



Moving to Work

2017 ANNUAL REPORT

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT AND CEO

Our Agency's vision has long been to create dynamic neighborhoods where people thrive. Since receiving the Moving to Work (MTW) designation in 2009, SAHA has made significant progress in realizing our mission. Our MTW designation has allowed SAHA the flexibility to transform our operations, programs, and housing by implementing innovative strategies.

This fiscal year alone, across 7 MTW activities aimed at creating administrative efficiencies, SAHA is estimating \$487,000 in cost savings, thereby reducing federal expenditures. We increased housing choices for low-income families by opening the first phase of the new East Meadows community, the site of the former Wheatley Courts public housing development. Phase II also is nearly complete. What's more, we promoted self-sufficiency among residents by sustaining resident enrollment and engagement in self-sufficiency programs. Through our self-sufficiency programs, we served over 1,200 individuals, with 45% of participants employed and the others involved in educational or job training activities. Fifty residents earned a high school diploma or certificate of high school equivalency, four earned an Associate's degree, and one earned a Bachelor's degree-- amounting to an estimated cumulative increase in lifetime earnings of over \$23M.

Additionally, the MTW designation has allowed us to establish innovative programs with our local partners, and we are pleased to announce the launch of several of these initiatives, including the restorative housing pilot program and the time-limited working referral pilot program.

Our accomplishments as a high-performing agency go beyond our MTW achievements. In 2017, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) recognized SAHA with 15 Awards of Merit — the most of any agency — and 5 Awards of Excellence nominations. We also bolstered our efforts to improve resident offerings through effective and innovative partnerships. SAHA and our many partners are leading the effort to bridge the digital divide and increase digital literacy at SAHA communities through the ConnectHome program.

As one of only 39 public housing authorities throughout the nation with the MTW designation, we are proud to lead in establishing best practices for both existing and prospective MTW agencies. We look forward to building on the success of our existing programs and aspire to improve customer service, combat homelessness, create more affordable units, and develop new income business silos with public and private partners.

Thank you for your support of our vision to *Create Dynamic Communities Where People Thrive*. We hope you will enjoy learning more about our FY2017 accomplishments in this year's MTW Annual Report.



David Nisivoccia
President and CEO

Vision

Create dynamic communities where people thrive.

Mission

Provide quality affordable housing that is well-integrated into the fabric of neighborhoods and serves as a foundation to improve lives and advance resident independence.

Strategic Goals

- Empower and equip families to improve their quality of life and achieve economic stability
- Invest in our greatest resource – our employees – and establish a track record for integrity, accountability, collaboration and strong customer service
- Preserve and improve existing affordable housing resources and opportunities
- Strategically expand the supply of affordable housing
- Transform core operations to be a high performing and financially strong organization
- Develop a local and national reputation for being an effective leader, partner, and advocate for affordable housing and its residents

Moving to Work Goals

- Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures
- Give incentives that promote self-sufficiency
- Increase housing choices for low-income families in San Antonio



Fiscal Year 2017: July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017

SAHA Board of Commissioners

Morris Stribling, DPM, Chairman
Charles Muñoz, Vice-Chairman
Tommy Adkisson
Francesca Caballero
Charles Clack
Marie R. McClure
Jessica Weaver

SAHA Executive Staff

David Nisivoccia
Interim President and Chief Executive Officer
Ed Hinojosa
Chief Financial Officer
Muriel Rhoder
Interim Chief Administrative Officer
Timothy Alcott
Development and Neighborhood Revitalization Officer

SAHA Senior Staff

Jo Ana Alvarado, Director of Innovative Technology
Domingo Ibarra, Director of Security
Diana Kollodziej Fiedler, Director of Finance and Accounting
Brandee Perez, Director of Federal Housing Programs
Adrian Lopez, Director of Community Development Initiatives
Hector Martinez, Director of Construction Services and Sustainability
Richard L. Milk, Director of Policy and Planning
Steve Morando, Director of Procurement and General Services
Rosario Neaves, Director of Communications and Public Affairs
Lorraine Robles, Director of Development Services and Neighborhood Revitalization
Janie Rodriguez, Director of Human Resources
Thomas R. Roth, Director of Asset Management
Patrick Zacchini, Director of Internal Audit

MTW Staff

Richard L. Milk, Director of Policy and Planning
Sara Eaves, MTW & GIS Program Analyst

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| MESSAGE FROM CEO | 3 |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| II. GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION | 11 |
| A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION | 11 |
| B. LEASING INFORMATION | 13 |
| C. WAITING LIST INFORMATION | 18 |
| III. PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES | 19 |
| IV. APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES | 20 |
| A. IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES | 20 |
| FY2011-1e – Preservation and expansion of affordable housing | 20 |
| FY2011-9 – Allocate set-asides of tenant-based vouchers for households referred by non-profit sponsors who will provide supportive services to those households | 23 |
| FY2013-2 – Simplified Earned Income Disregard (S-EID) | 25 |
| FY2013-4 – HQS Inspection of SAHA-owned non-profits by SAHA inspectors | 32 |
| FY2014-2 – Early Engagement (previously referred to as Path to Self-Sufficiency) | 34 |
| FY2014-3 – Faster Implementation of Payment Standard Decreases (HCV) | 39 |
| FY2014-4 – Biennial Reexaminations (HCV and PH) | 40 |
| FY2014-5 – Triennial Reexaminations (HCV) | 48 |
| FY2014-6 – Rent Simplification (HCV) | 50 |
| FY2015-1 – MDRC / HUD Rent Reform Study | 55 |
| FY2015-2 – Elderly Admissions Preference at Select Public Housing Sites | 71 |
| FY2015-3 – Modified Project Based Vouchers | 76 |
| FY2015-4 – Simplified Utility Allowance | 79 |
| FY2016-2 – Biennial and Triennial Notification of Rent Type Option | 82 |
| FY2017-1 – Time Limited Working Referral Program | 84 |
| FY2017-2 – Restorative Housing Pilot Program | 91 |
| B. ACTIVITIES ON HOLD | 99 |
| C. CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES | 100 |
| V. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS | 103 |
| A. SOURCES AND USES OF MTW FUNDS | 103 |
| MTW Initiatives | 104 |
| B. LOCAL ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN | 106 |
| C. COMMITMENT OF UNSPENT MTW FUNDS | 107 |
| VI. ADMINISTRATIVE | 110 |
| Certification of MTW Statutory Compliance | 111 |

Overview

The San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) provides housing to over 65,000 children, adults, and seniors through three housing programs – Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers, and Mixed-Income housing programs. SAHA employs approximately 521 people and has an annual operating budget of \$184 million. Existing real estate assets are valued at over \$500 million.

SAHA's involvement with Moving to Work (MTW) dates back to May 2000, when SAHA implemented its initial MTW demonstration program in three Public Housing communities: Mission Park Apartments, Wheatley Courts, and Lincoln Heights Courts. In 2009, SAHA signed an amended and restated agreement with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to make the MTW demonstration an agency-wide program.

The MTW designation provides SAHA with the flexibility to design and test innovative approaches to enhance the Agency's programs. The MTW designation also provides funding flexibility by combining Public Housing operating subsidy, Capital Fund Program (CFP) grants, and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program subsidies into a single fund block grant.

The following section provides an overview of SAHA's short-term accomplishments and summarizes the Agency's progress towards long-term goals and objectives.

Short-term Accomplishments

Progress towards long-term goals and objectives

On June 25, 2012, the Board of Commissioners formally approved SAHA's new Strategic Plan. Three elements comprise the core of the plan: a new vision for the Agency, a new mission statement, and a set of six strategic goals.

Vision: Create dynamic communities where people thrive.

Mission: Provide quality affordable housing that is well-integrated into the fabric of neighborhoods and serves as a foundation to improve lives and advance resident independence.

Strategic Goals

1. Empower and equip families to improve their quality of life and achieve economic stability.
2. Invest in our greatest resource – our employees – and establish a track record for integrity, accountability, collaboration and strong customer service.
3. Preserve and improve existing affordable housing resources and opportunities.
4. Strategically expand the supply of affordable housing.
5. Transform core operations to be a high performing and financially strong organization.

6. Develop a local and national reputation for being an effective leader, partner, and advocate for affordable housing and its residents.

SAHA's MTW Plan and Strategic Plan are closely integrated. The Strategic Plan goals articulate and reinforce the three statutory MTW goals. Because of the tight integration between the plans, progress in any MTW Activity is automatically captured in Strategic Plan progress reports.

Long-term MTW Plan

Over the course of FY2017, SAHA formed an internal working group to develop a long-term vision for each of the three MTW statutory objectives. As a result of this long-term strategic planning, the agencies is pursuing several initiatives including:

- Establish centers for working families in PH communities to increase integration with workforce agency programs and resources
- Develop initiative around High Opportunity Neighborhoods, including Small Area FMR
- Create education initiative to support attendance, school readiness, reading / math grade level performance, middle school transition, college readiness
- Expand ConnectHome role in City-wide digital inclusion efforts (Digital Inclusion Alliance)
- Develop strategies to prevent homelessness.

Strategic Plan

SAHA's Strategic Plan establishes six long-term strategic goals to be achieved by 2020. In order to ensure timely progress towards those goals, SAHA develops annual Strategic Implementation Plans that set out annual objectives for the fiscal year. Progress is measured by tracking key metrics for each strategic goal. The first of the following tables lists the key metrics assigned to each strategic goal. The second table shows the relationship between the long term strategic goals and annual objectives.

Key Strategic Goal Metrics

Metrics in boldface are MTW Standard Metrics.

| Strategic Goal | Metric | Definition |
|--|---|--|
| 1: Empower and equip families to improve their quality of life and achieve economic stability. | Education Attainment | % of 19 and older adults with an education level of 12 or more; Level 12 indicating GED/HS Diploma |
| | Employment rate of residents / participants (FT equivalent) | % of work-able adults that are employed at or above minimum FTE work level |
| | Employment rate of residents / participants (PTE and FTE) | % of work-able adults that are employed at or above minimum PTE work level |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Earned income | Median earned income of SAHA-assisted adults working at a full-time equivalent |
| | SS #8: Self Sufficient | Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency. |
| 2: Invest in our greatest resource – our employees – and establish a track record for integrity, accountability, collaboration and strong customer service. | Performance Evaluations Completed on time, % | Percentage of complete and correct evaluations submitted to HR within 30 days of anniversary date (hire date or promotion date) |
| | Employee turnover rate | Number of employees that have left divided by the total number of employees (for the period) |
| | Training commitment | Ratio of dollar amount set aside for training in each department's budget (to include tuition reimbursement, professional certification activities) to dollar amount spent for training |
| | Time to Hire | Percent of applicants that receive a contingent offer within 60 days from job post closing |
| | Wellness programs | \$ invested in SAHA wellness programs |
| 3: Preserve and improve existing affordable housing resources and opportunities. | Units of Housing Preserved | Number of housing units preserved by contract execution of funds that include (CFP, MTW, Operations, Insurance loss proceeds, replacement reserve funds, net proceeds from sale of non strategic assets and net loan proceeds from refinances (Beacon)). |
| | Percent of contracts expended | Percentage of contracts expended based on approved and executed contracts for eligible capital repair/replacements projects (as defined above) for current fiscal year. |
| | Funds Obligated | Funds obligated, based on executed contracts of funds that include (CFP, MTW, Operations, Insurance loss proceeds, replacement reserve funds, net proceeds from sale of non strategic assets and net loan proceeds from refinances (Beacon)) |
| | Offline units | Units that are uninhabitable due to significant repairs required |
| | Work order days closed within 2 days, % | Percentage of work orders closed out within 2 days |
| | Emergency Work Orders completed same day, % | Percentage of emergency work orders completed the same day of being ordered |
| 4: Strategically expand the supply of affordable housing. | Units acquired or built (completed) | Total sum of all units acquired or built |
| | Per unit cost | Total funds expended on construction/acquisition projects divided by the total number of units. |
| | Additional vouchers secured | Number of new, competitive vouchers secured |
| | Voucher value | Dollar value of new vouchers secured |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| 5: Transform core operations to be a high performing and financially strong organization. | Occupancy (%) | Percentage of units occupied |
| | Average HAP | Average Housing Assistance Payment per voucher |
| | HCV Scorecard | Scorecard score for Housing Choice Voucher program |
| | Non-Profit DSCR | Debt service coverage ratio for Beacon Communities |
| | MTW Baseline Compliance | MTW households assisted using the MTW baseline methodology set forth in PIH-2013-02. |
| | Net Operating Income (NOI) | Net Operating Income |
| | PHAS Score | PHAS score for Public Housing |
| 6: Develop a local and national reputation for being an effective leader, partner, and advocate for affordable housing and its residents. | Agency Awards/Recognition | Number of national, state, and local awards for agency programs |
| | Positive media coverage (%) | Number of positive/neutral hits divided by total (all) hits, by media outlet |
| | Policy wins (%) | Number of policies finalized in SAHA's favor divided by total number of policies engaged |

Long-term Strategic Goals and Short-term (Annual) Objectives

| Strategic Goals (Long-term 2020) | Objectives (Short-term FY2017) |
|---|--|
| 1: Empower and equip families to improve their quality of life and achieve economic stability. | Evaluate effectiveness of EEP program |
| | Analyze other alternative to small area FMRs that promotes neighborhoods of opportunity |
| | Increase employment & income for residents engaged in self-sufficiency activity |
| | Expand and scale up ConnectHome |
| 2: Invest in our greatest resource – our employees – and establish a track record for integrity, accountability, collaboration and strong customer service. | Retain high performing employees |
| | Revamp performance evaluation process |
| | Create a comprehensive onboarding process to best prepare an employee to be a productive staff member at SAHA |
| | Ensure a timely recruiting process |
| 3: Preserve and improve existing affordable housing resources and opportunities. | Decrease routine and emergency work order turnaround times |
| | Sell Section 32 single-family homes, vacant lots, and rental properties |
| 4: Strategically expand the supply of affordable housing. | Construction of new units |
| | Analyze other alternatives to small area FMRs that promotes neighborhoods of opportunity (also objective under goal 1) |

| | |
|---|---|
| 5: Transform core operations to be a high performing and financially strong organization. | Maximize Occupancy |
| | Minimize turnaround |
| | Reduce payment processing time |
| | Improve key processes |
| | Ensure financially sustainable organization over the long-term |
| | Develop criminal history policy |
| | Development data management consent policy |
| | |
| 6: Develop a local and national reputation for being an effective leader, partner, and advocate for affordable housing and its residents. | Build communications function |
| | Develop public relations measurement scorecard |
| | Market SAHA's expertise to build trust and authority with stakeholders |
| | Develop SAHA Legislative Function |
| | Engage in state legislative session, national policy issues, and local Housing Commission |

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

A. Housing Stock Information

Pursuant to PIH Notice PIH-2013-02 (HA), *Baseline Methodology for Moving to Work Public Housing Agencies*, the Agency's adjusted MTW baseline denominator for FY2017 is 17,861 households (PH: 5,715 and HCV: 12,146). At the end of FY2017, SAHA had 6,097 units in public housing (PH) and 13,046 authorized MTW vouchers.

