	No

2019-02 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost to process an annual reexamination of HCV households at $0 HAP.	$2,398	$1,046	$1,021	Yes

2019-02 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 process an annual reexamination of HCV households at $0 HAP.	116.76 hours	55.02 hours	53.71 hours	Yes

Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:
The ability to become self-sufficient can vary from one household to another based on several factors including educational, social and economic foundations. By increasing the timeline to 12 months and adding in an escrow accrual component, RHA anticipates providing an additional level of security for those participants who have increased their household income enough to be removed from housing assistance. RHA hopes to meet each of the benchmarks in the future.

32 In FY 2017, RHA changed its definition of self-sufficiency to 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. The outcome for this metric includes only those households who have met RHA's definition in regard to the final phase of self-sufficiency.

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 and 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-hour financial literacy class. 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 a Workforce Development 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 a Workforce Development 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 partnered with an outside institution to evaluate the continuing effects and changing statuses of families participating in the Rent Reform Controlled Study. The purpose of the evaluation was to properly gauge whether increases in income that do not affect a household's rent and whether limiting vouchers to five years was incentive enough for families to become self-sufficient. As RHA works through the lessons learned from the Rent Reform Controlled Study, 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.

Closed MTW Activities					
Activity #	**Fiscal Year Approved**	**Fiscal Year Closed**	**Activity Name**	**Statutory Objective(s)**	**Authorization(s)**
2014-03	2014	2019	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.
2014-07	2014	2017	Alternate HQS verification policy	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.5.
2015-04	2015	2018	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.

2014-03: Rent Reform Controlled Study

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended (if applicable):
This policy was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2014.

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 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 set using standard HCV rent calculations 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 can 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 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.

All families participating in the Rent Reform Study are required to meet with a Workforce Development 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, 133 Rent Reform households have signed an agreement to take full advantage of the FSS Lite Program of which 89 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. RHA's Workforce Development Coordinators made 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.

Year of Close Out:
As of June 30, 2019, this activity has been closed.

Reason for Close Out:
RHA staff considered several factors before reaching a decision to close this activity. Based on current rental market conditions resulting in a decline in RHA's current HCV lease up figures along

with the undue stress that a time-limited voucher may cause for the participating family, it was determined that this activity would be closed. Notification was given to all remaining Rent Reform Controlled Study participants of RHA's intent to close the activity at which time all active households would be transitioned to a regular HCV voucher.

Impact:
Since implementation in FY 2014, 312 vouchers have been issued of which 211 have leased up. Overall, 56 participants in the study group and 57 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 2019, 95 households remained housed under this activity, 42 in the control group and 53 in the study group.

Hardship Policy:
Based on the current rental market and the lack of affordable housing within the City of Reno, the City of Sparks and Washoe County, RHA revised its hardship procedure in its FY 2019 MTW Annual Plan as it relates to this activity. This revision establishes an automatic hardship for the following households, provided that a formal request of a hardship is received by RHA:

- Elderly and/or disabled households
- Families with a disabled dependent residing in the household.

Households who do not meet the requirements for an automatic hardship will be allowed to request a hardship three months prior to the expiration of their voucher. The request will be reviewed and examined to determine whether the following conditions have been met and a hardship from the five-year time limited voucher is warranted.

1. The family has remained in compliance and in good standing with the HCV program for six months prior to the request of the hardship, and

2. One of the following conditions is true:
    - Washoe County's rental market vacancy rate is at or below 4%
    - Washoe County's unemployment rate is at or above 8%
    - Household has a signed ITSP and they are actively pursuing the goals established.

If granted a hardship by the committee, Rent Reform Controlled Study families will be transferred to a regular HCV voucher. RHA will not be providing extensions.

Hardship Requests:
Throughout FY 2019, 37 hardships had been received of which 24 had been reviewed by the established Hardship Committee. Following review, 23 hardships were approved, and one was denied as the participant was not in compliance and in good standing with the HCV program for six months prior to the request. This participant requested a file review, which established a 48-month repayment agreement for the debt owed and the household was terminated on the date that the voucher expired.

Activity Metrics:

The following HUD Standard Metrics were identified and continue to be 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 $24,300 FY 2018: $21,348 FY 2017: $23,046 FY 2016: $20,614 FY 2015: $15,192 FY 2014: No Data	Yes
	Study Group $17,494		Study Group $32,039 FY 2018: $31,567 FY 2017: $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 $1,478 FY 2018: $1,618 FY 2017: $641 FY 2016: $945 FY 2015: $267 FY 2014: No Data	Benchmark was not achieved for the control group.
	Study Group $118		Study Group $1,922 FY 2018: $1,452 FY 2017: $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[33]**	**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 13 or 14% (13 HOH) FY 2018: 14 or 25% FY 2017: 16 or 23% FY 2016: 15 or 20% FY 2015: 20 or 26% FY 2014: 18 or 33%	No
	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 27 or 28% (20 HOH, 7 Co-Head) FY 2018: 43 or 63% FY 2017: 33 or 45% 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 9 or 9% (9 HOH) FY 2018: 13 or 24% FY 2017: 14 or 20% 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 15 or 16% (10 HOH, 5 Co-Head) FY 2018: 13 or 19% FY 2017: 27 or 36% FY 2016: 18 or 24% FY 2015: 19 or 26% FY 2014: 8 or 15%	

[33] At the end of FY 2019, 95 households remained housed under the Rent Reform Controlled Study (42 control group and 53 study group). The percentage calculation for each employment status includes co-head members, where applicable.