(Tables from Form 50900)

| New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Property Name | Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based * | Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based | Description of Project |
| East Meadows Phase I | 8 | 8 | The first on-site phase, which was awarded a 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits on July 30, 2014, will include 215 mixed income family units on three and one half blocks consisting of one, two, three and four bedroom garden apartments, and two, three and four bedroom townhouse apartments with related exterior site amenities. This phase will also include a BiblioTech, a digital library, for the residents and community to use. |

| Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based * | Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based | Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year * | Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year * |
|--|---|--|--|
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 39 |
| | | Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year | Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year |
| | | 8 | 33 |

| Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year |
|---|
| Public Housing (PH) Stock Changes: SAHA added 71 new PH units at a new mixed-income tax-credit development (East Meadows Phase I). |
| Voucher Authorization changes: SAHA added 27 vouchers to the total number of vouchers authorized under Moving-to-Work. These vouchers were converted from the Mod-Rehab program. |
| Other Housing Stock changes (non-profit/partnerships): Starting in FY2014, SAHA amended its MTW Agreement to allow Replacement Housing Factor Funds (RHF) to be added to the MTW Block Grant. At fiscal year-end, SAHA had completed 95% of East Meadows (Choice Phase II, formerly known as Wheatley Courts). The new development is a 9% Low Income Tax Credit project with a total of 215 new units--59 market units, 77 tax-credit only units, and 71 public housing layered with tax-credits, and 8 project-based vouchers. |

| General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures during the Plan Year | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Property | Description of Work | Activity in FY2017 (\$) |
| Blanco | Phase I-II Structural Assessment | \$35,883.09 |
| H.B. Gonzalez | Foundation Movement Study | \$46,566.67 |
| Westway | A/E - Drainage, Sewer, Site Engineering Investigation | \$18,104.64 |
| Lewis Chatham | A/E - HVAC Improvements - Air Balance Project | \$1,289.36 |
| Charles Andrews | A/E - Substantial Renovation Scope & Determination | \$25,589.27 |
| W.C. White | A/E - Basement Column Distress Project | \$24,995.50 |
| Scattered Site - 10145 | | |
| Galesburg | Burn Unit - Reconstruction | \$59,915.40 |
| Westway | Sewer, Site Drainage & Solar Site Improvements | \$2,439,182.34 |
| 24 Gus Garcia | Burn Unit Reconstruction | \$173,498.06 |
| HB Gonzalez | Structural and Foundation Repairs | \$757,137.19 |
| Villa Tranchese | Chilled water plant/air handler replacement assessment/design | \$17,800.00 |
| Fair Avenue | Fire Pump-Emergency generator-Sprinkler feasibility study | \$7,521.60 |
| Villa Hermosa | Chiller Feeder Upgrade | \$19,770.00 |
| Blanco | Temporary Shoring | \$9,200.00 |
| 24 Gus Garcia | Structural/MEP/GeoTech Engineering Service | \$3,376.00 |
| Matt Garcia | Dwelling Repairs - Kitchen, Bath & Balcony Concrete repairs | \$77,700.00 |
| Charles Andrews | Comp Mod - Site, Bldg, Interior and Parking Improvements | \$319,101.76 |
| Fair Avenue | Fire Sprinkler and Alarm Design | \$48,500.56 |
| Lila Crockrell | MEP Engineering Consulting (Ph. I - IV) | \$13,610.00 |
| W.C. White | Basement: Drainage, Crawl Space and Screen Wall Repairs | \$141,073.73 |
| | Total Capital Expenditures | \$4,239,815.17 |

| Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End | | |
|--|--------------|---|
| Housing Program * | Total Units | Overview of the Program |
| Market-Rate | 1,961 | Units are scattered throughout the Agency's non-profit portfolio (Beacon Communities) and partnership portfolio. This fiscal year, the agency added 59 market units as part of East Meadows Phase I. see below. This year, the agency added 77 Tax-credit units as part of East Meadows Phase I. |
| Other | 5,371 | |
| Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed | 7,332 | |
| If Other, please describe: | | Includes all other affordable housing reserved for low income households with less than 80% of Area Median Income (Tax-Credits, Affordable Housing Disposition Program (AHDP), Bond, State HOME funds, State Housing Trust Funds, Project-Based Assistance (PBA), and Fannie Mae) |

B. Leasing Information

Pursuant to PIH Notice PIH-2013-02 (HA), *Baseline Methodology for Moving to Work Public Housing Agencies*, the Agency's FY2017 MTW families served (annual average) is 18,036 out of 17,861 MTW adjusted baseline denominator or 101%. The Agency continues to serve substantially the same number of households as it did upon entering the MTW demonstration.

| | MTW – Serving Substantially the Same | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| | MTW Baseline Denominator | MTW Baseline Numerator (Annual Average Leasing) | MTW Baseline Compliance Calculation |
| PH | 5,715 | 5,767 | 101% |
| Vouchers | 12,146 | 12,098 | 100% |
| Other (Local, Non-Traditional) | --- | 171 | NA |
| Total | 17,861 | 18,036 | 101% |

SAHA currently has three communities, the Park at Sutton Oaks, the Gardens at San Juan Square, and East Meadows Phase I, which meet the definition of local, non-traditional housing. These communities were built using MTW funding and serve households with less than 80% AMI outside of Section 8 and Section 9 (PH). Below is information on local, non-traditional households provided with housing assistance at the end of the FY2017 fiscal year, not reported in PIC or its successor system:

(Tables from Form 50900)

| Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Housing Program: | Number of Households Served* | |
| | Planned | Actual |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ** | N/A | 171 |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ** | N/A | N/A |
| Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed) | N/A | N/A |
| Total Projected and Actual Households Served | 0 | 171 |
| Housing Program: | Unit Months Occupied/Leased**** | |
| | Planned | Actual |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs *** | N/A | 2,054 |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs *** | N/A | N/A |
| Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed) | N/A | N/A |
| Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased | 0 | 2,054 |

The Agency planned to lease 100% of all local, non-traditional MTW units; defined as non-Section 8/9 affordable units occupied by non-Section 8 households. Due to the nature of the MTW reporting requirement, it is impossible to plan how many of the non-Section 8/9 affordable units will be occupied by a household without a Section 8 voucher. Every reporting cycle, property management reviews rent rolls and determines how many non-Section 8/9 affordable units are occupied by a household without a Section 8 voucher. Units occupied by a household with a Section 8 voucher cannot be counted in the local, non-traditional unit category, because they are counted in the traditional Section-8 total.

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

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

| | Average Number of Households Served Per Month | Total Number of Households Served During the Year |
|---|---|---|
| Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only | N/A | N/A |

| Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| HUD will verify compliance with the statutory objective of "assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families" is being achieved by examining public housing and Housing Choice Voucher family characteristics as submitted into the PIC or its successor system utilizing current resident data at the end of the Agency's fiscal year. | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal Year: | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted | N/A | N/A | N/A | 58 | 156 | 163 | 185 | N/A |
| Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income | N/A | N/A | N/A | 43 | 89 | 105 | 118 | N/A |
| Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income | N/A | N/A | N/A | 74% | 57% | 64% | 64% | N/A |

According to SAHA's records, the Agency continues to meet this statutory objective by serving a total of 17,122 very-low income households (97%).

| As of 6.30.2017 | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | Total Households | Number below 50% AMI | % Below 50% AMI |
| PH | 5,706 | 5,564 | 98% |
| Vouchers | 11,813 | 11,442 | 97% |
| Other (Local, Non-Traditional) | 185 | 118 | 64% |
| Total | 17,704 | 17,122 | 97% |

(Tables from Form 50900)

| Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix |
|--|
|--|

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

| Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|-----------|--------|
| Family Size: | Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW | Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW | Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes * | Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained | Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained | | |
| 1 Person | 2,617 | 3,952 | N/A | 6,569 | 36% | | |
| 2 Person | 873 | 2,134 | N/A | 3,007 | 16% | | |
| 3 Person | 998 | 2,338 | N/A | 3,336 | 18% | | |
| 4 Person | 730 | 2,004 | N/A | 2,734 | 15% | | |
| 5 Person | 401 | 1,178 | N/A | 1,579 | 9% | | |
| 6+ Person | 317 | 917 | N/A | 1,234 | 7% | | |
| Totals | 5,936 | 12,523 | 0 | 18,459 | 100% | | |
| Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized | There are no non-MTW Adjustments to the distribution of household sizes. Baseline percentages of household sizes to be maintained were established using the most complete historical dataset that included household size. The reported data in the Agency's FY2011-2012 report for FY2011-1 Activity was used to set the baseline-- this is a snapshot of occupancy as of June 30, 2012. It is important to note that this form uses the term "Family Size". SAHA does not define nor track families; rather, the Agency tracks households and household size. | | | | | | |
| Mix of Family Sizes Served | | | | | | | |
| | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person | Totals |
| Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained ** | 36% | 16% | 18% | 15% | 9% | 7% | 100% |
| Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year *** | 6,753 | 3,084 | 2,875 | 2,349 | 1,387 | 1,071 | 17,519 |
| Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year **** | 39% | 18% | 16% | 13% | 8% | 6% | 100% |
| Percentage Change | 8% | 8% | -9% | -9% | -7% | -9% | 0% |
| Absolute Percentage Change | 3% | 2% | -2% | -2% | -2% | -1% | 0% |
| Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages | While all household sizes show a percent change over 5%, the absolute differences between the baseline and FY2017 is no greater than 3%. The overall range of absolute differences across all household sizes is -1% to 3%, indicating the Agency is still serving a comparable mix of households by household size. The following city-wide trends justify the family size variations: (1) Demographic Change: The city of San Antonio has seen significant | | | | | | |

demographic change that justifies the variation. First, there has been an increase in the proportion of population aged 62 years and older and a decrease in the proportion of its population under 18 years old. Second, the city has seen a decrease in the proportion of households and families below the poverty level who have children. Both of these demographic shifts are consistent with the increase in one- and two-person households and the decrease in three-plus person households. These shifts in demographics are also evident among households served by SAHA through MTW.

| San Antonio city, Texas | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | 2008-2012 Estimates | 2013-2017 Estimates | Statistical Significance | Percent Change |
| Population | Under 18 years | 26.60% | 25.40% | Yes | -5% |
| | 62 years and over | 13.20% | 14.50% | Yes | 10% |
| Source: American Community Survey Comparative Demographic Estimates (CP05); 2017 and 2012 Five-Year Estimates | | | | | |

| San Antonio city, Texas | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | 2008-2012 Estimates | 2013-2017 Estimates | Statistical Significance | Percent Change |
| Household s by Type | Household s with one or more people under 18 years | 36.90% | 35.30% | Yes | -4% |
| Percentage of families and people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level | With related children of the householde r under 18 years | 23.00% | 21.40% | Yes | -7% |
| Source: American Community Survey Comparative Social Estimates (CP02) and Comparative Economic Estimates (CP03); 2017 and 2012 Five-Year Estimates | | | | | |

(2) Housing Market Change: The city of San Antonio has experienced an increase in the proportion of housing units with no bedrooms and one bedrooms while also experiencing a decrease in the proportion of units with three bedrooms.

| San Antonio city, Texas | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | 2008-2012 Estimates | 2013-2017 Estimates | Statistical Significance | Percent Change |
| Bedrooms | Total | 524,522 | 540,148 | Yes | 3% |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| | housing units | | | | |
| | No bedroom | 2.4% | 2.7% | Yes | 13% |
| | 1 bedroom | 16.1% | 16.8% | Yes | 4% |
| | 2 bedrooms | 24.3% | 23.9% | | |
| | 3 bedrooms | 39.8% | 38.9% | Yes | -2% |
| | 4 bedrooms | 15.1% | 15.3% | | |
| | 5 or more bedrooms | 2.3% | 2.4% | | |
| Source: American Community Survey Comparative Housing Estimates (CP04); 2017 and 2012 Five-Year Estimates | | | | | |

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

** The numbers in this row will be the same numbers in the chart above listed under the column "Baseline percentages of family sizes to be maintained."

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

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

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

| Housing Program | Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions |
|------------------------------|---|
| Public Housing | There was a high number of vacancies due to the relocation of the Victoria Plaza resident as well as a high number of evictions for program violations. SAHA continues to select applicants from the waitlist to ensure these units are occupied timely. |
| Housing Choice Voucher | The Housing Choice Voucher Program selected 3,316 applicants from the wait list from July 2016 through June 2017. The success rate of lease up for the applicants selected from the wait list was 10%, mostly contributed to no response from the applicants when notified they were selected. The The Housing Choice Voucher wait list was recently closed on July 7, 2017 in an effort to achieve shorter waiting times and prevent false hope among families waiting for voucher assistance. |
| Local, Non-Traditional Units | none |

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

For MTW reporting purposes, SAHA has defined self-sufficiency as a PH household who is paying a flat rent for at least 6 months or a HCV household utilizing a zero HAP voucher for at least 6 months. The logic is that if a household is able to pay the full amount of their housing cost without subsidy from the Agency, than they have achieved a level of economic stability. Detailed below are the results of FY2017.

| Activity Name/# | Number of Households Transitioned * | Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| FY2013-2: Simplified Earned Income Disregard | 0 | See definition above for Public Housing |
| FY2014-4 Biennial Reexaminations | 39 | See definition above for Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program |
| FY2014-6 Rent Simplification | 13 | See definition above for Housing Choice Voucher Program |

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| FY2015-1 MDRC/HUD Rent Study | 3 | |
| FY2017-1 Time Limited Working Referral Program | 0 | See definition above for Public Housing |
| FY2017-2 Restorative Housing Pilot Program | 0 | See definition above for Public Housing |
| Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions | 13 | * The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used. |
| ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY | 42 | |

C. Waiting List Information

(Tables from Form 50900)

| Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Housing Program(s) * | Wait List Type ** | Number of Households on Wait List | Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed *** | Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units | Site-Based | 25,098 | Open | No |
| Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program and Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program | Community-Wide | 32,060 | Open | No |
| Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program: Moderate Rehabilitation | Moderate Rehabilitation | 21,337 | Open | No |
| Project-Based Local | Local Project Based | 23,721 | Open | Yes**** |

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

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

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

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe: NA

If Other Wait List Type, please describe: NA

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

**** The East Meadows PBV wait list was opened for all household types

III. Proposed MTW Activities

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

IV. Approved MTW Activities

A. Implemented Activities

FY2011-1e – Preservation and expansion of affordable housing

Statutory Objective: Increase Housing Choices

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2011/FY2011

2. Description: During the 2010-2011 fiscal year, SAHA adopted an Affordable Housing Preservation and Expansion Policy that establishes the principles, goals, priorities, and strategies to preserve and expand the supply of high quality, sustainable, and affordable housing in San Antonio. Under SAHA's broader uses of funds authority, Attachment D, the Agency can use MTW funding for local, non-traditional units providing that the activities meet the requirement of the MTW statute. While SAHA has had the authority to utilize this flexibility since 2011, the Agency did not utilize it for the construction of new units from 2011 to 2013; all development reported under this activity during those years occurred outside the scope of MTW as it used other funding sources including tax-credits, HOME funding, CDBG, and other local and state funding.

In FY2014, SAHA began utilizing this flexibility in combination with a new flexibility to combine Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) funds with the MTW block grant; the Agency executed an RHF amendment and RHF Plan that was approved by HUD in FY2014.

This activity is designed to increase housing choices. It operationalizes the preservation and expansion policies adopted in FY2011, by utilizing the local, non-traditional unit authorization under SAHA's broader uses of funds authority and securing the approval to combine RHF funds into the MTW block grant to construct new affordable units (defined as units reserved for households with income at or below 80% area median income or AMI). While SAHA may develop new communities with market-rate units in addition to affordable units; this activity does not authorize the use of RHF funds for the development of those market-rate units. It is also important to note that SAHA's flexibility to construct and/or preserve new Section 8/9 units are authorized under the single-fund flexibility only and outcomes are reported in the sources and uses section of this report (Section V). The only units authorized under this activity are units reserved for households with income at or below 80% AMI that are non-Section 8/9.

FY2014 Update: In FY2014, the Agency completed the Park at Sutton Oaks, a mixed-income community with 208 units, of which 162 are reserved for households with income at or below 80% AMI and 113 are non-Section 8/9. This community is also Phase I of the Choice Neighborhood Initiative.

FY2015 Update: In FY2015, the Agency completed the Gardens at San Juan Square, a mixed-income community with 252 units, of which 63 units are Section 9 (Public Housing), 31

units are Section 8 (Project-Based Vouchers), and 158 affordable and non-Section 8/9 (Tax-Credit and HOME units). This community is 100% reserved for households with income at or below 80% AMI.

FY2016 Update: The Agency originally planned to add 44 affordable, non-Section 8/9 (Tax-Credit and HOME units) units as part of the Wheatley Choice Neighborhood Initiative Phase 2. While construction started in July 2015, these units are not scheduled to be available until August 2016 at the earliest. These units will be reported in FY2017.

Over the last 3 years, the Agency has replaced a total of 364 substandard public housing units (116 units at San Juan Homes and 248 units at Wheatley Courts) with 460 new units at the Park at Sutton Oaks (208 units) and Gardens at San Juan Square (252 units). Ninety percent of these new units or 414 remain affordable to households with an income at or below 80% AMI. Of the 414 affordable units, 271 are non-Section 8/9.

FY2017 Update: At fiscal year end, SAHA had completed 95% of East Meadows (Choice Phase II, formerly known as Wheatley Courts). The new development is a 9% Low Income Tax Credit project with a total of 215 new units -- 59 market units, 77 tax-credit only units, 71 public housing units layered with tax-credits, and 8 project-based vouchers. As a result, the agency added 77 new affordable units under this activity.

2i. Hardships: This activity is not a rent reform activity; therefore, this MTW reporting element is not required.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: Mixed-finance developments are very challenging to complete in the current funding environment. SAHA has utilized multiple funding sources in the past, including: tax credits, HOME funds, and other state and local funding. Recent changes to the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs' Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP), which administers housing tax-credits, continue to prove challenging for the Agency. Under the recent QAP, opportunity neighborhood parameters are making it difficult to be awarded tax credits for projects located in areas where the Agency is engaged with the community on place-based revitalization. The Agency continues to advocate at the state level for tax-credits in neighborhoods that are the focus of place-based initiatives.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions:

FY2016 Update: The benchmarks for years 3-5 of this activity have been updated to reflect the new construction schedule for the Choice Neighborhood development phases.

FY2017 Update: There were no changes to benchmark or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data on developed units and households from the third-party management company for each new development. The expenditure of MTW funds is tracked through the Agency's JDE system.

HUD Standard metrics

| HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box. | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number). | Benchmark met. |
| | 0 | 610 (5-year) 113 (Year 1) 158 (Year 2) 0 (Year 3) 77 (Year 4) 4 (Year 5) | Year 1: 113 Year 2: 158 Year 3: 0 Year 4: 77 Year 5: (coming in FY18) Cumulative: 352 | |
| HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box. | Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual housing units preserved after implementation of the activity (number). | Benchmark met. |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

FY2011-9 – Allocate set-asides of tenant-based vouchers for households referred by non-profit partners who will provide supportive services to those households

Statutory Objective: Increase Housing Choices

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2011/December 2011

2. Description: SAHA allocates set-asides of tenant-based vouchers for households referred by non-profit partners who commit to provide supportive services. The set-asides are for households with specific priority needs, such as those who are homeless. Current partners are the Center for Health Care Services (CHCS) and San Antonio Metropolitan Ministries (SAMM).

CHCS and SAMM provide a needs assessment of the household in order to qualify and certify them as homeless as defined by HUD. Once the household is determined eligible by CHCS and SAMM, the household is referred by CHCS/SAMM to SAHA and placed on the waiting list. When the household is selected from the SAHA waiting list, SAHA processes all referrals in accordance with HUD guidelines and the SAHA voucher program Administrative Plan. The household is scheduled for an appointment with SAHA staff to determine eligibility. Once the household is determined eligible they complete documents necessary for processing. One requirement of the program is that CHCS and SAMM provide intensive case management for one year to every household participating in the program. CHCS and SAMM provide reports to SAHA on a quarterly basis.

FY2014 Update: Since implementation SAHA has leased up 195 participants of which 31 have terminated the program.

FY2015 Update: Of the 221 set-aside vouchers leased since implementation, 129 remain housed of which 112 have been housed for more than 24 months. An additional 8 households were actively searching for a unit in June 2015 and have not been included in this fiscal year outcomes.

FY2016 Update: At the end of the fiscal year, 117 households were utilizing a set-aside voucher. During the fiscal year, a total of 211 participants have been housed for at least 24 months; 106 have been terminated and 105 remained housed as of the end of FY2016.

FY2017 Update: At the end of the fiscal year, 152 households were utilizing a set-aside voucher and 44% remained housed for at least 2 years.

2i. Hardships: This activity is not a rent reform activity; therefore, this MTW reporting element is not required.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: SAHA continues to work with partners to provide housing to populations facing homelessness.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). | Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number). | Benchmark not met. SAHA continues to request referrals from partners to increase utilization for this program. |
| | 0 | 200 | 152 | |

SAHA Metrics

| Maintain Households Served | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Percentage of households served that continue to be housed after 2 years | 0 | 90% | 44% | Benchmark not met. SAHA continues to request referrals from partners to increase utilization for this program. |

FY2013-2 – Simplified Earned Income Disregard (S-EID)

Statutory Objective: Promote Self-Sufficiency and Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2013/FY2014

2. Description: This activity expands the number of months for which EID (*referred to as earned-income disregard or earned-income disallowance*) is available to participants from 24 months to 60 months, and makes the benefit available continuously during the 60 months, without start/stop. Income is disregarded on a sliding scale based on year of participation:

- During year 1, 100% of earned income is disregarded
- Year 2: 80%
- Year 3: 60%
- Year 4: 40%
- Year 5: 20%

The head, spouse, or co-head of the household qualifies the entire household (formerly only Head of Household could participate). SAHA has completed research on the ability to reconcile various program requirements around escrows and EID for Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) households. Because the program requirements cannot be reconciled, FSS households are no longer eligible for the S-EID. Participation in the Jobs-Plus program remains a requirement for S-EID participants.

FY2013 Update: FY2013 was dedicated to implementing the alternative earned income disregard.

FY2014 Update: The Agency had 80 working households actively receiving the S-EID at the end of the fiscal year.

FY2015 Update: The Agency had 101 working households actively receiving the S-EID at the end of the fiscal year.

FY2016 Update: Starting in FY2016, SAHA required participating households to attend quarterly financial counseling sessions, in order to ensure that families are given all the tools and knowledge necessary to succeed. At the time of the referral, staff schedule an appointment with financial counseling providers such as Family Service Association or the Financial Empowerment Center. Participating households need to attend the counseling sessions within the time to process the change, or within one month of processing.

For participants who are unable to attend an in-person session, online options are provided and monitored by staff.

Jobs-Plus Staff monitor attendance, and follow up with members to ensure they are on track. Should they fail to attend, staff report back to management when a member lapses. A hardship provision allows a grace period for unforeseen circumstances.

The Agency had 140 working households actively receiving the S-EID at the end of the fiscal year. An additional 67 households have started their S-EID, but were not actively working and receiving a disregard at the end of the fiscal year.

The Agency was able to successfully complete all necessary software changes during FY2016. Any new households receiving the S-EID will be tracked in the new programmed system. The current S-EID households will be manually entered into the new programmed system over a 6 month period. This will eliminate errors associated with manual tracking. As a direct result of this software change, the Agency is positioned to be able to better understand how the S-EID is impacting household income stability and respond when residents experience loss of income and employment.

FY2017 Update: The Agency had 196 households on SEID at the end of the fiscal year.

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity during this fiscal year.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies:

FY2013-FY2015 Update: Challenges for this activity, which are consistent with many of SAHA's initiatives, are funding, coordinating with a software vendor, and testing custom programming. SAHA expected custom programming for S-EID to be completed by the software vendor by the fall of 2014; however, this process was delayed due to other programming needs of the vendor taking priority as well as technical issues with the final programming deliverable.

In addition, in FY2015, the Agency saw an increase in error rate for the processing of these household's paperwork. This is likely a result of high staff turnover at the property, manual tracking, and associated training needs. SAHA's Internal Audit team is working with property management to ensure proper processing.

FY2016 Update: The Agency has made considerable progress on resolving software issues and continues to offer additional training to staff on the S-EID calculations and requirements. SAHA's case management team and public housing property management teams are working closely to ensure residents are provided the support and resources to maximize the S-EID incentive.

4. Benchmark/Metric Changes:

FY2016 Update: There were no substantial revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year; however, it is important to note that due to new tracking efforts, the Agency is now able to report on households who have started S-EID but who are not working as of the last day of the

fiscal year. In addition, the average salary for cost estimates were updated with this year's salary cost.

FY2017 Update: There were no substantial changes to benchmark or metrics this fiscal year. Salaries were updated in the metric calculations.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| SS #1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$11,000 | \$12,100 | 139 Working Households:\$17,117.27 196 Total Households: \$12,139.29 | Benchmark met. |
| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual head(s) of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 185 | 131 | Benchmark not met. |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation | Expected percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Actual percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | | | |
| | 0 | 100% | 71% 131 out of 185 work-able Households (Non-Elderly and Non-Disabled Heads/Co-Heads/Spouses) | Benchmark not met. |
| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | 0 | 0 | 3 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase) | 0 | 200 | 196 (139 were actively working at the end of the fiscal year and receiving S-EID, all households are receiving services through Jobs Plus) | Benchmark met. |
| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | Benchmark met. |

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$4,718 (200 HOURS * \$23.59) | \$4,718 (200 HOURS * \$23.59) | \$4,624 (196 HOURS * \$23.59) | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 200 | 200 | 196 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage). | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 13.22 | 10.62 (3% decrease) | SAHA's QC reviews is approximately 10% of all resident files. During the period there were no SEID files selected during the QC process. | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. |
| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$130,284 | \$130,284 | \$253,680 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

SAHA Metrics

| Number of Household Members who take advantage of disregard (average) | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of Household Members who take advantage of disregard (average) | 1 | 1.5 | 1 | Benchmark not met. |

FY2013-4 – HQS Inspection of SAHA-owned non-profits by SAHA inspectors

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2013/FY2013

2. Description: This activity allows SAHA inspectors (instead of third-party contractors) to inspect and perform rent reasonableness assessments for units at properties that are either owned by SAHA under the Agency's non-profit portfolio, Beacon Communities, or owned by a SAHA-affiliate under the Agency's partnerships portfolio. At the time of implementation, SAHA's Inspections Department was equipped to absorb the additional inspections without the need to add additional full-time or part-time equivalent positions. The cost of hiring a third-party contractor was \$76.32 per inspection; while the cost to perform the inspection in-house was only \$20.86 per inspection.

FY2013 Update: SAHA completed 1,758 inspections, saving the Agency over \$97,000.

FY2014 Update: SAHA completed a total of 3,045 inspections, saving the Agency over \$160,000.

FY2015 Update: SAHA completed a total of 3,527 inspections, saving the Agency over \$195,607.

FY2016 Update: SAHA completed a total of 3,505 inspections, saving the Agency \$27,479 for a cumulative savings of \$489,461.

While the number of inspections was similar to prior years, the estimated savings per inspection was adjusted to reflect the new cost estimate of \$35.06 per inspection for SAHA and \$42.90 estimated cost for a third-party.

FY2017 Update: SAHA completed a total of 3,982 inspections, saving the Agency \$31,219 for a cumulative savings of \$520,680.

2i. Hardships: This activity is not a rent reform activity; therefore, this MTW reporting element is not required.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: SAHA will continue to monitor the cost savings to ensure the inspection cost remains below third-party cost levels and the number of inspections continues to be effectively absorbed by current staffing levels.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 3,982 inspections * \$42.90 = \$170,828 | 3,982 inspections * \$35.06 = \$139,609 | 3,982 inspections * \$35.06 = \$139,609 | Benchmark was met. Savings= \$31,219. |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 0 hours | 3,982 inspections x .5 hours = 1,991 hours | 3,982 inspections x .5 hours = 1,991 hours | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

FY2014-2 – Early Engagement (previously referred to as Path to Self-Sufficiency)

Statutory Objective: Promote Self-Sufficiency

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2013/January 2014

2. Description: This activity is designed to increase housing choices by providing training to support successful participation in SAHA's assisted housing programs, and was originally approved as part of the FY2013-2014 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year.

The Early Engagement Program (EEP), is an enhanced orientation for incoming residents that provides training to support successful participation in SAHA's assisted housing programs. All incoming residents are required to attend an EEP orientation as part of the housing process. The premise of EEP is to engage, educate, and proactively link incoming residents to needed services in the community before they are housed.

The Community Development Initiatives (CDI) Department created the concept of Early Engagement as a result of communication from SAHA staff. Staff determined that many of the challenges that current and incoming residents experienced are: new residents are ill-informed on SAHA policies, a high volume of eviction interventions and uncollected rent takes place, a large percentage of delinquencies is common, and crisis situations, such as hoarding and the inability to pay rent and utility bills. This resulted in many residents, who had been on waiting lists for up to seven years, becoming evicted soon after moving into our subsidized housing communities. The EEP curriculum addresses these issues directly to help empower our residents to become informed and responsible renters.

Engage: Orientations are held monthly or /bi-monthly at the Girl Scouts Leadership Center and at Alamo College's Westside Education Training Center. The orientation format was developed to ensure optimal participation and engagement of attendees. Incoming residents are provided a letter with a date for the orientation. At registration, each resident is given a folder with a Self Sufficiency Assessment, punch card, resource material from partners, and a pen and paper for notes. Residents are given a name tag with color dot; dot color determines which group the resident will be a part of during the orientation and which group leader will guide them to all sessions. All residents are provided a light continental breakfast in the morning and snacks during the Resource Fair.

Each orientation begins with a general session that includes a welcome message from SAHA's executive team and a "Recipe for Success" presentation. This session sets the tone for the day and includes a message from SAHA's President and CEO and testimonials from former and current housing residents. Attendees are provided with an overview for the day and are assigned to a small group (<50) that will travel together to five concurrent sessions. Curriculum consists of four topics and a Resource Fair conducted concurrently for 30 minutes.

Educate: Topics for concurrent sessions include: Safety and Security, Financial Literacy, Tenant's Rights, and Housekeeping. Sessions are conducted by presenters from the following partnering community agencies: Safety and Security (SAHA Security), Financial Literacy (City of San Antonio Financial Empowerment Center), Tenant's Rights (St. Mary's School of Law), Housekeeping (City of San Antonio Code Compliance).

Each session follows a curriculum jointly created by SAHA staff and community experts. The goal of each session is to provide attendees with the foundation required to become a "successful renter". At the end of each session, residents complete an evaluation and a copy of the evaluation is given to each presenter.

Proactively link to services: When residents attend the Resource Fair, they are instructed to utilize the punch card that is in their folder and have it punched by a minimum of 10 agencies. Agencies/Partners in attendance at the Resource Fair include those providing the following services: employment, job training, education, child care, voter registration, self-sufficiency programs, financial institutions, etc.

Attendees who attend all sessions, complete a Self Sufficiency Assessment, and submit a completed Resource Fair participation punch card are awarded a Certificate of Completion and are escorted to the final phase of the orientation: obtaining a voucher (for HCV applicants) or list of public housing properties (for Public Housing applicants).

FY2014 Update: The activity was implemented in January 2014. The Agency has seen 1,035 households attend the training and over 20 partner agencies consistently providing outreach and training to SAHA's future residents. A survey found that over 72% of attendees agreed that the Early Engagement sessions provided easy to understand material that was relevant to their lives.

FY2015 Update: The Agency surpassed the benchmark of 480 by serving 1,482 households through the Early Engagement Program. There were a total of 13 early engagement sessions.

FY2016 Update: This fiscal year, the Agency hosted 10 sessions with 20-35 partner agencies participating at each session. A total of 1,587 households completed the Early Engagement Program. Each year since the program has been in place, the Agency has been able to increase the number of households completing the program. Since 2014, a total of 4,104 households have successfully completed the series of courses.

FY2017 Update: This fiscal year, the Agency hosted 10 sessions with 23-36 partner agencies participating at each session. A total of 1,521 households completed the Early Engagement Program. Each year since the program has been in place, the Agency has been able to increase the number of households completing the program. Since 2014, over 5,600 households have successfully completed the series of courses.

2i. Hardships: This activity is not a rent reform activity; therefore, this MTW reporting element is not required.

3. Challenges:

FY2014 Update: In the first year of implementation (FY2013-2014), the largest challenge to implementing an activity that requires all new admissions to attend early engagement sessions lasting 4 hours is managing the logistics. The Agency spent the first two quarters of the first fiscal year working with partners to develop curriculum and secure a venue to accommodate 200 plus attendees.

Also, this activity required changes to the Public Housing and voucher program admissions process. Prior to this activity, Public Housing and the voucher program wait lists were managed separately. As part of a non-MTW cost-efficiency initiative, this fiscal year the Agency moved to a unified application process whereby all households on any wait list (Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher, or other special programs) are screened for eligibility by the Unified Application Center (UAC), a centralized applications department for all SAHA housing programs.