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 2 or 2% FY 2018: 2 or 4% FY 2017: 4 or 6% FY 2016: 8 or 11% FY 2015: 1 or 1% FY 2014: 0 or 0%	Yes[34]
	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 0 or 0% FY 2018: 3 or 4% FY 2017: 9 or 12% FY 2016: 9 or 12% FY 2015: 0 or 0% FY 2014: 0 or 0%	
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 6 or 6% FY 2018: 13 or 24% FY 2017: 27 or 38% FY 2016: 30 or 39% FY 2015: 24 or 31% FY 2014: 0 or 0%	Yes[35]
	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 7 or 7% FY 2018: 16 or 24% FY 2017: 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 25 or 26% (20 HOH, 5 Co-Head) FY 2018: 34 or 62% FY 2017: 52 or 73% FY 2016: 43 or 57% FY 2015: 39 or 50% FY 2014: 23 or 43%	Yes
	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 28 or 29% (23 HOH, 5 Co-Head) FY 2018: 34 or 50% FY 2017: 37 or 50% FY 2016: 32 or 42% FY 2015: 30 or 42% FY 2014: 22 or 42%	
Other	0	0	0	N/A

[34] Based on data received from RHA's annual survey administered to all Rent Reform Study participants.

[35] Based on data received from RHA's annual survey administered to all Rent Reform Study participants. It includes participants who have participated in some form of job training program, not all participants are currently enrolled.

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 2 FY 2018: 4 FY 2017: 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 1 FY 2018: 6 FY 2017: 5 FY 2016: 6 FY 2015: 6 FY 2014: 7	

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. Calculation: 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. Calculations: 575*1.125% = 6.47 569*75*12 = 512,100	Control Group $328,324 On average, RHA paid $27,360.34 per month in HAP payments for 42 control group households or $651.44 per family, per month. Calculations: 651.44*42*12 = 328,324.05 FY 2018: $431,878 FY 2017: $536,521 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. Calculation: 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. Calculations: 615*1.125% = 6.92 608*75*12 = 547,200	Study Group $471,881 On average, RHA paid $39,323.44 per month in HAP payments for 53 study group households or $741.95 per family, per month. Calculations: 741.95*53*12 = 471,881.30 FY 2018: $586,272 FY 2017: $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. Calculation: 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. Calculations: 361*1.125% = 4.06 365*75*12 = 328,500	Control Group $202,588 On average, the 42 control group households pay $16,882.31 per month towards rent and utilities or $401.96 per family. Calculations: 401.96*42 = 16,882.31 16,882.31*12 = 202,587.71 FY 2018: $223,423 FY 2017: $282,744 FY 2016: $332,868 FY 2015: $358,488 FY 2014: No Data	No

	Study Group $294,300 On average Study Group households pay $24,525 per month towards rent and utilities or $327 per family. Calculation: 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. Calculations: 327*1.125% = 3.68 331*75*12 = 297,900	Study Group $236,038 On average, the 53 study group households pay $19,669.85 per month towards rent and utilities or $371.13 per family. Calculations: 371.13*53 = 19,669.85 19,669.85*12 = 236,038.25 FY 2018: $294,820 FY 2017: $310,440 FY 2016: $321,240 FY 2015: $284,256 FY 2014: No Data	

2014-03 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome[36]**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of Rent Reform Study households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	Control Group 0	Control Group 5	Control Group 3 FY 2018: 5 FY 2017: 4 FY 2016: 2 FY 2015: 3 FY 2014: 0 10 households leased up under the control group have met RHA's first phase of self-sufficiency	Benchmark was not achieved for the control group.

[36] In FY 2017, RHA changed its definition of self-sufficiency to 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. The outcome for this metric includes only those households who have met RHA's definition in regard to the final phase of self-sufficiency.

	Study Group 0	Study Group 5	Study Group 7 FY 2018: 2 FY 2017: 18 FY 2016: 12 FY 2015: 12 FY 2014: 0 33 households leased up under the study group have met RHA's first phase of self-sufficiency based on traditional HCV rent calculations	

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	15.45 months	25.37 months FY 2018: 25.37 FY 2017: 25.37 FY 2016: 26.57 FY 2015: 29.08 FY 2014: 29.50	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 Calculations: 33*15 = 495 53*150 = 7,950	$8,445	$10,460 166 interims were logged and tracked, and 94 annuals were completed. Calculations: 33*166 = 5,478 53*94 = 4,982 FY 2018: $13,898 FY 2017: $13,428 FY 2016: $13,343 FY 2015: $10,673 FY 2014: $231	No

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. Calculations: 1.7*15 = 25.5 2.8*150 = 445.5 25.5+420 = 445.5	445.5 hours	545.4 hours 166 interims were logged and tracked, and 94 annuals were completed. Calculations: 1.7*166 = 282.2 2.8*94 = 263.2 FY 2018: 724.6 hours FY 2017: 702 hours 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%	Yes

Final outcomes and lessons learned:
Following approval of RHA's FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, staff began implementing the Rent Reform Controlled Study with the first family leasing up on January 30, 2014.