When Early Engagement was implemented in January of 2014, residents who were called off the waiting list were required to attend Early Engagement before their eligibility appointment with the UAC. As a result, many of the attendees at the first several sessions never became residents in SAHA's housing programs due to various eligibility reasons, including but not limited to households being over the income limit when earned income verification was completed or households who were unable to provide supporting documentation for a wait list preference. In order to address this issue and better manage limited resources, the Agency began meeting with households who were called off the waiting list to establish eligibility prior to attending Early Engagement sessions.

FY2015 Update: We have seen a slight increase in negative exits in the Public Housing program and a reduction in negative exits in the Housing Choice Voucher program. Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher program, and the agency's Community Development Initiatives Department will be looking at negative exits and the specific reasons to adjust early engagement programming, as needed.

FY2016 Update: This fiscal year, the Agency continued to surpass benchmarks. As the Early Engagement Program matures, the Agency is exploring ways to enhance curriculum that responds to the top reasons why residents involuntarily exit housing programs.

FY2017 Update: The Agency plans to make adjustments to internal reports that will allow for future reporting to include reporting the percentage of exits that are negative for all households exiting and EEP only households as opposed to monthly averages. This metric will allow the agency to better understand the impact of this activity.

4. Benchmark/Metric Changes: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection:

FY2016 Update: Currently, the Agency counts the number of attendees manually and issues certificates to households completing the Early Engagement sessions. The UAC logs the household's certificate in the file notes in the Elite housing database system when the resident is provided a voucher or unit. This fiscal year, SAHA identified a method to flag these households in the housing database. Staff are currently undertaking the process of flagging past EEP participants. The agency expects to be able to report on the EEP only metrics in FY2017.

FY2017 Update: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). | Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 480 | FY2014: 1,035 FY2015: 1,482 FY2016: 1,587 FY2017: 1,521 | Benchmark met |

SAHA Metrics

| Negative Program Exits (All) (HCV) | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households exiting the housing program for a negative reason (decrease)- report as monthly average | 44 | 40 | 65 | Benchmark not met |
| Negative Program Exits (All) (PH) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households exiting the housing program for a negative reason (decrease)- reported as monthly average | 41 | 37 | 34 | Benchmark not met |
| Negative Program Exits (EEP only) (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households exiting the housing program for a negative reason (decrease)- report as monthly average | TBD | TBD | 4 | TBD |
| Negative Program Exits (EEP only) (PH) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|---|-----|
| Number of households exiting the housing program for a negative reason (decrease)- reported as monthly average | TBD | TBD | 4 | TBD |
|--|-----|-----|---|-----|

FY2014-3 – Faster Implementation of Payment Standard Decreases (HCV)

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Planned Implementation: FY2014/when FMR is reduced and SAHA payment standards are reduced.

2. Description: This activity is designed to reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2013-2014 MTW Plan. The Agency did not use this waiver in FY2017.

Currently, when Fair Market Rent (FMR) is reduced and the payment standard is adjusted accordingly, the reduced payment standard is applied at each participant's second regular reexamination. This activity will allow SAHA to apply the lower payment standards at each participant's next reexamination (Move, Interim and/or Annual reexaminations). If the participant's rent portion increases as a result of applying the new payment standard, SAHA will provide the participant a 30-day notice of rental increase. The per unit cost will be calculated by the total housing assistance payments divided by the total number of units leased each month. The housing assistance payments expense will be obtained from the monthly financial statements and the total units will be obtained from the Unit Month Report.

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity during this fiscal year.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: There were no challenges/potential new solutions for this fiscal year.

4. Benchmark/Metric Changes: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 12,129 Annual Average Households Served (FY2014) multiplied by \$568.43 | 12,129 Annual Average Households Served (FY2014) multiplied by \$537.96 | NA | NA |

FY2014-4 – Biennial Reexaminations (HCV and PH)

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2014/January 2014

2. Description: The FY2011-3 Biennial Reexamination activity was approved and implemented for HCV and PH in FY2011. This activity allowed SAHA to conduct biennial reexaminations instead of regular annual reexaminations for elderly and/or disabled households on a fixed income. Due to the success of this activity at SAHA and other MTW agencies, biennial reexaminations were expanded to include all households in public housing and non-elderly/non-disabled households in HCV (As of FY2014, reexaminations for the elderly/disabled households in HCV are under a triennial schedule as outlined under FY2014-5 in Section IV.B.). For reporting purposes, this activity was closed out in FY2013 and a new activity, FY2014-4 was created.

The FY2014-4 activity allows SAHA to conduct biennial reexaminations for all non-elderly/disabled HCV and all PH participant households (approximately 8,500 households in HCV and 5,900 households in PH). Every household has the option of interim reexamination at any time, if there is a change in household composition, reduction in income, or an increase in expenses. Both departments implemented biennial reexaminations on the new eligible households in January 2014.

For the HCV program, the activity was implemented in January 2014 for households with a reexamination date in May 2014. Half of the eligible households with a May 2014 reexamination date were randomly selected for the biennial schedule. These households were seen by SAHA staff in FY2013 and will not complete their next reexamination until FY2015. All other households were seen by SAHA staff for their regularly scheduled reexaminations in FY2014, at which time they were placed on the biennial schedule. These households will not complete another reexamination until FY2016. This method of randomization continued for each month's scheduled reexaminations until April 2015 when the activity was fully implemented. All new households are placed on the biennial schedule, as they are admitted.

For the PH program, the activity was implemented in January 2014, for all households with a reexamination date in the time period between January 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014. These households were seen by SAHA staff in FY2014 and will not complete their next reexamination until FY2016. Households with a reexamination date that occurred in the time period between July 1, 2013, and December 31, 2013, were put on the biennial schedule at their next reexamination in FY2015. These households will not complete their next reexamination until FY2017.

In order to meet program requirements, FSS participants will maintain an annual reexamination schedule. Participants in other programs that require regular reexaminations will also maintain an annual reexamination schedule.

FY2014 Update: There were 1,666 PH and 4,120 AHP biennial reexaminations completed during year 1 of the two year rolling implementation.

FY2015 Update: There were 3,807 PH and 4,198 AHP biennial reexaminations completed during the final year of the two year rolling implementation.

FY2016 Update: There were 4,003 PH and 3,500 AHP biennial reexaminations completed this fiscal year. The Agency is estimating the cost prior to the implementation of biennials for over 13,000 households in PH and AHP was \$495,815. Based on FY2016 outcomes, the Agency estimates the current cost after full implementation is \$284,963, resulting in an estimated cost savings of \$210,852 this year.

FY2017 Update: There were 5,767 PH and 4,013 AHP biennial reexaminations completed this fiscal year. The agency continues to save by conducting reexaminations on a biennial schedule.

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity this fiscal year.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: There were no challenges/potential new solutions for this fiscal year.

4. Benchmark/Metric Changes: Every year, the savings for CE#1 and CE#2 are realized as a result of the reduction in the number of reexaminations completed. The Agency pulls the current average salary and benefits as of the end of the reporting fiscal year and updates the calculation. This fiscal year, the salary and benefits was \$23.33 for AHP and \$23.59/\$33.83 for PH. As a result, the baselines and benchmarks are updated to reflect the correct calculations based on the number of re-examinations that would have to be completed before the implementation of this activity, the number of re-examinations completed after the implementation of this activity, and the updated salary and benefits. This allows the Agency to compare the true cost savings and time savings.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (PH) | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Cost on reexamination process (decrease) | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | $((6,000 \text{ Biennials} * 2 \text{ hours of staff time}) * 75\% \text{ (for CSS Staff)} * \$23.59) + ((\# \text{ Biennials}$ | $((4,701 \text{ Biennials}/2) * 2 \text{ hours of staff time}) * 75\% \text{ (for}$ | $((5,767 \text{ Biennials} * 2 \text{ hours of staff time}) * 75\% \text{ (for CSS Staff)} * \$23.59) + ((\#$ | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | * 2 hours of staff time) * 25% (for Manager Approval Time) * \$33.83) | CSS Staff) * \$23.59) + ((# Biennials * 2 hours of staff time) * 25% (for Manager Approval Time) * \$33.83) | Biennials * 2 hours of staff time) * 25% (for Manager Approval Time) * \$33.83) | |
| | \$316,380 | \$123,941.87 | \$157,625 | Benchmark met. While the total number of biennials was slightly higher than expected, the agency has met the desired savings benchmark. |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings (PH) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Staff time spent on reexaminations | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 4,701 Biennials * 2 hours of staff time | 4,701 Biennials/2 * 2 hours of staff time | 5,767 Biennials * 2 hours of staff time | |
| | 9,402 hours | 4,701 hours | 6,026 | Benchmark met. While the total number of biennials was slightly higher than expected, the agency has met the desired savings benchmark. |
| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue (PH) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$10,029,168 | \$10,029,168 | \$5,704,680 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #1: Increase in Household Income (PH) | | | | |

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). (Total Households Wage income before exclusions) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$3,001.39 | \$3,001.39 | \$3,807 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (PH) | | | | |
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Number of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected number of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity. | Actual number of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity. | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 1,175 | 733 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Actual percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 22.32% | 24% | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (PH) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 75 | 75 | 26 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency (PH) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 0 | 20 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | | | |

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). |
| | \$23.33 * (8,500 reexams * 1 hour) | \$23.33 * (4,250 reexams * 1 hour) | \$23.33*(4,013 Biennials* 1 hour) | Benchmark met. |
| | \$198,305/yr | \$99,152.5/yr | \$93,623 | |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 8,500 potential biennials multiplied by 1 hour | 4,250 potential biennials multiplied by # 1 hour | 4,013 Biennials multiplied by 1 hour | Benchmark met. |
| | 8,500 hours | 4,250 hours | 4,013 hours | |
| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). (Defined as Total HAP Expense) | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$2,243,429 | \$2,243,429 | \$648,734 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #1: Increase in Household Income(HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected | Average earned income of households affected by this policy | Expected average earned income of | Actual average earned income of households affected | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| by this policy in dollars (increase). | prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars). | |
| | \$6,735 | \$12,140 | \$9,060 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (HCV) | | | | |
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Number of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected number of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity. | Actual number of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity. | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 4,250 * .51 2,168 | 4,250 * .51 2,168 | 2,253 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected percentage of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Actual percentage of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 51% | 51% | 56% | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | (#Biennials multiplied by percent receiving TANF) 4,250 * 2% 84 | (#Biennials multiplied by percent receiving TANF) 4,250 * 2% 84 | 60 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 10 | 19 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

FY2014-5 – Triennial Reexaminations (HCV)

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2014/FY2014 Q3

2. Description: Prior to this activity, HCV Elderly/Disabled households on a 100% fixed income completed biennial reexaminations of their household income and composition. SAHA defines fixed income as Social Security (SS), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and pension. Documentation shows that elderly and disabled participants experience minimal income changes each year; typically, the only change is the result of a cost of living increase from the Social Security Administration (SSA). The inconvenience to the elderly and disabled residents due to these reexaminations may pose a physical burden and result in inefficient use of staff time. This activity allows SAHA to conduct triennial reexaminations for elderly/disabled HCV participant households on a 100% fixed income.

This activity was implemented in January 2014 for households with a reexamination date in May 2014. Every household will have the option of interim reexaminations at any time if there is a change in household composition, reduction in income or an increase in medical expenses.

FY2014 Update: There were 657 triennial reexaminations completed during year 1 of the three year rolling implementation.

FY2015 Update: There were 3,296 triennial reexaminations completed during year 2 of the three year rolling implementation.

FY2016 Update: There were 3,087 triennial reexaminations completed during the final year of the three year rolling implementation. The Agency is estimating the cost prior to the implementation of triennials for 12,000 households was \$253,320. Based on FY2016 outcomes, the Agency estimates the current cost after full implementation is \$65,167; resulting in an estimated cost savings of \$188,153 this year.

FY2017 Update: There were 2,138 triennial reexaminations completed during the fiscal year. The Agency is estimating the cost prior to the implementation of triennials for 12,000 households was \$253,320. Based on FY2017 outcomes, the Agency estimates the current cost after full implementation is \$49,880; resulting in an estimated cost savings of \$203,440 this year (Baseline minus FY2017 Cost).

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: There were no challenges/potential new solutions for this fiscal year.

4. Benchmark/Metric Changes: There were no substantial revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year; however, the benchmark calculations have been updated with the FY2017 average salary and benefits.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite. Annual time studies are completed to estimate the average time spent on processing.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | Baseline average HAS salary (\$23.33) multiplied by 12,000 reexams | Next year's average HAS salary (\$23.33) multiplied by 8,000 reexams | This year's average HAS salary (\$23.33) multiplied by number of reexams | Benchmark met. While the total number of biennials was lower than expected, the agency has met the desired savings benchmark. |
| | \$253,320/yr | \$168,880/yr | \$23.33 * 2,138 Triennials \$49,880 | |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | # triennials multiplied by 1 hour | # triennials multiplied by 1 hour | # triennials multiplied by 1 hour | Benchmark met. While the total number of biennials was lower than expected, the agency has met the desired savings benchmark. |
| | 12,000 per year | 8,000 | 2,138 Triennials multiplied by 1 hour | |
| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue(HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). (Defined as Total HAP Expense) | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$304,222 | \$304,222 | \$454,698 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

FY2014-6 – Rent Simplification (HCV)

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Planned Implementation: FY2014/ July 2015

2. Description: Traditionally, rent calculation is based on 30% of the participant's adjusted monthly income. This activity lowers the percentage used to calculate rent to 27.5% of monthly gross income for all MTW HCV participants and new admissions, and eliminates deductions (i.e., medical and child care) with minimal impact to the participants' rent portion. MTW participants who experience a rent increase of \$26 or more due to the rent simplification calculation will have the household's Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated in accordance with 24 CFR 5.628 (i.e., non-MTW TTP calculation). Participants who are granted a hardship exemption will remain exempt until their rent portion falls below the \$26 threshold. Hardship exemptions under this provision will be verified at each annual and interim reexamination.

FY2015 Update: The implementation of this activity was intentionally delayed while SAHA engaged with HUD and MDRC on a national rent reform study. The agency will be implementing this activity in July 2015. SAHA is 1 of 4 MTW agencies participating in a rent reform study. Households who are not part of the study (approximately 2,000) will follow FY2014-6 rent policies.

FY2016 Update: This activity was implemented in July 2015. A total of 2,679 households were processed during the fiscal year.

FY2017 Update: A total of 5,038 households were processed during the fiscal year. The cost prior to implementation (baseline) is calculated at 1 hour per processed household compared to the cost after implementation at 15 minutes per processed household. Total estimated savings for the year is \$88,152.41.

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: There were no challenges/potential new solutions for this fiscal year.

4. Benchmark/Metric Changes: Baselines and benchmarks for self-sufficiency metrics were set in this fiscal year report. No other significant changes were made to the metrics; however, the benchmark calculations have been updated with the FY2017 average salary and benefits.

5. Data Collection: HCV collects data on the total number of households under this activity in the Elite housing database.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | Average Staff Salary * 1 hours * # of households processed | Average Staff Salary * .25 hours * # of households processed | Average Staff Salary * .25 hours * # of households processed | Benchmark met |
| | \$23.33 * 1 * 5,038 = \$117,536.54 | \$23.33 * .25 * 5,038= \$29,384.14 | \$23.33 * .25 * 5,038= \$29,384.14 | |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 1 hour * # Households on Rent Simplification | .25 hours * # Households on Rent Simplification | .25 hours * # Households on Rent Simplification | Benchmark met |
| | 5,038 | 1,259 | 1,260 | |
| CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage). | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 11% | 5% | 10% | Benchmark not met |
| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). (Defined as Total HAP Expense) | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$704.22 | \$704.22 | \$963.12 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #1: Increase in Household Income(HCV) | | | | |

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$4,168 | \$4,168 | \$5,964.94 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (HCV) | | | | |
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Number of total households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected number of total households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity. | Actual number of total households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity. | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 1,102 | 1,102 | 2,069 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to | Expected percentage of total households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Actual percentage of total households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | | | |
| | 29% | 29% | 41% | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | 47 | 47 | 57 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency (HCV) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| | Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | 0 | 0 | 13 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
|--|--|--|--|--|

FY2015-1 – MDRC / HUD Rent Reform Study

Statutory Objective: Increase housing choices, reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and promote self-sufficiency

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2015/ Started selecting participants in March 2015 for June 2015 Recertifications.