RHA initially began working with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) to provide an analysis of the Rent Reform Controlled Study participants. The goal of the partnership with UNR was to identify any differences between the two groups and determine whether providing an alternate rent calculation strategy would successfully create an incentive for self-sufficiency when participants knew that rents are not tied to income levels. RHA anticipated that the analysis would compare the impacts of the MTW rent strategy to those of the rent calculation in effect prior to the Agency's MTW designation in order to determine if this alternate rent calculation should be considered for future RHA housing programs.

To carry out this analysis, a survey was developed in collaboration with UNR. This survey was finalized on August 7, 2014 with the first household completing it on September 24, 2014. The lengthy process to develop the survey ultimately resulted in some households taking the survey before moving into the unit whereas other households took the survey several months after leasing up. As a result, the timing of the baseline and annual surveys were difficult to coordinate and participation of annual follow-up surveys on exact anniversary dates became problematic.

On August 30, 2018, RHA received notification from UNR that they would no longer be able to meet their obligation toward the study. As of that date, all data related to the study was released to RHA for an in-house staff member or non-UNR contractor to analyze. On January 23, 2019 a data sharing agreement was executed with UW to begin analysis.

Once UW began their review of the data, they noted that there were a lot of questions built into the survey that could not be used in the analysis. Some of the questions were too specific to a particular type of household so the sample size was too small to analyze. Other questions were not structured to specifically capture outcomes that could be compared over time. They ultimately recommended that the design of the survey should be modified to be shorter and more precise to target the specific outcomes needed for an analysis.

The structure of the study was to randomly assign families into either a control group or a study group as they were pulled from the wait list. This ultimately became challenging. Families who were provided a voucher to participate in the study group were unable to afford the set rent structure in place simply didn't lease up. This was noted by Rebecca Walter with the University of Washington during her data analysis on August 9, 2019. Ms. Walter provided the following:

> "Assignment to the control group or experimental group at baseline is difficult when a minimum rent is required. There were voucher recipients that did not qualify to participate in the study because they were randomly assigned to the experimental group but could not meet the minimum rent. There were households that were enrolled in the study in the control group that could not afford the experimental group's minimum rent so they had to be removed from the analysis since the preliminary analysis with the entire sample indicated differences between the control and experimental groups at baseline. Upon further investigation, it was discovered that households that could not afford the minimum rent were being entered into the control group at a higher rate than the experimental group. Therefore, all households that could not pay the minimum rent at the time of entry were removed from the sample. This highlights important policy considerations for rent reform and which households can afford minimum rents."

Study group participants were able to increase their annual household income. In fact, household income increases each year and is on average higher every year when compared to households in the control group. This increase in household income is also reflected in the increase in employment status for the study group over the control group. The increase in income and employment status for these families is encouraging. In the future, RHA may consider another activity designed around similar rent structures, however the approach to pulling applicants from the waitlist will need to be explored further.

Detailed information on each of the findings from the survey can be found in Section VII of this report.

2014-07: Alternate HQS verification policy

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

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.

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

Reason for close out:
HUD is now allowing for biennial HQS inspections through Section 220 of the 2014 Appropriations Act, this activity has been closed.

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

Plan Year Approved, Implemented and Amended:
This activity was identified, approved and implemented in FY 2015.

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.

MTW statutory objective(s):
Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.

Year of close out:
This activity was closed out in FY 2018.

Reason for close out:
With the elimination of EID in RHA's FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan, this activity has been closed.

Section V

Sources and Uses of Funds

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

A. Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

i. Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year
RHA has submitted unaudited and audited information in the prescribed Financial Data Schedule (FDS) format through the Financial Assessment System – PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system.

ii. Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year
RHA has submitted unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the FASPHA, or its successor system.

iii. Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility
In FY 2109, RHA utilized single fund flexibility allowed for under its MTW designation for the following non-capital projects: • The Landlord Incentive Program (2018-01) implemented in FY 2018 continues to be well received by landlords. In FY 2019, total funds expended for this program was $43,755. • RHA continues to expand its Workforce Development Program, formerly the FSS program (2014-04). Participants in this program, who are actively working toward self-sufficiency, are given the opportunity to attend workshops designed to help them find and maintain permanent employment. The program continues to focus on the entire family as opposed to the individual thereby creating an environment that encourages the next generation to pursue their educational and employment goals. In FY 2019, the cost of operating the program was largely due to staffing. However, Self-Sufficiency Funds in the amount of $2,669.26 which was awarded to seven participants who are actively working toward the goals established in their ITSPs. • The expanded Workforce Development Program requires 4.5 full-time equivalents to effectively manage the program and work directly supporting and engaging program participants. One additional full-time equivalent is required to maintain oversight and compliance of the MTW Plan which is filled by our MTW Coordinator. The total cost of operating the MTW and Workforce Development Program is $154,138.51.