2. Description: San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) has been selected to participate in a study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to evaluate a Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) alternative rent reform policy (the “Study”). MDRC, a nonprofit and nonpartisan education and social policy research organization, is conducting the Study on behalf of HUD. The Study sets forth alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies that will be implemented at several public housing authorities across the country in order to fully test the policies nationally.

The goals of this alternative rent policy are to:

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

A computer generated program will randomly select the participants for the Study from the pool of eligible vouchers. The Study Group vouchers will be managed using the proposed policies. The Control Group vouchers will be managed using the existing policies. Eligible participants in both the Study and Control Groups will include only those with vouchers that are administered under the Moving To Work (MTW) Program and not currently utilizing a biennial certification. Non-MTW Vouchers (i.e., Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing, Moderate Rehabilitation, and Shelter Plus Care), Enhanced Vouchers, and HUD Project Based Vouchers are excluded from the Study. Additionally, the Study is focused on work-able populations and will not include elderly households; disabled households, and households headed by people older than 56 years of age (who will become seniors during the course of the long-term study). Households currently participating in Family Self-sufficiency (FSS) and Homeownership programs will not be included in the Study. Households that contain a mix of members with an immigration status that is eligible for housing assistance and immigration status that is non-eligible for housing assistance would not be included in the Study.

Description of Rent Reform Components

The Study is designed to test an alternative strategy to standard HUD operating rules for the HCV program. The proposed alternative rent policies will include the following six key features:

- i. Simplify income determination and rent calculation of the household's Total Tenant Payment (TTP) and subsidy amount by:
 - a. Eliminating deductions and allowances,
 - b. Changing the percent of income from 30% of adjusted income to a maximum of 28% of gross income,
 - c. Ignoring income from assets when the asset value is less than \$25,000,
 - d. Using retrospective gross income, i.e., 12-month "look-back" period and, in some cases, current/anticipated income in estimating a household's TTP and subsidy, and
 - e. Capping the maximum initial rent burden at 40% of current gross monthly income.
- ii. Conduct triennial income recertification rather than annual recertification with provisions for interim recertification and hardship remedies, if income decreases.
- iii. Streamline interim certifications to eliminate income review for most household composition changes and moves to new units.
- iv. Require the TTP is the greater of 28% gross monthly income (see #1 above) or the minimum rent of \$100. A portion of the TTP will be paid directly to the landlord.
- v. Simplify the policy for determining utility allowances.
- vi. Additionally, the Study will offer appropriate hardship protections to prevent any Study Group member from being unduly impacted as discussed in Section 2i below.

Description of the Rent Reform Activity

1. Simplified Income Determination and Rent Calculation

Under the current HUD regulations, the Total Tenant Payment (TTP) is a calculation derived from the voucher household's 30% adjusted monthly income (gross income less HUD prescribed deductions and allowances). SAHA follows a process of interviewing the household to identify all sources of income and assets, then proceeds to verify the information and perform the final calculation. The process is complex and cumbersome, which increases the risk of errors. According to HUD's Occupancy Handbook, Chapter 5 "Determining Income and Calculating Rent," the most frequent errors found across PHA's are: Voucher holders failing to fully disclose income information; errors in identifying required income exclusions; and incorrect calculations of deductions often resulting from failure to obtain third-party verification. The complexity makes the HCV program less transparent and understandable by the public, landlords, and voucher holders.

2. Elimination of Deductions

SAHA proposes a new method of calculation, which eliminates the calculation of deductions and allowances in the determination of annual income.

- a. Percent Annual Gross Income.

The Total Tenant Payment (TTP) rent calculation will be determined by establishing gross annual income and then determining the greater of 28% of the gross monthly income or the minimum rent of \$100.

b. Elimination of Income from Assets valued less than \$25,000

SAHA will eliminate the verification and calculation of income earned from household assets valued less than \$25,000. Households would not be required to document assets worth less than that amount. This will reduce administrative costs and simplify the program for greater transparency and program compliance.

c. Review of Retrospective Income.

To establish annual gross income for the three year certification period, SAHA will review the total household income without deductions for the twelve-month period prior to recertification, i.e., the “Retrospective Gross Income.” A household’s annual gross income will depend on its *Retrospective Gross Income* during a 12-month “look back” period.

At the certification, if a household’s current/anticipated income is less than its retrospective gross income by more than 10%, a “temporary” TTP based on current income alone will be set for a six-month grace period. After that grace period, the TTP will automatically be switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined average retrospective gross income. No interim recertification interview would be required to reset this TTP.

d. Capping the Initial Maximum Rent Burden

HUD places a rent maximum for households moving into a new unit under the Housing Choice Voucher subsidy. This maximum rent burden is determined to be 40% of the household’s adjusted annual income. However, under the Rent Reform Study the PHA will no longer be adjusting household income using deductions and allowances. The household must not pay more than 40 percent of gross current monthly income for the family share when the family first receives voucher assistance in a particular unit. (This maximum rent burden requirement is not applicable at reexamination if the family stays in place).

3. Triennial Certifications

SAHA currently performs re-certification of HCV households on an annual basis. The annual certification will review program eligibility, household composition, income and other household circumstances. Additional re-examinations (“interim certifications”) may be required for changes in the household situation such as: composition, income, and change in unit.

SAHA proposes performing re-certification of the Study Group every third year (triennial). The triennial certification will review program eligibility, household composition, current income and income over the past twelve months (“retrospective income”), unit information and shall set the Total Tenant Portion (TTP) and the household share of the rent. The TTP for the Study Group will remain in effect during the three year certification period, with some exceptions related to decreases in income and changes in household.

Under the alternative rent policy, a household's annual gross income will be determined using its reported (and verified) *retrospective gross income* during a 12-month "look-back" period. (In this calculation, gross income will exclude any prior income from sources that have expired for the household during that period, such as TANF or Unemployment Insurance benefits, since the household can no longer count on them. It will include imputed welfare income – i.e., any sanctioned portion of a household's TANF grant). SAHA will create a local form to supplement the HUD form 9886 to provide tenant consent for SAHA to collect information relevant to the triennial recertification period.

If the household has an increase in income between certifications, the household's TTP will not be re-determined and increased to reflect the higher income. However, if the household has a decrease in income, the household may request and SAHA may provide an interim re-certification or other remedies under the hardship process (see Section 2i). The interim re-certification will be conducted when a household has a reduction of income of more than 10% from the retrospective gross income.

- a. SAHA interim certification will re-calculate the household TTP based on a new retrospective gross income review to determine the greater of 28% of the retrospective gross income or the minimum rent of \$100. This retrospective gross income will establish the TTP that will remain in effect until the sooner of the next triennial certification or a tenant requested interim certification. The tenant may only request one interim certification per year. The year period during which only one interim is permitted begins on the effective date of the triennial recertification and ends 12 months later.
- b. At the triennial certification at the beginning of the three-year period (and at subsequent triennials) if a household's current/anticipated gross income is less than its retrospective gross income by more than 10%, the current income alone will be used to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period. After that grace period, the TTP will automatically be switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined retrospective gross income. No interim recertification interview would be required to reset this TTP.
- c. At the initial triennial certification only, if a household's childcare expense exceeds \$200 per month, the gross income will be reduced by a deduction of reasonable childcare cost above the \$200 per month, to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period. SAHA defines reasonable childcare costs as less than \$3,000 per year for one child and \$6,000 per year for two children. After that grace period, the TTP will automatically be switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined retrospective gross income. No interim recertification interview would be required to reset this TTP.
- d. The Study Group will be allowed one request per year for an interim certification to reset their TTP. The year period during which only one interim is permitted begins on the effective date of the triennial recertification and ends 12 months

later. The TTP will only be reset if a household's new retrospective monthly income (at the time of the request) is more than 10% lower than its most recent prior retrospective gross monthly income. If the limit on interim certification presents a hardship, the household will need to apply for a Hardship Exemption (See Section 2i below).

4. Streamline Interim Certifications

SAHA will institute a streamlined interim certification process for the Study Group to report change of circumstance that does not require adjustment in subsidy. For these events, SAHA will not request income information. These events include:

- a. Changes to household composition. The Study Group must report both additions and removal of members to the household to SAHA to determine program eligibility and other HUD required reporting (e.g., deceased tenant reporting). However, unless the addition of an adult member changes the voucher bedroom size appropriate for the household composition to prevent overcrowding or over-housing, SAHA will not request income information for the new household member until the next scheduled triennial certification.

If the loss of a household member results in a reduction of more than 10% of the most recent retrospective gross income, the household will be allowed to reset their TTP.

In the event that the new or removed member requires a change to the voucher bedroom size, SAHA will review the retrospective gross income of the newly added or removed household members, apply a new utility allowance, and will reset the household TTP. A reduction in subsidy for new voucher bedroom size will be implemented when the current lease ends and new lease begins.

Changes to household composition will not be counted towards the limit of one requested interim certification per year.

- b. Change of unit. Households seeking to move to a new unit will submit a request for move pursuant to current procedures. For households that move to more expensive units during the three-year period, SAHA will absorb the higher contract rent costs up to the lesser of the gross rent or the payment standard, which is consistent with traditional rent rules. However, unless the request for move is due to a change in household composition, SAHA will not request income information or reset the household TTP until the sooner of the next scheduled triennial certification or tenant requested interim certification to reset TTP. SAHA will apply new utility allowance schedule, if any, to the household at the new lease effective date.
- c. Changes in Utility Allowances. When utility schedules are updated to reflect rate changes, utility allowances, and utility allowance payments (UAPs) will be

adjusted only when HAP subsidies or TTPs are recalculated for other reasons. More specifically, updated utility schedules will be applied when households:

- i. Change their contract rent,
- ii. Recertify and the TTP is recalculated during interim or triennial,
- iii. Move to new units, or
- iv. Change their household composition requiring a change in voucher size.

5. Minimum Rent to Owner

Currently, HUD does not require minimum rents to be paid by the voucher holder to the landlord. SAHA is proposing that Study Group members will be required to make a minimum payment of at least \$100 direct to the HCV landlord in addition to SAHA's portion of rent (Housing Assistance Payment "HAP"). The total amount of rent will equal the contract rent established in the lease. This policy mirrors the market system of tenants paying owners directly and creates a closer relationship and sense of responsibility for both the leaseholder HCV household and the property owner.

The amount of rent to owner the Study Group will pay is equal to their TTP less the Utility Allowance plus any amount over the payment standard for which the tenant may be responsible to pay. The Study Group rent to owner will not be less than the minimum rent. In the event that the Study Group household TTP less the Utility Allowance is less than the minimum rent, the household will pay the Owner the minimum rent and SAHA will reimburse the household the balance of the Utility Allowance. However, if the minimum rent to owner exceeds 40% of the household current/anticipated gross income, the household may request a Hardship Exemption as detailed in Section 2i below.

6. Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule

Currently, SAHA annually reviews and periodically re-establishes a Utility Allowance Schedule which represents the reasonable expectation of costs for utilities as part of the tenant's lease. The utility allowance is based on utility surveys and analysis of the type of structure, bedroom size, appliances provided by tenant, and type of appliances (gas/electric). The simplified schedule is based on the analysis of data collected from SAHA's existing HCV portfolio including the most common structure and utility types. This new utility allowance schedule will be implemented upon the triennial certification or change of unit.

SAHA proposes a simplified schedule to reduce administrative costs and reduce errors associated with the traditional method of applying the Utility Allowance Schedule. The simplified utility allowance schedule is also anticipated to benefit property owners who will have a more accurate understanding of the total gross rent to be applied to their properties and to the Study Group members who will be able to use this new schedule to clarify gross rent in their selection of housing units.

This schedule will be applied to the lesser of: the actual size of the unit or the size of the voucher rather than the larger of the actual unit size or the voucher size. SAHA will

continue to use current market consumption data to determine when adjustments to the simplified schedule are needed (upon change of more than 10% in rates).

Proposed Flat Utility Allowance

| Bedroom Size | Flat Rate |
|--------------|-----------|
| 0 | \$ 75 |
| 1 | \$ 94 |
| 2 | \$124 |
| 3 | \$174 |
| 4 | \$214 |
| 5 | \$277 |
| 6 | \$290 |
| 7 | \$333 |

FY2015 Update: During FY2015, SAHA has worked with HUD and MDRC to lay the groundwork for the implementation of this activity. SAHA has updated the Administrative Plan, updated procedures, trained and prepared the proper staffing of housing specialists and has made modifications to its housing software in order to implement these activities. SAHA has also started to enroll households into the Study and Control Groups.

SAHA anticipates that enrollment will continue for several months into FY2016, through January 2016. This means that many of the metrics will need to be evaluated in the context of a half-year of full implementation.

FY2016 Update: At the end of FY2016, there were a total of 1,660 households enrolled in the MDRC Rent Study (779 in the control group and 881 in the study group). SAHA is still working with the software vendor to develop and test reports that will allow the agency to report on some of the metrics listed below.

FY2017 Update: At the end of FY2017, there were a total of 1,547 households enrolled in the MDRC Rent Study.

While the agency did not achieve the benchmark of zero hours for time spent on processing (CE#2), the outcome is well below the baseline. The Agency considers the outcome acceptable and in line with the intended outcome of reducing the time staff spent on administrative processing.

2i. Hardships: There were a total of 62 hardships received during the fiscal year. At fiscal year-end, 41 had been approved, 20 denied, and 1 was still under review. Most of the hardship requests were the result of loss of income.

Hardship Policy

SAHA is participating in the Study in order to further the national discussion regarding the future of the Housing Choice Voucher Program. The alternative rent strategies are not intended to create an undue burden on the Study Group members. SAHA has established the following Hardship Policy for Study Group members. Households participating in the Study as part of the Control Group will be subject to the current SAHA policies.

A. Hardship Waiver Request Process: The process for requesting a waiver will be as follows:

- 1) A household must initiate a request for a hardship waiver, by completing and submitting a written hardship request to Housing Assistant Specialist.
- 2) The household must supply information and documentation that supports a hardship claim with their written request. For example, a household must provide proof of the following: loss of eligibility for a federal state, or local assistance program; loss of employment or reduction in work hours; or the incapacitation or death of an income-earning household member and amount of lost income.
- 3) If a household claims zero income as part of its hardship request, it must provide a detailed accounting of funds used to cover basic costs of living (food, personal/family care necessities, etc.). This information must be provided every 90 days.
- 4) To request hardship based on the risk of eviction for non-payment of rent or utilities, a household must provide a copy of written 10 day notice from the landlord of non-payment of rent and the landlord's intent to terminate the household's tenancy, or a notice from a utilities company warning of a utilities shut-off. Tenant must promptly deliver the 10 day notice from the Landlord well in advance of a scheduled court date for eviction proceedings.

B. Hardship Waiver Criteria: SAHA may determine a financial hardship exists when the household cannot pay the minimum rent or has an excessive rent burden. Households will be considered for a hardship waiver, as discussed below, if:

- 1) The hardship cannot be remedied by the one interim recertification permitted each year (which cannot reduce a household's TTP below the minimum level).
- 2) The household is at an income level or experiences a loss of income and/or a TTP increase such that its total monthly TTP exceeds 40 percent of its current monthly gross income. The gross income will include imputed income in the same manner as current calculations.
- 3) The household faces risk of eviction for non-payment of rent – including utility shut-offs for non-payment of utility bills that could lead to eviction.
- 4) Other circumstances as determined by the housing agency.

C. Hardship Review Process

- 1) The administrative review of the household circumstances will be conducted by SAHA according to current review processes.
- 2) For hardship claims related to imminent risk of eviction, SAHA will conduct an expedited hearing process.
- 3) Where a hardship request is denied, the household may request an independent review or hearing of its case through the housing agency's normal grievance procedures.
- 4) SAHA will complete all information regarding the request for Hardship and the outcome in the system of record for tracking Hardship requests.