B. Local Asset Management Plan

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

YES	NO

ii. Did the MTW PHA implement a local asset management plan (LAMP) in the Plan Year?

YES	**NO**

iii. Did the MTW PHA provide a LAMP in the appendix?

YES	**NO**

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

YES	**NO**

Section VI

Administrative

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 executed its MTW agreement on June 27, 2013 and began working with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) to administer and conduct an annual analysis of its Rent Reform Controlled Study and Mobility Demonstration participants. A questionnaire was developed and has since been administered annually to program participants beginning in September of 2014. On August 30, 2018, RHA received notification from UNR that they would no longer be able to meet their obligation toward the studies. As of that date, all data related to both studies was released to RHA for an in-house staff member or non-UNR contractor to analyze.

On January 23, 2019, RHA executed a data sharing agreement to establish a research partnership with UW to assist with the Mobility Demonstration, Rent Reform Controlled Study, and other related research projects and needs. The survey and administrative data for the Mobility Demonstration and Rent Reform Controlled Study was transferred to Rebecca Walter, the project lead at UW to begin analyses. Final results for the Rent Reform Controlled Study and preliminary results for the Mobility Demonstration as of August 15, 2019 are included in Section VII as Attachment I.

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 2019, 2,714 households out of a total of 2,869 households or 94.60% were very low-income (<50% AMI).

    a) Public Housing: 683 out of 741 or 92.17%
    b) Housing Choice Vouchers: 2,031 out of 2,128 or 95.44%

2) Baseline numbers have been set by HUD at 3,127; as of June 30, 2019, 2,869 households were served or 91.75% of baseline.

3) RHA is maintaining a comparable mix of families by family size as shown in the table on page 23, Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year).

Section VII

Attachment

VII. Attachment

Rent Reform Controlled Study
Final Results (8/15/19)

The Rent Reform Controlled study was implemented in 2014 and includes a control group with rents calculated under the standard HUD Housing Choice Voucher guidelines and an experimental group with a set rent. The purpose of this study is to determine if self-sufficiency is incentivized when rents are not tied directly to income. Both groups were provided time-limited Housing Choice Vouchers that expire after five years. Households from the HCV waiting list were randomly assigned to either the control or experimental group.

Although data is collected over a period of five years, not all households appear in every year. Some households left the program early. Other households entered the program later since participants were entered into the study over a three-year period. A between-subjects design is used to compare outcomes in the control group to the experimental group with administrative data that was collected monthly and survey data that was collected annually (Table 1). The household characteristic variables were analyzed at baseline to confirm that there were no differences in the control and experimental groups. The outcome variables were analyzed over time but were also examined at baseline to confirm that were no difference in the groups at the beginning of the study.

Table 1. Variables

	Data Source	Data Type	Statistical Test
Household Characteristics			
Head of Household Age	Administrative	Continuous	Independent Samples T-test
Gender	Survey	Categorical	Chi-Square
Marital Status	Survey	Categorical	Chi-Square
Race	Survey	Categorical	Chi-Square
Ethnicity	Survey	Categorical	Chi-Square
Crime Conviction	Survey	Categorical	Chi-Square
Outcome Variables			
Annual Household Income	Administrative	Continuous	Independent Samples T-test
Savings Account	Survey	Categorical	Chi-Square
Employment Status	Administrative	Categorical	Chi-Square
Educational Attainment	Survey	Categorical	Chi-Square
TANF Recipient	Administrative	Categorical	Chi-Square
Health	Survey	Ordinal Scale 1-4	Independent Samples Median
Stress	Survey	Ordinal Scale 1-4	Independent Samples Median
Property Satisfaction	Survey	Ordinal Scale 0-4	Independent Samples Median
Neighborhood Satisfaction	Survey	Ordinal Scale 0-4	Independent Samples Median
Life Satisfaction	Survey	Ordinal Scale 0-4	Independent Samples Median

The analyses does not include all participants that were enrolled in the study. A preliminary analysis with the entire sample indicated differences between the control and experimental groups at baseline. Upon further investigation, it was discovered that households that could not afford the minimum rent were being entered into the control group at a higher rate than the experimental group. Therefore, all households that could not pay the minimum rent at the time of entry were removed from the sample.

The household characteristics of the restricted sample are not statistically significantly different at baseline so analyses proceeded with the restricted sample (Table 2).

Table 2. Sample

	Control	**Experimental**	**Total**
Baseline	66	76	142
Participant Year 1	64	70	134
Participant Year 2	54	65	119
Participant Year 3	36	46	82
Participant Year 4	22	36	58
Participant Year 5	6	18	24
Total	248	311	599

Attrition includes both self-sufficiency and non-self-sufficiency exits (Table 3). It is important to note that the study is ongoing and there are households participating in the study that have not exited nor reached the fifth year.