D. Hardship Remedies:

- 1) The Hardship remedies may include any of the following:
 - i. Allowing an additional interim recertification beyond the normal one-per-year option. This could lower household's TTP (but only as low as the \$100 minimum TTP) until the next triennial recertification.
 - ii. Setting the household's TTP at the minimum level for up to 90 days.
 - iii. Setting the household's TTP at 28 percent of current income, for up to 180 days.
 - iv. Offering a "transfer voucher" to support a move to a more affordable unit (including a unit with lower utility expenses).
 - v. A specific time frame for the temporary TTP or minimum rent may be established for longer than 180 days based on specific circumstances. However, the time frame will never go past the triennial recertification date.
 - vi. Any combination of the above remedies.
- 2) During the period when the TTP is reduced, the housing agency will increase its payment to the landlord to cover the portion of the rent previously paid by the tenant directly to the landlord, and it will notify the landlord of the change and the time period of the increased payments.
- 3) In addition to the remedy or remedies offered, the household may be referred to federal, state or local assistance programs to apply for assistance, or to obtain verification that they are ineligible to receive benefits.
- 4) The Hardship remedies are subject to the following limitations:
 - i. The tenant portion of the rent payments will not be suspended prior to a hardship designation.
 - ii. Remedies will not affect any rent attributable to a gross rent that exceeds the applicable payment standard.
 - iii. Opting out of the alternative rent policy is not a remedy option.

E. End of Hardship Waiver Period

- 1) If the hardship continues, the household may submit a request for an extension of the hardship remedy. However, the time frame will never go past the triennial recertification date.
- 2) At the end of the hardship waiver period, the household's regular TTP will be reinstated.

Transition Period

- A. Selection of Participants: Study Participants will be randomly selected from the eligible vouchers through a computer generated random selection program. Eligible vouchers will specifically exclude the following:
- a. Vouchers not currently administered under the Moving to Work Program:
 - i. Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)
 - ii. Moderate Rehabilitation
 - iii. Shelter Plus Care
 - b. Enhanced Vouchers
 - c. HUD Project Based Vouchers
 - d. Vouchers administered under portability
 - e. Elderly households: Head of Household, co-head, spouse or single member households 62 years or older pursuant to the Administrative Plan

- f. Households headed by people older than 56 years of age (who will become seniors during the course of the long-term study).
 - g. Disabled households: Head of Household, co-head, spouse or single member households with disability as defined in the Administrative Plan
 - h. Households currently participating in the Family Self-sufficiency Program
 - i. Households participating in the Homeownership Program
 - j. Households that contain a mix of eligible and non-eligible household members would not be included in the Study
- B. Enrollment of Study Group members
- a. Prior to Certification Meeting: Selected Study Group members will receive special information with their recertification package to introduce them to the rent reform policies and to answer household questions. SAHA will conduct the triennial certification at the time otherwise scheduled for the household annual certification.
 - b. During Certification Meeting: At the initial triennial certification, the household will have the changes in rent reform policies explained to them. They will be provided with a gift card as a nominal thank you for providing filling out a base information form. Changes in the household share, TTP, utility schedule allowance will be provided to the household with no less than 30 days' notice.
 - c. Mitigation of impact at initial triennial certification: A "grace period" of six months will be provided to mitigate the impact of the transition for the following two cases:
 - i. At the triennial certification at the beginning of the three-year period (and at subsequent triennials), if a household's current/anticipated income is less than its retrospective income by more than 10%, the current income alone will be used to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period.
 - ii. At the initial triennial certification only, if a household's childcare expense is above \$200 per month, the gross income will be reduced by a deduction of reasonable childcare cost above the \$200 to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period.
 - iii. After that grace period, the TTP will automatically be switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined average prior income. No interim recertification interview would be required to reset this TTP.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: While SAHA has experienced some expected administrative challenges related to the implementation of this rent reform study, the Housing Choice Voucher program continues to work closely with HUD and MDRC to develop and implement policies, procedures, and training.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: Staff wages will be updated every year when the Agency reports outcomes.

FY2017 Update: Calculated cost savings outcomes are using \$23.33 salary and the actual number of annuals, interims, etc completed.

5. Data Collection:

FY2016 Update: SAHA is currently working with a software vendor to develop and test standard reports that will allow the Agency to report on the metrics listed below. Data will be collected from the Elite housing database and surveys conducted by MDRC.

FY2017 Update: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total cost of task in dollars. | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Cost per Annual Certification | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$12,657.50</u> <u>YEAR 2: \$12,657.50</u> <u>YEAR 3: \$12,657.50</u> <u>OVERALL: \$37,972.50</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time to calculate annual certification: 830 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$5,947.50</u> <u>YEAR 2: \$0</u> <u>YEAR 3: \$0</u> <u>OVERALL: \$5,947.50</u> Savings: \$32,025.00</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time to calculate annual recertification: 390 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$13,667</u> (1,660 annuals) <u>YEAR 2: \$1,929</u> (212 annuals)</p> | Benchmark met |
| Cost per Interim Certification | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$6,328.75</u> <u>YEAR 2: \$6,328.75</u> <u>YEAR 3: \$6,328.75</u> <u>OVERALL: \$18,986.25</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time to calculate interim certification: 415 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$2,973.75</u> <u>YEAR 2: \$2,973.75</u> <u>YEAR 3: \$2,973.75</u> <u>OVERALL: \$8,921.25</u> Savings: \$10,065.00</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time to calculate interim recertification: 195 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$0</u> (0 interims) <u>YEAR 2: \$1,436</u> (324 interims)</p> | Benchmark met |
| Cost of Rent Calculation | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$5,032.50</u> <u>YEAR 2: \$5,032.50</u> <u>YEAR 3: \$5,032.50</u> <u>OVERALL: \$15,097.50</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time to calculate rent: 330 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$1,982.50</u> <u>YEAR 2: \$0</u> <u>YEAR 3: \$0</u> <u>OVERALL: \$1,982.50</u> Savings: \$13,115</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time to calculate rent: 130 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$4,556</u> (1,660 calculations) <u>YEAR 2: \$1,626</u> (536 calculations)</p> | Benchmark met |

| Cost to Determine Income from Assets | <p><u>YEAR 1:\$19.29</u> <u>YEAR 2:\$19.29</u> <u>YEAR 3:\$19.29</u> <u>OVERALL: \$57.87</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time to determine Income from Assets: 1.27 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1:\$2.52</u> <u>YEAR 2:\$0</u> <u>YEAR 3: \$0</u> <u>OVERALL:\$2.52</u> Savings: \$55.36</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time to determine Income from Assets: 0.17 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$3,154</u> (1,660 determinations) <u>YEAR 2: \$1,125</u> (536 determinations)</p> | Benchmark met |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Cost to Determine utility allowance | <p><u>YEAR 1:\$2,952.50</u> <u>YEAR 2:\$2,952.50</u> <u>YEAR 3:\$2,952.50</u> <u>OVERALL: \$7,777.50</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time to determine Utility Allowance: 170 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1:\$1,372.50</u> <u>YEAR 2:\$0</u> <u>YEAR 3:\$0</u> <u>OVERALL:\$1,372.50</u> Savings: \$6,405</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time to determine Utility Allowance: 90 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 | <p><u>YEAR 1: \$11,564</u> (1,660 determinations) <u>YEAR 2: \$4,127</u> (536 determinations)</p> | Benchmark met |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Time to Complete Annual Certification | <p><u>YEAR 1: 830 hours</u> <u>YEAR 2: 830</u> <u>YEAR 3: 830</u> <u>OVERALL:2,490 hours</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Complete Annual Certification (not including 0.66 hours of preparation): 0.83 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 | <p><u>YEAR 1:390 hours</u> <u>YEAR 2: 0</u> <u>YEAR 3:0</u> <u>OVERALL:390 hours</u> Savings: 2,100 hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Complete Annual Certification (not including 0.66 hours of preparation): 0.39 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 | <p><u>YEAR 1: 647</u> (1,660 annuals) <u>YEAR 2: 83</u> (212 annuals)</p> | Benchmark not met |
| Time To Determine Tenant Rent | <p><u>YEAR 1: 330</u> <u>YEAR 2: 330</u> <u>YEAR 3: 330</u> <u>OVERALL: 990</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Tenant Rent: 0.33 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 | <p><u>YEAR 1: 130</u> <u>YEAR 2: 0</u> <u>YEAR 3: 0</u> <u>OVERALL: 130</u> Savings: 860</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Tenant Rent: 0.13 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 | <p><u>YEAR 1: 0</u> <u>YEAR 2: 70</u> (536 determinations)</p> | Benchmark not met |
| Time to Determine Utility Allowance | <p><u>YEAR 1:170 hours</u> <u>YEAR 2:170</u> <u>YEAR 3:170</u></p> | <p><u>YEAR 1:90 hours</u> <u>YEAR 2:0</u> <u>YEAR 3:0</u> <u>OVERALL:90</u></p> | <p><u>YEAR 1: 149</u> (1,660 determinations) <u>YEAR 2: 48</u> (536 determinations)</p> | Benchmark not met |

| | OVERALL: 510 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Utility Allowance: 0.17 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 | Savings: 420 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Utility Allowance: 0.09 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Time to Determine Income from Assets | YEAR 1: 1.27 hours YEAR 2: 1.27 YEAR 3: 1.27 OVERALL: 3.8 hours <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Income from Assets: 0.33 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 times the estimated proportion of affected participants: 0.0038 (0.38%) | YEAR 1: 0.17 hours YEAR 2: 0 YEAR 3: 0 OVERALL: 0.17 hours Savings: 3.63 hours <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Income from Assets: 0.33 hours times the number of study participants: 1,000 times the estimated proportion of affected participants: 0.0005 (0.05%) | YEAR 1: 548 (1,660 determinations) YEAR 2: 177 (536 determinations) | Benchmark not met |
| CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Average Error Rate in Determining TTP | 18% | 15% | 1% | Benchmark met |
| Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance | 2% | 2% | 0% | Benchmark met |
| SS #1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Average Earned Income of Study Group | \$7,704.87 | \$7,704.87 | \$7,704.87 | Benchmark met |
| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full- Time (2) Employed Part- Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other | Head(s) of households in in the categories identified below prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual head(s) of households in in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | Percentage of total work-able households in the categories identified below prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected percentage of total work-able households in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (percent). | Actual percentage of total work-able households in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (percent). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Study Group Employment Status for (1) Employed Full- Time: (2) Employed Part- Time: (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: (5) Unemployed: (6) Other:with any wages | (1) Employed FT: 211 or 26% (2) Employed PT: 160 or 20% (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: TBD (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: TBD (5) Unemployed: 241 or 30% (6) Other: 558 or 70% | (1) Employed FT: 211 or 26% (2) Employed PT: 160 or 20% (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: TBD (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: TBD (5) Unemployed: 241 or 30% (6) Other: 558 or 70% (7) | (1)Employed FT: 211 or 26% (2)Employed PT: 160 or 20% (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: TBD (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: TBD (5) Unemployed: 241 or 30% (6) Other: 558 or 70% | Benchmark met |
| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Study Group Households Receiving TANF Benefits | 17 | 17 | 17 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-sufficiency

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase). | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Study Group Households Receiving Self-sufficiency Services | 15 | 15 | 15 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease). | Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Average HCV Subsidy for Study Group | \$637.59 | \$637.59 | \$637.59 | Benchmark met |
| SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase). | PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Total HCV Tenant Share for Study Group | \$234.08 | \$234.08 | \$234.08 | Benchmark met |
| HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of | Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the | Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after | Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | activity (number). This number may be zero. | implementation of the activity (number). | opportunity after implementation of the activity (number). | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | 0 | 0 | 0 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

FY2015-2 – Elderly Admissions Preference at Select Public Housing Sites

Statutory Objective: Increase Housing Choices

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2015/FY2015

2. Description: This activity is designed to meet the statutory objective of increasing housing choices for low-income families and was originally approved as part of the FY2014-2015 MTW Plan. This activity establishes a 4-to-1 elderly admissions preference at specific communities in order to increase housing choices for elderly households.

The goal of the activity is to address continuing concerns of elderly residents at specific communities regarding lifestyle conflicts between elderly and non-elderly residents. Property Management's ability to address these conflicts is reduced significantly when the ratio of non-elderly to elderly residents rises above a certain proportion. The 4-to-1 admissions preference is proposed in order to create and maintain an optimal mix of elderly and non-elderly residents in each community.

The idea of an optimal mix is based on research of the reaction to a 1995 Massachusetts law that attempted to limit the percentage of non-elderly disabled tenants living in state-funded elderly housing. In 2002, the Massachusetts Office of Legislative Research provided an update on the success of the 1995 law, which had established optimal proportions of 86.5% elderly and 13.5% non-elderly residents. Housing officials reported that the law had been largely successful in:

- reducing the number of problems that arise from these mixed populations sharing the same housing;
- slowing what had been a sharply increasing rate of non-elderly disabled households moving in; and
- reducing the relatively high percentage of non-elderly disabled tenants in certain projects.

Housing advocates, however, suggested that the optimal proportion should be 80% elderly and 20% non-elderly residents. This MTW activity, FY2015-2, adopts that suggested 80/20 ratio ("4-to-1") both for its admissions preference as well as for its ultimate unit mix. In doing so, SAHA is applying the same admissions preference that is in effect at the Atlanta Housing Authority, and for the same purpose: to create and maintain a balanced population of elderly and non-elderly disabled residents at each community. In Atlanta's MTW Plans and Reports, the activity is referred to as the "4-to-1 Elderly Admissions Preference".

In practical terms, this activity allows the admission of four elderly applicants from the waiting list before admitting a non-elderly applicant, until such time as an optimal mix of elderly and non-elderly disabled residents is reached for the community. No residents will be required to relocate in order to meet these targets. The agency is not establishing a date by which to

achieve the 80/20 target, and will rely solely on the normal resident turnover process to gradually transition the population balance.

The first communities at which this policy is applied are Fair Avenue and WC White. The following section describes how the activity works at each community.

Fair Avenue

The total number of units at Fair Avenue is 216, making 173 the 80% target for elderly households. Prior to implementation, Fair Avenue was home to 110 elderly (62 and over) households. So Fair Avenue needs to add 63 elderly households to meet the 80% target. The turnover rate for Fair Avenue in FY2014 was 19.9% (3.5 units per month), or 43 units over the course of the year.

Assuming turnover rate would remain the same for FY2015, SAHA expected those 43 available units to be offered to 35 elderly households and 8 non-elderly disabled households. Specifically, the first four available units would be offered to elderly households, and the fifth available unit would then be offered to a non-elderly disabled household. The sixth through ninth units would be offered to elderly households, and the tenth to a non-elderly disabled household. That sequence, repeated through the year in 8 full cycles and 1 partial cycle, is represented in the following table, where “E” represents Elderly Household and “NE” represents Non-elderly Disabled Household.

| Fair Avenue: Admissions cycle and estimated time frame based on turnover rate of 3.5 units per month | E | E | E | E | NE |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 (Jul – Aug) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 (Aug-Sep) | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 (Sep-Oct) | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 4 (Nov-Dec) | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 5 (Dec-Jan) | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| 6 (Jan-Feb) | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |
| 7 (Mar-Apr) | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 |
| 8 (Apr-May) | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 |
| 9 (May-Jun) | 41 | 42 | 43 | | |
| Total admissions at the end of the plan year | 35 | | | | 8 |

Assuming that turnover is proportionally distributed between elderly and non-elderly units, SAHA expected the number of elderly households at Fair Avenue to increase to 123 by the end of FY2015.

| Household Type | Current number of units | Number made available due to turnover (subtract) | Number offered based on admissions preference (add) | Net change | Total number at end of FY2015 |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--|---|------------|-------------------------------|
| Non-Elderly Disabled | 106 | -21 | +8 | -13 | 93 |
| Elderly | 110 | -22 | +35 | +13 | 123 |

At the net rate of 13 units per year, Fair Avenue is expected to reach the goal of adding 63 elderly households in 4 to 5 years.

The variable that SAHA knows the least about today is how turnover will be distributed between elderly and non-elderly households. This calculation assumes that turnover is proportionally distributed between the household types. As the year progresses and actual data comes in, this assumption can be corrected with a better projection.