Table 3. Attrition from Baseline

	Control		**Experimental**		**Total**	
	Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**
Year 1 Attrition	2	3.03%	6	7.89%	8	5.63%
Year 2 Attrition	12	18.18%	11	14.47%	23	16.20%
Year 3 Attrition	30	45.45%	30	39.47%	60	42.25%
Year 4 Attrition	44	66.67%	40	52.63%	84	59.15%
Year 5 Attrition	60	90.91%	58	76.32%	118	83.10%

The majority of the exits in both the control and experimental groups were non-self-sufficiency exits (Table 4). Of the self-sufficiency exits, the majority occurred during the third year of participation in the study (Table 5).

Table 4. Exits

	Control		**Experimental**		
	Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	χ^2
Self-Sufficiency Exit	14	37.8%	9	33.3%	
Non-Self-Sufficiency Exit	23	62.2%	18	66.7%	0.138
Total	37	100%	27	100%	

Table 5. Self-Sufficiency Exits

	Control		**Experimental**		**Total**	
	Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**
During 1st Year	2	14.29%	2	22.22%	4	17.39%
During 2nd Year	3	21.43%	1	11.11%	4	17.39%
During 3rd Year	7	50.00%	3	33.33%	10	43.48%
During 4th Year	2	14.29%	2	22.22%	4	17.39%
During 5th Year	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	1	4.35%

There are no statistically significant differences between the control and experimental groups at baseline. The mean age of participants is late 30s and the majority are single/unmarried, White, females that have never had a crime conviction other than a traffic violation (Table 6).

Table 6. Household Characteristics at Baseline

	Control (*n*=66)		**Experimental (*n*=76)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	***t***
Head of Household Age	38	9	39	11	-0.758
	Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	χ^2
Gender					
Male	10	15.2%	9	11.8%	0.334
Female	56	84.8%	67	88.2%	
Marital Status					
Married	15	22.7%	17	22.4%	0.012
Divorced/Widowed	16	24.2%	18	23.7%	
Single/Unmarried	35	53.0%	41	53.9%	
Race					
White	39	59.1%	50	65.8%	0.678
Non-White	27	40.9%	26	34.2%	
Ethnicity					
Hispanic or Latino	15	22.7%	25	32.9%	0.179
Non-Hispanic or Latino	51	77.3%	51	67.1%	
Crime Conviction					
No	50	75.8%	64	84.2%	1.805
Yes	16	24.2%	12	15.8%	

Annual household income is statistically different between the control and experimental groups in Years 2, 3 and 4 (Table 7). In the experimental group, household income increases each subsequent year from Year 1 to Year 5.

Table 7. Annual Household Income

	Control			**Experimental**			
	Count	**Mean**	**SD**	**Count**	**Mean**	**SD**	***t***
Baseline	66	21,243	8,294	76	23,083	7,828	-1.359
Year 1	64	17,412	10,264	70	20,491	10,016	-1.757
Year 2	54	18,518	13,634	65	24,177	14,170	-2.206*
Year 3	36	16,969	12,376	46	26,514	15,335	-3.038**
Year 4	21	16,777	12,034	36	34,521	18,479	-3.933***
Year 5	6	26,571	10,081	18	37,842	23,406	-1.132

* p < 0.05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

There is no statistically significant difference between the control and experimental group on savings account outcomes over time (Table 8). The total savings amount was also considered but the results for this variable are not reported because there are issues with the question wording and data reliability.

Table 8. Savings Account

		Control		Experimental		
		Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	χ^2
Baseline	No	27	40.9%	23	30.3%	1.755
	Yes	39	59.1%	53	69.7%	
Year 1	No	29	45.3%	26	37.1%	0.922
	Yes	35	54.7%	44	62.9%	
Year 2	No	26	48.1%	23	35.4%	1.984
	Yes	28	51.9%	42	64.6%	
Year 3	No	13	48.1%	14	51.9%	0.402
	Yes	22	40.7%	32	59.3%	
Year 4	No	9	42.9%	10	27.8%	1.357
	Yes	12	57.1%	26	72.2%	
Year 5	No	1	16.7%	3	16.7%	1.000[1]
	Yes	5	83.3%	15	83.3%	

[1]The Fisher's Exact Test *p*-value is reported in this case since at least one cell has an expected count less than 5.

Employment status is statistically different between the control and experimental groups in Years 2 and 3 (Table 9). A larger share of the experimental group are employment from Years 1 through 4 compared to the control group.

Table 9. Employment Status

		Control		Experimental		
		Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	χ^2
Baseline	Employed	44	66.7%	57	75.0%	1.194
	Unemployed	22	33.3%	19	25.0%	
Year 1	Employed	37	57.8%	47	67.1%	1.244
	Unemployed	27	42.2%	23	32.9%	
Year 2	Employed	28	51.9%	49	75.4%	7.153**
	Unemployed	26	48.1%	16	24.6%	
Year 3	Employed	17	47.2%	33	71.7%	5.101*
	Unemployed	19	52.8%	13	28.3%	
Year 4	Employed	11	52.4%	26	72.2%	2.292
	Unemployed	10	47.6%	10	27.8%	
Year 5	Employed	6	100%	15	83.3%	0.546[1]
	Unemployed	0	0.00%	3	16.7%	

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

[1]The Fisher's Exact Test *p*-value is reported in this case since at least one cell has an expected count less than 5.