WC White

The total number of units at WC White is 75, making 60 the 80% target for elderly households. Prior to implementation, WC White was home to 38 elderly (62 and over) households. So the community needs to add 22 elderly households to meet the 80% target. The turnover rate for WC White in FY2014 was 25.33% (1.6 units per month), or 19 units over the course of the year.

Assuming turnover remained the same for FY2015, SAHA expected those 19 available units to be offered to 16 elderly households and 3 non-elderly disabled households. Specifically, the first four available units would be offered to elderly households, and the fifth available unit would then be offered to a non-elderly disabled household. The sixth through ninth units would be offered to elderly households, and the tenth to a non-elderly disabled household. That sequence, repeated through the year in 3 full cycles and 1 partial cycle, is represented in the following table, where “E” represents Elderly Household and “NE” represents Non-elderly Disabled Household.

| WC White: Admissions cycle and estimated time frame based on turnover rate of 1.6 units per month | E | E | E | E | NE |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 (Jul – Sep) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 (Oct-Dec) | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 (Jan-Apr) | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 4 (Apr-Jun) | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | |
| Total admissions at the end of the plan year | 16 | | | | 3 |

Assuming that turnover is proportionally distributed between elderly and non-elderly units, SAHA expected the number of elderly households at WC White to increase to 44 by the end of FY2015.

| Household Type | Current number of units | Number made available due to turnover (subtract) | Number offered based on admissions preference (add) | Net change | Total number at end of FY2015 |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--|---|------------|-------------------------------|
| Non-Elderly Disabled | 37 | -9 | +3 | -6 | 31 |
| Elderly | 38 | -10 | +16 | +6 | 44 |

At the net rate of 6 units per year, Fair Avenue will reach the goal of adding 22 elderly households in 3 to 4 years.

The variable that SAHA knows the least about today is how turnover will be distributed between elderly and non-elderly households. This calculation assumes that turnover is proportionally distributed between the household types. As the year progresses and actual data comes in, this assumption can be corrected with a better projection.

FY2015 Update: There were no changes to this activity during the fiscal year.

FY2016 Update: There were no changes to this activity during this fiscal year.

FY2017 Update: With these two properties having an 80/20 mix, the Agency have seen a drop in neighbor disputes and crime.

2i. Hardships: This activity is not a rent reform activity; therefore, this MTW reporting element is not required.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: This activity did not begin implementation until November 1, 2014. The Agency's priority up to that time was increasing occupancy across the Public Housing portfolio. Since November, the Agency has actually seen a very low rate of elderly household applicants at all properties. As a result, staff have been challenged with trying to implement the activity while maintaining a high occupancy at Fair and WC White.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). Units occupied by elderly family | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Total number of housing units made available for elderly households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). | 148 units occupied by elderly family | 186 units occupied by elderly family/ 38 additional units occupied by elderly family (186 minus 148) | 200 units occupied by elderly family/ 52 additional units occupied by elderly family (200 minus 148) | Benchmark met. |
| At Fair Avenue, number of housing units made available for elderly households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). | 110 units occupied by elderly family | 136 units occupied by elderly family/ 26 additional units occupied by elderly family (136 minus 110) | 156 units occupied by elderly family/ 46 additional units occupied by elderly family (156 minus 110) | Benchmark met. |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| At WC White, number of housing units made available for elderly households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). | 38 units occupied by elderly family | 50 units occupied by elderly family/ 12 additional units occupied by elderly family (50 minus 38) | 44 units occupied by elderly family/ 6 additional units occupied by elderly family (44 minus 38) | Benchmark not met. |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|

SAHA Metrics

| <i>Elderly Household Percentage</i> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Percentage of units occupied by elderly households | Percentage of units occupied by elderly households prior to implementation of the activity | Expected percentage of units occupied by elderly households after implementation of the activity | Actual percentage of units occupied by elderly households after implementation of the activity | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| Total | 148 of 291 total units (51%) | 186 of 291 total units (64%) | 200 out of 291 total units (69%) | Benchmark met. |
| Fair Avenue | 110 of 216 total units (51%) | 136 of 216 total units (63%) | 156 out of 216 total units (72%) | Benchmark met. |
| WC White | 38 of 75 total units (51%) | 50 of 75 total units (67%) | 44 of 75 total units (59%) | Benchmark not met. |

FY2015-3 – Modified Project Based Vouchers

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness and increase housing choices

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2015/FY2015

2. Description: First, this activity allows SAHA to commit vouchers to developments in SAHA's new and existing properties. The vouchers increase the number of units that are affordable to households based on their actual ability to pay. For example, a tax credit rent affordable to a 30% AMI household will be affordable to a 4-person household earning \$17,640 or more. However, many households earn much less than that, and a 4-person household earning \$10,000 (typical for SAHA-assisted households) is not able to afford a tax credit rent affordable to a 30% AMI household. SAHA may commit vouchers to San Juan Homes III, East Meadows (formerly Wheatley Courts), Victoria Commons, or any other SAHA-owned or SAHA-controlled development. This activity applies only to commitment of vouchers to SAHA-owned or controlled units. Any commitment of vouchers to privately-owned developments will be made through a competitive process outside the scope of this activity.

Secondly, this activity also increases cost effectiveness by removing the automatic provision of a tenant-based voucher to a household who wishes to relocate from a unit associated with a local project based set aside voucher. This stabilizes overall occupancy at the communities where vouchers are committed.

FY2015 Update: There are no updates for this fiscal year.

FY2016 Update: This activity is dependent on the development timelines for various new construction projects. As planned, SAHA did not project-base any new housing choice vouchers in FY2016. SAHA continues to meet benchmarks for this activity; indicating that the modified PBVs are providing affordable housing based on the household's actual ability to pay.

FY2017 Update: This fiscal year, SAHA committed 8 project-based vouchers at East Meadows Phase I.

2i. Hardships: This activity is not a rent reform activity; therefore, this MTW reporting element is not required.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies:

FY2015 Update: The project-based Section 8 housing program experienced specific leasing issues at the new Gardens at San Juan Square. As mentioned above in section II.B. Leasing Information, the issues were a result of differences in policies and processes between the housing authority and traditional housing programs and the third-party management and the multi-financing requirements. In addition to the challenges mentioned above for Public Housing, the clients in the voucher program experienced confusion as to the project-based nature of the

voucher. Many clients tried to use the voucher at other locations. The voucher program was able to mitigate these issues by conducting joint appointments with the third-party management staff, identifying on the voucher with a sticker and note that the voucher could only be used at the Gardens at San Juan Square, and conducting larger pulls off of the waiting list to ensure there were enough eligible applicants.

In the FY2015 MTW Plan, metrics for Wheatley Courts and Victoria Commons Chavez Multifamily were included in this activity. Due to changing development timelines, the modified Project-Based Vouchers (PBVs) could not be committed. It is anticipated that those properties could be reconsidered for this activity for FY2017 or beyond.

FY2016 Update: While there are no additional challenges related to this activity, the activity is connected to FY2011-1e and assumes the challenges noted under FY2011-1e.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite.

HUD Standard Metrics

| HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box. Project-Based Vouchers | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| # of additional units made affordable to households based on their actual ability to pay (at or below 80% AMI) East Meadows Phase I (units at or below 60% AMI) | 0 | 8 | 8 | Benchmark met |
| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| East Meadows Phase I | # of units * average per unit cost (PUC) * 12 months 8 * \$563.38 * 12 = \$54,084.48 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | Benchmark met |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| East Meadows Phase I | # of recertifications after 2 years (due to new biennial recertification schedule) * average staff time per recertification (in hours) 8 * 1.5 = 12 hours | 0 hours | 0 hours | Benchmark met |

SAHA Metrics

| Median household income | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Median income of households living in local project based set-aside voucher units, by income bracket | <i>Metrics listed by community below.</i> | | | |
| 80% AMI | 80% AMI | 75% AMI | NA | NA – There were no 60% AMI occupants at end of FY15 |
| 60% AMI | 60% AMI | 55% AMI | NA | NA – There were no 60% AMI occupants at end of FY15 |
| 50% AMI | 50% AMI | 45% AMI | 35% AMI | Benchmark met |
| 30% AMI | 30% AMI | 25% AMI | 8% AMI | Benchmark met |

FY2015-4 – Simplified Utility Allowance

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2015/ January 2014 for vouchers issued and May 2014 reexaminations.

2. Description: Traditionally, SAHA annually reviews and periodically re-establishes a Utility Allowance Schedule which represents reasonable utility cost expectations as part of a tenant's lease. The Utility Allowance Schedule is based on utility surveys and analysis of the type of structure, bedroom size, appliances provided by tenant, and type of appliances (gas/electric).

This activity establishes a new, simplified schedule that is based on the analysis of data collected from SAHA's existing HCV portfolio including the most common structure and utility types. The simplified schedule reduces administrative costs associated with the traditional method of applying a Utility Allowance Schedule. Specifically, the activity will allow the HCV department to be more cost effective by reducing staff time spent on calculating multiple utility schedules for 6 different structure types plus various utility types such as gas, electric or propane.

Note that this activity applies only to HCV participants that are not part of FY2015-1 MDRC/HUD Rent Study. If a household is selected to participate in the control or treatment group of the Rent Study, they will be subject only to FY2015-1, and not this activity FY2015-4.

The simplified utility allowance schedule is also anticipated to benefit property owners, who will have a more accurate understanding of the total gross rent to be applied to their properties, and to benefit participants, who will be able to use this new schedule to clarify gross rent in their selection of housing units.

The new utility allowance schedule is implemented at the time of recertification, interim or change of unit. The schedule will be applied to the lesser of these two options:

- the actual size of the unit, or
- the size of the voucher.

SAHA will continue to use current market consumption data to determine when adjustments to the simplified schedule are needed (upon change of more than 10% in rates).

FY2015 Update: This fiscal year, SAHA has 1,094 participants under the flat Utility Allowance (UA) schedule. The following participants were removed:

- All special programs participants
- All participants whose UA does not equal flat UA amounts
- All participants who UA equals flat UA amounts but were processed prior to the January 1, 2015 implementation

- All participants who UA equals flat UA amount but move in date was prior to effective date

FY2016 Update: This fiscal year, SAHA had 3,909 participants under the flat Utility Allowance (UA) schedule.

FY2017 Update: This fiscal year, SAHA processed 4,533 participants under the flat Utility Allowance (UA) schedule.

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity this fiscal year.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: Implementation was delayed until January 2015 due to required software updates. There have been no other challenges/potential new strategies associated with this activity.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: Every year, the savings for CE#1 and CE#2 are realized as a result of the per unit processing time and cost. In addition, the Agency pulls the current average salary and benefits as of the end of the reporting fiscal year and updates the calculation. This fiscal year, the salary and benefits was \$23.33. As a result, the baselines and benchmarks are updated to reflect the correct calculations based on the number of households served and the updated salary and benefits. This allows the Agency to compare the true cost savings and time savings.

5. Data Collection: SAHA continues to track this activity using Elite housing database and an internal QC database.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Cost Savings | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0.17 hours multiplied by 4,533 households = 770.61 hours multiplied by average staff cost \$23.33 | 0.09 hours multiplied by 4,533 households = 407.97 hours multiplied by average staff cost \$23.33 | 0.09 hours multiplied by 4,533 households = 407.97 hours multiplied by average staff cost \$23.33 | Benchmark met. Agency saved \$8,460 on the 4,533 households. |
| | \$17,978.33 | \$9,517.94 | \$9,517.94 | |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease) | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| | 0.17 hours times 4,533 households | 0.09 hours times 4,533 households | 0.09 hours times 4,533 households | Benchmark met. The Agency saved 363 staff hours |
| | 770.61 hours | 407.97 hours | 407.97 hours | |
| CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage). | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | Utility Allowance Error Rate = 2% | Utility Allowance Error Rate = 2% | Utility Allowance Error Rate = 2% | Benchmark met |
| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$1,060,429 | \$1,060,429 | \$1,060,429 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

FY2016-2 – Biennial and Triennial Notification of Rent Type Option

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Implemented:

2. Description: This activity is proposed to increase cost effectiveness, through a more efficient coordination of communication with residents.

PHAs are typically obligated to periodically (once a year) inform Public Housing Residents that they have an option of paying income-based rent or a flat rent. The PHA must give each family the opportunity to choose between the two methods for determining the amount of tenant rent payable monthly by the family.

As more residents move to biennial and triennial reexamination schedules, however, the number of staff interactions with residents decreases. It becomes more efficient to coordinate communication and notification requirements during a single visit, and notify residents of their option in accordance with their new schedules.

A resident may still choose a different rent type at any time, independent of the notification.

FY2016 Update: There were no updates associated with this activity for this fiscal year.

FY2017 Update: There were no updates associated with this activity for this fiscal year.

2i. Hardships: This activity is not a rent reform activity; therefore, this MTW reporting element is not required.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: There were no challenges/potential new solutions for this fiscal year.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite. A paper copy of the rent choice notification, signed by the resident, is kept in each family's file folder.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Staff time (\$26.44 * 7 = \$185.08) plus material costs of \$2863 = \$3,048 | Staff time (\$26.44 * 3.5 = \$92.54) plus 50% of material costs (\$1431) = \$1,524 | \$1,524 | Benchmark met |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 7 hours | 3.5 hours | 3.5 hours | Benchmark met |

FY2017-1 – Time Limited Working Referral Program

Statutory Objective: Promote Self-Sufficiency

1. Approved/Implemented: FY2017- December 2016/FY2017

2. Description: This activity is designed to achieve the MTW statutory objective to give incentives that promote self-sufficiency, by providing working households in need of short-term housing assistance an opportunity to quickly access public housing units. This activity seeks to provide targeted assistance to a subset of households that 1) are working, and 2) would benefit from a period of increased housing stability to complete education/training, increase savings, or accomplish another self-sufficiency goal. These households will benefit from accelerated access to housing units, and, due to the time limit on the housing assistance, will transition out within 5 years. By focusing on households that have already started on the path to self-sufficiency, this activity should accelerate the number of households that actually transition to self-sufficiency during the period they receive housing assistance.

1. Overview

This activity provides time-limited public housing assistance to working households referred to SAHA by Workforce Solutions Alamo (WSA). Households referred to SAHA by WSA will receive five years of public housing assistance. If, at the end of five years, a hardship exists, two additional years of assistance are made available.

Upon starting housing assistance, participating households are required to enroll and participate in a SAHA self-sufficiency program such as Jobs-Plus or FSS.

Households will typically use the conventional public housing rent structure and biennial recertification schedule (per MTW Activity FY2014-4). However, both structure and schedule will be affected by the requirements of the self-sufficiency program selected by the household. For example, those enrolled in FSS will make use of an escrow account. Those in Jobs-Plus will have the option to establish an Earned Income Disregard (EID). For households living in Cassiano, the new Cassiano Jobs-Plus program will require an EID.

The total number of households to be served under this activity is currently capped at 200, and will be pulled in at a rate of 25 per quarter. Over 20,000 households are currently on the public housing waitlist. The 200 time-limited households represent 1% of that waitlist. As a result, providing these households with housing assistance will have a very limited impact on other households currently on the waitlist, especially at the draw rate of 25 per quarter. Additionally, it is expected that the time-limited units will turn over faster than standard units, creating more housing opportunities in the long run.

However, SAHA is taking steps to minimize any short-term negative impacts to non-participants. SAHA will reach out to households currently in waitlist pools whose applications indicate that they are working to notify them of the opportunity provided by this new program. Also,

properties with extremely long wait times are being made unavailable to time-limited households, in order to not extend the already long wait times even longer.

2. Previous Pilot

Previously, a pilot project (MTW Activity FY2013-1) was approved as part of the FY2013 MTW Plan. The pilot ended in FY2016. FY2013-1 is now closed out and is replaced with this activity, FY2017-1. This activity builds on the lessons learned from the pilot. Some of those lessons included:

- The pilot activity relied on applicants self-identifying as working households during the application process. A wait list preference was provided to these applicants. However, many applicants that selected the working household preference were in fact not actually working. As a result, staff and applicants spent valuable time in initial meetings that did not result in successful placements. This new activity addresses this challenge by removing the preference. In its place, households will be eligible for a time-limited unit if they are referred by a partner workforce agency.
- Pilot households were required to participate in FSS or similar self-sufficiency activity, but did not always do so. Staff identified a number of factors, including: lack of clear communication and immediate follow up on the requirement, pilot households living in elderly communities (where there are no FSS or Jobs-Plus staff), and the novelty of the requirement (for both staff and applicants). The new activity addresses these factors by partnering closely with workforce partners who will assist in communication, as well as increased understanding of what training areas need to be emphasized.