Educational attainment is statistically different between the control and experimental groups in Year 2 only. The control group contains a higher proportion of high school graduates than the experimental group (Table 10). Please note that there may be reporting errors for this question. For example, the number of participants without a high school diploma increases from baseline to Year 1 in the experimental group.

Table 10. Educational Attainment

	Control		Experimental		
	Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	χ^2
Baseline					
No High School Diploma	19	28.8%	22	28.9%	0.000
High School Diploma	47	71.2%	54	71.1%	
Year 1					
No High School Diploma	16	25.0%	24	34.3%	1.377
High School Diploma	48	75.0%	46	65.7%	
Year 2					
No High School Diploma	9	16.7%	22	33.8%	4.519*
High School Diploma	45	83.3%	43	66.2%	
Year 3					
No High School Diploma	8	22.2%	13	28.3%	0.387
High School Diploma	28	77.8%	33	71.7%	
Year 4					
No High School Diploma	5	23.8%	10	27.8%	0.108
High School Diploma	16	76.2%	26	72.2%	
Year 5					
No High School Diploma	1	16.7%	7	38.9%	0.621[1]
High School Diploma	5	83.3%	11	61.1%	

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

[1]The Fisher's Exact Test *p*-value is reported in this case since at least one cell has an expected count less than 5.

There is no statistical difference over time in TANF receipt between the control and experimental groups (Table 11). Very few households receive TANF so this variable may be removed as an outcome variable.

Table 11. TANF Recipient

		Control		Experimental		
		Count	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	χ^2
Baseline	No	57	86.4%	70	92.1%	1.233
	Yes	9	13.6%	6	7.9%	
Year 1	No	59	92.2%	63	90.0%	0.196
	Yes	5	7.8%	7	10.0%	
Year 2	No	50	92.6%	61	93.8%	1.000[1]
	Yes	4	7.4%	4	6.2%	
Year 3	No	34	94.4%	43	93.5%	1.000[1]
	Yes	2	5.6%	3	6.5%	
Year 4	No	20	95.2%	33	91.7%	1.000[1]
	Yes	1	4.8%	3	8.3%	
Year 5	No	6	100%	24	100%	-------[2]
	Yes	0	0%	0	0%	

[1]The Fisher's Exact Test *p*-value is reported in this case since at least one cell has an expected count less than 5.
[2] No value is reported because there is no statistical comparison since there are no households receiving TANF in Year 5 in either the control or experimental group.

There is no statistically significant difference between the control and experimental group in health and stress outcomes (Table 12). Note the nature of the health and stress questions on the survey are subjective and do not provide a time period for the self-reporting assessment.

Table 12. Health and Stress

	Control		Experimental		
	Count	**Median**	**Count**	**Median**	χ^2
Health					
Baseline		2.00		2.50	3.427
Year 1		2.00		2.00	0.820
Year 2		2.00		2.00	0.018
Year 3		2.00		2.00	0.021
Year 4		2.00		2.00	0.000
Year 5		2.00		2.00	0.123
Stress					
Baseline		2.00		2.00	3.005
Year 1		3.00		3.00	0.489
Year 2		2.00		3.00	0.449
Year 3		2.50		3.00	0.568
Year 4		2.00		3.00	0.995
Year 5		2.00		3.00	0.030

There is no statistically significant difference between the control and experimental group in property, neighborhood, or life satisfaction outcomes (Table 13).

Table 13. Property, Neighborhood, and Life Satisfaction

	Control		**Experimental**		
	Count	**Median**	**Count**	**Median**	χ^2
Property Satisfaction					
Baseline		3.00		2.63	1.402
Year 1		3.00		2.88	0.275
Year 2		2.47		2.75	0.307
Year 3		2.50		2.88	1.560
Year 4		3.00		2.94	0.000
Year 5		2.13		2.88	0.683
Neighborhood Satisfaction					
Baseline		2.93		2.96	0.007
Year 1		3.00		3.11	0.125
Year 2		3.06		3.00	0.243
Year 3		2.79		3.00	0.203
Year 4		3.00		2.94	0.061
Year 5		2.82		2.71	0.015
Life Satisfaction					
Baseline		3.00		3.08	1.640
Year 1		3.00		3.00	0.009
Year 2		2.93		3.00	0.029
Year 3		3.00		3.00	0.188
Year 4		3.29		3.00	0.092
Year 5		2.82		2.71	0.000

Mobility Demonstration Study
Preliminary Results (8/15/19)

The Mobility Demonstration began in 2014 and allows households in public housing to move to PBV single-family, duplex, or condo units in low-poverty neighborhoods. The purpose of this study is to determine if a move out of public housing to a neighborhood with more opportunity improves outcomes for low-income households. For the Mobility Demonstration, a within-subject design is used to compare household outcomes over time. The outcome variables were gathered from administrative and survey data (Table 1).

Table 1. Variables

	Data Source	Data Type	Statistical Test
Household Characteristics			
Head of Household Age	Administrative	Continuous	Descriptive Statistics
Gender	Survey	Categorical	Descriptive Statistics
Marital Status	Survey	Categorical	Descriptive Statistics
Race	Survey	Categorical	Descriptive Statistics
Ethnicity	Survey	Categorical	Descriptive Statistics
Crime Conviction	Survey	Categorical	Descriptive Statistics
Outcome Variables			
Annual Household Income	Administrative	Continuous	Paired Samples T-test
Savings Account	Survey	Categorical	McNemar
Employment Status	Administrative	Categorical	McNemar
Educational Attainment	Survey	Categorical	McNemar
TANF Recipient	Administrative	Categorical	McNemar
Health	Survey	Ordinal Scale 1-4	Wilcoxon
Stress	Survey	Ordinal Scale 1-4	Wilcoxon
Property Satisfaction	Survey	Ordinal Scale 0-4	Wilcoxon
Neighborhood Satisfaction	Survey	Ordinal Scale 0-4	Wilcoxon
Life Satisfaction	Survey	Ordinal Scale 0-4	Wilcoxon

Although this study began with a control group, there were not enough participants in this group to use as a control. Also, the original design of the study was not setup as a randomized controlled experiment because the control group contained households that were provided with the opportunity to move out of public housing to a low-poverty neighborhood but decided to stay in place. This design resulted in an inherent difference between the two groups. Not all participants that were enrolled in the mobility study that moved were included in the analysis. Only those households that participated in the study for at least one year and took the survey twice (at baseline and after the first year) were includes so a within-subjects analysis over time could be conducted. Not all households entered into the study at the same time so there may be future adjustments to the attrition rate as there are still some households participating in the study (Table 2).

Table 2. Sample and Attrition

	Count	Attrition
Baseline	38	-----
Participant Year 1	38	-----
Participant Year 2	27	28.95%
Participant Year 3	22	42.11%
Participant Year 4	15	60.53%
Participant Year 5	6	84.21%
Total	146	-----

Of the 18 exits, over half of the exits have been voluntary self-sufficiency exits (Table 3). There is insufficient data to determine how long households need housing assistance before they can make a self-sufficiency exit but this is an important metric to track for all households receiving public assistance. Note that no exits occurred with the first year because those participants were removed since they could not be compared over time.

Table 3. Exits

	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Self-Sufficiency Exit	10	55.5%		
During Year 2			3	30.00%
During Year 3			2	20.00%
During Year 4			4	40.00%
During Year 5			1	10.00%
Non-Self Sufficiency Exit	8	44.5%		
Total	18	100%		

The mean age of the head of household for participants in the mobility study is 42. The majority of the participants are single, White, females that have never had a crime conviction other than a traffic violation. Approximately 60% of the participants are White and non-Hispanic/Latino (Table 4).

Table 4. Household Characteristics at Baseline

		Mean	SD
Head of Household Age (*n*=38)		42	11
		Count	**Percent**
Gender (*n*=38)	Male	4	10.5%
	Female	34	89.5%
Marital Status (*n*=38)	Married	8	21.1%
	Divorced/Widowed	9	23.7%
	Single/Unmarried	21	55.3%
Race (*n*=38)	White	23	60.5%
	Non-White	15	39.5%
Ethnicity (*n*=38)	Hispanic or Latino	14	36.8%
	Non-Hispanic or Latino	24	63.2%
Crime Conviction (*n*=38)	No	32	84.2%
	Yes	6	15.8%

Annual household income is statistically different from baseline in Year 3 and Year 4 for households that moved from public housing to low-poverty neighborhoods (Table 5). Household income increases each subsequent year, with the exception of Year 2, from the date that households moved from public housing.

Table 5. Annual Household Income

	Baseline			Comparison Year			
	Count	**Mean**	**SD**	**Count**	**Mean**	**SD**	***t***
Year 1	38	15,968	11,243	38	18,705	11,813	-1.550
Year 2	27	13,582	10,555	27	18,401	12,326	-1.907
Year 3	22	12,077	9,600	22	20,683	13,240	-2.901**
Year 4	15	10,840	8,915	15	21,534	8,981	-3.407**
Year 5	6	12,550	9,185	6	25,156	8,766	-2.045

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

There is no statistical difference over time in savings accounts for households that moved from public housing to low-poverty neighborhoods (Table 6).

Table 6. Savings Account

		Comparison No	**Comparison Yes**	***p*-value**[1]
Year 1 (*n*=38)				
	Baseline No	4	11	1.000
	Baseline Yes	11	12	
Year 2 (*n*=27)				
	Baseline No	5	7	1.000
	Baseline Yes	8	7	
Year 3 (*n*=22)				
	Baseline No	3	6	0.754
	Baseline Yes	4	9	
Year 4 (*n*=14)				
	Baseline No	2	3	0.625
	Baseline Yes	1	8	
Year 5 (*n*=6)				
	Baseline No	0	2	1.000
	Baseline Yes	1	3	

[1]The exact p-value is calculated based on a binomial distribution because there are 25 or fewer records in at least one cell.

There is no statistical difference over time in employment for households that moved from public housing to low-poverty neighborhoods (refer to Table 7).

Table 7. Employment Status

	Comparison Unemployed	Comparison Employed	*p*-value[1]
Year 1 (*n*=38)			
Unemployed	15	5	0.453
Employed	2	6	
Year 2 (*n*=27)			
Unemployed	8	6	0.125
Employed	1	12	
Year 3 (*n*=22)			
Unemployed	6	5	0.219
Employed	1	10	
Year 4 (*n*=15)			
Unemployed	3	5	0.453
Employed	2	5	
Year 5 (*n*=6)			
Unemployed	0	2	------[2]
Employed	0	4	

[1]The exact p-value is calculated based on a binomial distribution because there are 25 or fewer records in at least one cell.
[2]No value is reported because each group must have a minimum of one to conduct a statistical comparison.

There is no statistical difference over time in educational attainment, defined by obtaining a high school diploma or GED, for households that moved from public housing to low-poverty neighborhoods (Table 8).

Table 8. Educational Attainment

	Comparison No High School	Comparison High School Diploma	*p*-value
Year 1 (*n*=38)			
No High School Diploma	7	4	1.000
High School Diploma	4	23	
Year 2 (*n*=27)			
No High School Diploma	2	7	1.000
High School Diploma	6	12	
Year 3 (*n*=22)			
No High School Diploma	3	5	1.000
High School Diploma	6	8	
Year 4 (*n*=14)			
No High School Diploma	2	3	1.000
High School Diploma	5	9	
Year 5 (*n*=6)			
No High School Diploma	2	2	1.000
High School Diploma	2	0	

There is no statistical difference over time in TANF for households that moved from public housing to low-poverty neighborhoods (Table 9). Very few households receive TANF so this variable may be removed as an outcome variable.

Table 9. TANF Recipient

	Comparison No	Comparison Yes	*p*-value
Year 1 (*n*=38)			
No	34	2	0.500
Yes	0	2	
Year 2 (*n*=27)			
No	24	1	1.000
Yes	0	2	
Year 3 (*n*=22)			
No	19	1	1.000
Yes	1	1	
Year 4 (*n*=15)			
No	13	1	1.000
Yes	1	0	
Year 5 (*n*=6)			
No	6	0	------[1]
Yes	0	0	

[1] No value is reported because each group must have a minimum of one to conduct a statistical comparison.

There is no statistical difference over time in health or stress outcomes for households that moved from public housing to low-poverty neighborhoods (Table 10). Note the nature of the health and stress questions on the survey are subjective and do not provide a time period for the self-reporting assessment.

Table 10. Health and Stress

	Baseline Median	Comparison Year Median	Median Difference	*Z*
Health				
Year 1 (*n*=38)	2.00	2.00	0.00	-0.140
Year 2 (*n*=27)	2.00	2.00	0.00	-0.197
Year 3 (*n*=22)	2.00	2.00	0.00	-0.099
Year 4 (*n*=15)	2.00	3.00	1.00	-0.284
Year 5 (*n*=6)	2.50	1.50	-1.00	-1.633
Stress				
Year 1 (*n*=38)	2.50	3.00	0.50	-0.852
Year 2 (*n*=27)	3.00	2.00	-1.00	-0.880
Year 3 (*n*=22)	3.00	2.00	-1.00	-0.922
Year 4 (*n*=15)	3.00	3.00	0.00	-0.368
Year 5 (*n*=6)	2.50	3.00	0.50	0.000

There is no statistical difference over time in property, neighborhood, or life satisfaction outcomes for households that moved from public housing to low-poverty neighborhoods (Table 11).

Table 11. Property, Neighborhood, and Life Satisfaction

	Baseline Median	**Comparison Year Median**	**Median Difference**	***Z***
Property Satisfaction				
Year 1 (*n*=38)	3.73	3.64	-0.09	-0.322
Year 2 (*n*=27)	3.73	3.73	0.00	-0.639
Year 3 (*n*=22)	3.82	3.82	0.00	-0.131
Year 4 (*n*=15)	3.82	3.64	-0.18	-0.660
Year 5 (*n*=6)	3.81	3.54	-0.27	-1.156
Neighborhood Satisfaction				
Year 1 (*n*=38)	3.52	3.41	-0.11	-0.347
Year 2 (*n*=27)	3.70	3.78	0.08	-0.422
Year 3 (*n*=22)	3.76	4.00	0.24	-0.697
Year 4 (*n*=15)	3.55	3.55	0.00	-0.691
Year 5 (*n*=6)	3.75	3.73	-0.02	-0.184
Life Satisfaction				
Year 1 (*n*=38)	3.46	3.14	-0.32	-0.804
Year 2 (*n*=27)	3.50	3.60	0.10	-0.394
Year 3 (*n*=22)	3.60	3.29	-0.31	-1.188
Year 4 (*n*=15)	3.60	3.00	-0.60	-1.734
Year 5 (*n*=6)	3.72	3.36	-0.36	-1.214