Activity elements that remain consistent with the pilot include:

- Working households who participate in this activity will receive five years of housing assistance, with a two-year extension if needed based on hardship.
- Hardship policies mirror FSS practices and policies: SAHA can extend the term of the assistance up to 2 years if the family provides a written request for an extension and SAHA finds that good cause exists for the extension.
- FSS or Jobs-Plus participation is required -- each FSS and Jobs-Plus family receives case management services from a Case Manager who maintains close communication with the family and works with them to develop individualized plans. These plans establish specific interim and final goals to measure the family's progress toward fulfilling its obligations and becoming self-sufficient.

Changes and new elements that will be incorporated into the MTW Activity to improve program outcomes include:

- The pilot had been oriented to increasing housing choice and self-sufficiency. Now that this activity is referral-driven (instead of wait list preference-driven), the rationale for increasing housing choice by decreasing wait list time is no longer applicable. Instead, the activity will be focused solely on self-sufficiency.

- Households that participated in the previous pilot and remain in good standing will be rolled over automatically into the new program, and their time spent in the pilot will not count against the five-year time limit (the “clock is reset”)
- SAHA and WSA staff are developing a branding and communication strategy regarding the referral program
- SAHA staff will increase messaging of requirements and time limits backed up with strong written policies and procedures
- CDI and PH staff coordinate activities using a master tracking worksheet, that tracks the following:
 - Specific instances when the 5-year term limit is being communicated to participating households
 - If the family refuses to participate in FSS, CDI will inform PH staff, who will initiate eviction proceedings
 - Whether the household is meeting the financial counseling requirement
 - Household cohorts
 - New strategies employed as part of the Individual Plan development (for example, it was discussed that the goals should be focused on how much money it will take for the household to be able to pay flat rent by their 5th year)
 - Hardship tracking process, including all hardships requested
 - Improve methods to ensure families are complying with the rules of the pilot (including retaining employment throughout)
 - Develop a procedure for households moving to section 8

3. Metrics and Data Sources

For the most part, the metrics of this activity remain the same as the pilot activity. The most significant change is the proposal to track metrics by annual cohorts. Each year, a new cohort will be added to the tracking table below, allowing for comparisons between groups that started in different years. . These cohorts will be tracked as SAHA metrics, in addition to the HUD Standard Metrics that establish annual, activity-wide benchmarks and outcomes.

One metric is proposed to be removed: the SAHA metric for “Average Years of participation”. Staff felt that this figure provided little information is programmatically useful, and that the other metrics being tracked provided better feedback regarding program performance.

FY2017 Update: There were no updates associated with this activity for this fiscal year. SAHA has spent FY2017 working with the community partner and preparing for full implementation. As of the end of the fiscal year, no new households were admitted under this activity. At the time of preparing this report, several households had been pulled from the waitlist, their paperwork had been processed, and they were waiting for the next vacancy at their preferred property.

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity this fiscal year.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: Other than delayed implementation, there have been no other challenges/potential new strategies associated with this activity.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: The data that has been manually collected for this activity will be entered into the Agency's housing database system, Elite, and all new TLWP households will be tracked in the system.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase). | Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero. | Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | Benchmark met |
| SS #1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average income of participating households (Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars). | Median earned income of households rolling over from pilot program | \$4700 annual increment leading to target established by Income Report analysis of median household income at time of self-sufficiency exit (\$36,000) | Actual average earned income | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$12,500: | \$17,200 | \$12,763 (all) \$16,410 (employed only) | Benchmark not met |
| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Other (Heads and co-heads with any Earned Income) | Number of heads of households and co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity. | Expected number of heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Actual number of heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 18 | 23 | 12 | Benchmark not met |
| Other (Heads and co-heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity. | Expected percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Actual percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 75% (18 out of 23) | 100% | 67% (12 out of 18) | Benchmark not met |

| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 0 | 1 | Benchmark not met |
| SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of qualified households referred by partners and accepted by SAHA to participate (Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency) | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 23 (# of households continuing from pilot) | 100 (up to 200 households will participate at a time; participation will ramp up to 200 by year 2) | 20 | Benchmark not met |
| SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease). | Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$283.17 | \$283.17 | \$293.17 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase). | PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$160.92 | \$160.92 | \$144.89 | Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |
| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 1 | 0 | Benchmark not met |
| HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease). | Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months). | Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months). | Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 12 months | 2 months | 30 months | Benchmark not met |

SAHA Metrics

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| Increase in Household Income, by cohort | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average income of participating households (Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars). | Median earned income of households rolling over from pilot program | \$4700 annual increment leading to target established by Income Report analysis of median household income at time of self-sufficiency exit (\$36,000) | Actual average earned income | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$12,500 | \$17,200 | Cohort 1 (Original from FY13-2 Activity): \$12,763 (all) \$16,410 (employed only) | Benchmark not met |
| Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status, by cohort | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Other (Heads and co-heads with any Earned Income) | Number of heads of households and co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity. | Expected number of heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Actual number of heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | 18 | 23 | Cohort 1: 12 | Benchmark not met |
| Other (Heads and co-heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity. | Expected percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Actual percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 75% (18 out of 23) | 100% | Cohort 1: 67% | Benchmark not met |
| Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency, by cohort | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of qualified households referred by partners and accepted by SAHA to participate (Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency) | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 23 (# of households continuing from pilot) | 100 (up to 200 households will participate at a time; participation will ramp up to 200 by year 2) | Cohort 1: 18 | Benchmark not met |
| Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency, by Cohort | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency . | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 1 | Cohort 1: 0 | Benchmark not met |
| Hardship rate | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Rate of hardship requests. All types of hardships are counted, including but not limited to requests at the end of the five-year term. | 0 | 5% | Cohort 1: 0 | Benchmark met |

FY2017-2 – Restorative Housing Pilot Program

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

1. Approved/Implemented: December 2016/May 2017

2. Description: This activity is designed to achieve the MTW statutory objective to give incentives that promote self-sufficiency, through resident services initiatives that provide eligible probationers and their families a public housing preference. This activity identifies a population of underserved residents – probationers – who currently face challenges securing stable housing. By providing a public housing preference, these households can more quickly establish a solid foundation from which to undertake subsequent reintegration and self-sufficiency goals

This activity is a two-year pilot program that will allow for up to 50 adult probationers who are reporting as part of the “Resurgence Collaborative” reentry initiative to have preference for housing on SAHA public housing properties. Probationers will be selected for application into the pilot by the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD). Probationers in the pilot will receive dual case management support from the SAHA FSS Program and their Community Supervision Officer (CSO). The two-year term of the pilot program does not restrict how long residents will be able to continue to receive housing assistance.

The total number of households to be served under this activity is currently capped at 50. Over 20,000 households are currently on the public housing waitlist. Providing probationers and their households with housing assistance will have a very limited impact on other households currently on the waitlist.

Households will typically use the conventional public housing rent structure and biennial recertification schedule (per MTW Activity FY2014-4). However, both structure and schedule will be affected by the requirements of the self-sufficiency program selected by the household. For example, those enrolled in FSS will make use of an escrow account. Those in Jobs-Plus will have the option to establish an Earned Income Disregard (EID). For households living in Cassiano, the new Cassiano Jobs-Plus program will require an EID.

1. Target Population

Bexar County CSCD will select eligible probationers for the pilot based on the Texas Risk Assessment System (TRAS) in order to identify probationers with high housing “needs” and a relatively low risk of reoffending. Probationers identified with a high housing need and low risk will be screened by their CSO for SAHA’s income requirements and disability status to determine their eligibility for SAHA assistance. If the probationer meets SAHA’s income requirements they will be offered to apply for the Pilot via the Referral Form. The probationer’s total criminal history will be taken into account for these risk assessments.

2. Criminal History Review

Probationers will be selected for application to the pilot by the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections. Only Bexar County adult probationers currently serving a probation sentence for an allowable offense (Class B misdemeanor, nonviolent Class A misdemeanor, lowest-level controlled substance possession offense, or a first-time burglary offense) will be eligible for the pilot program. Probationers concurrently serving three or more separate probation sentences for allowable offenses or a single probation term for three or more allowable offenses will be ineligible for the Pilot. An exemption to current SAHA Screening and Eviction Guidelines will be required to allow some participants in the Pilot population to avoid automatic denial.

Probationers with a criminal history that includes narcotics distribution, violent felonies, or multiple burglary offenses at any time will be ineligible. Probationers with any allowable offenses within the past five years for which they are not currently serving a probation sentence for will also be ineligible unless the probationer successfully completed a probation sentence(s) for the offense(s) in question. Federal bans on sex offenders and persons convicted of drug manufacturing on federal property remain. In addition, people previously evicted from federally-assisted housing or who have committed crimes on SAHA property in the past will be ineligible for the Pilot.

3. Dual Case Management

Probationers selected for the pilot will be dual-case managed by a SAHA FSS Case Worker and their CSO. FSS will attempt to use only one or two case managers for the Pilot population as will the Bexar County CSCD. Selected probationers must be willing to engage in FSS case management for up to 5 years and if they unilaterally terminate case management they may be evicted. Selected probationers in the Pilot will receive a FSS case manager upon entering public housing, and the FSS case manager's role will be to supervise and motivate clients in conjunction with the CSO. Bexar County CSOs will have the final say on what court-ordered services must be completed and in what order, though the FSS case manager and CSO should coordinate and jointly agree on non-court ordered services and supervision. Selected probationers will be required to report to a CSO at the Barbara Jordan Center location in order to utilize services at the Resurgence Collaborative.

The SAHA FSS Case Manager would work to be present and present materials at SAHA-based hearings related to a Pilot participant; the Bexar County CSO would handle criminal and court-related matters pertaining to offenses probationers in the Pilot may commit. Both case managers should coordinate efforts and meet on at least a monthly basis to review problem cases and problem-solve.

The FSS Case Managers will also coordinate with property managers to address problems as needed. Scheduled meetings with clients do not have to be attended by both managers but

efforts and communication should be coordinated so as not to confuse or mislead clients. SAHA will track the results of this Pilot with Bexar County CSCD through the FSS program.

4. Pilot Requirements

The probationers must also stay in good standing with their probation requirements (including substance monitoring and home inspections). Probationers rearrested for violations of their current probation or new criminal offenses may be swiftly evicted from public housing and removed from the lease if determined by their CSO and SAHA. Family members would not be subjected to eviction if another adult in the household is capable of taking over the lease, unless otherwise determined by SAHA and the Bexar County CSCD.

Pilot Probationers who must go to residential drug treatment will not forfeit their public housing unit provided they have other immediate family members already living in the unit and capable of maintaining the lease. Probationers exiting residential drug treatment would still be able to apply to the pilot, if all other eligibility requirements being met. An MOU will be created for the Pilot to share information between SAHA and the Bexar County CSCD. In addition to the MOU the participating probationers will be required to sign a release of information form in order for the CSCD to share any of case specific information (i.e. drug tests) with the SAHA case manager.

Probationers who are evicted due to an arrest or violation will be ineligible to apply for the Pilot in the future. Evicted probationers' spots in the Pilot will be recycled into the population cap for each pilot program. The same will apply for those probationers who leave public housing either voluntarily or through increased self-sufficiency. Individuals who finish their probation requirements may still be required to meet with a FSS case manager, and their spot will be recycled into the Pilot population cap.

Probationers will be required to obtain services at the "Resurgence Collaborative" at the Barbara Jordan Center determined by their FSS case manager and CSO. Services not provided at the Resurgence Collaborative may be completed through FSS/Probation's existing network of services providers. In addition, the FSS case manager will work to engage family members in services offered at the Resurgence Collaborative to build self-sufficiency in the entire family.

5. Pilot Logistics

Up to 50 probationers reporting as part of the "Resurgence Collaborative" reentry initiative and their immediate families will be allowed prioritized access to public housing at SAHA properties over a two-year period. The population cap of 50 will include both probationers coming into new public housing units with their families and probationers who are being allowed to move in with immediate family members that are already living in public housing properties.

Probationers selected for the Pilot will be given a signed referral from their CSO to present to SAHA staff at the Unified Application Center. The Referral Form will be created specifically for this Pilot and will be based on similar referrals for other SAHA special populations/projects. If

probationers apply to the Pilot and their term of probation expires before a spot in the Pilot becomes open, their Referral will expire and they will have to reapply to obtain SAHA housing assistance. Probationers who commit a crime after being accepted into the Pilot but before moving into their unit will be removed from the Pilot.

6. Outcomes

According to 2012 Byrne CJI Grant Implementation Plan Data collected by Trinity University, the Choice Neighborhood footprint (location of the Resurgence Collaborative), and offenders in the footprint have higher rates of recidivism (re-arrests) and a higher arrest rate. The number of people per ZIP code on probation in the footprint is twice that compared to other ZIP codes in Bexar County. Additionally 52% of probationers who live in these ZIP codes had their probation revoked instead of completed, compared to 41% for Bexar County as a whole. Focus groups conducted by Trinity University with probationers also found that transportation is one of the most significant barriers for probationers. Together this baseline data illustrates that the Choice Neighborhood has a higher percentage of probationers, these probationers struggle with basic needs such as transportation, and these probationers have their probation revoked or re-offend at a greater rate than Bexar County as a whole.

The program is anticipated to reduce recidivism among probationers. The prioritized access to housing in the Pilot will also allow SAHA to determine the effect of immediate housing on probationers in regards to such measures.

FY2017 Update: After receiving final approval from HUD in December 2016, the Agency worked to implement the activity with its partners. By the end of the fiscal year, referrals were being received and one of the 50 pilot slots was filled by a new household. The Agency will update metrics once all 50 slots have been filled—which is expected to occur during FY2018.

2i. Hardships: There has been no hardship requests associated with this activity this fiscal year.

3. Challenges/Potential New Strategies: Other than delayed implementation, there have been no other challenges/potential new strategies associated with this activity.

4. Benchmark/Metric Revisions: There were no revisions to the benchmarks or metrics this fiscal year.

5. Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system (Elite), case management database system (TAAG), and a shared google sheet to facilitate data collection across departments and agencies.

HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i> | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase). | Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero. | Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$0.00 | \$6475 | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| SS #1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Report the following information separately for each category: | Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| (1) Employed Full- Time | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| (2) Employed Part- Time | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| (5) Unemployed | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% decrease | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| Report the following information separately for each category: | Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent). | Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| (1) Employed Full- Time | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| (2) Employed Part- Time | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| (5) Unemployed | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% decrease | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 0 | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |

| SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households assisted by services | Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number). | Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 50 | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease). | Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$283.17 | \$283.17 | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase). | PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | \$160.92 | \$160.92 | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |
| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 0 | 0 (no transitions expected in first year) | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | of 2-year pilot program) | | |
| HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease). | Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months). | Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months). | Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 12 months | 2 months | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |

SAHA Metrics

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| Revocation Rate | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Percentage of revocations (probationers with probation revoked) | Local revocation rate | Expected revocation rate | Actual revocation rate of pilot probationers | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| | 52% (average from sample) | 41% or less (average for target zip codes) | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report | Forthcoming in FY2018 Report |

F. Activities on Hold

SAHA has implemented all of the Agency's approved activities.

G. Closed Out Activities

Closed out in FY2017

None.

Closed out in Prior Years

FY2011-1- Block grant funding with Full Flexibility

Closed out as an activity at the close of FY2013, and reported in the new Form 50900 Attachment B Section V. Sources and Uses.

FY2011-1a- Promote Education through Partnerships

Closed out as an activity at the close of FY2013, and reported in the new Form 50900 Attachment B Section V. Sources and Uses.

FY2011-1b- Pilot Child Care Program

Closed out in FY2013 Report.

FY2011-1c- Holistic Case Management

Closed out as an activity at the close of FY2013, and reported in the new Form 50900 Attachment B Section V. Sources and Uses.

FY2011-1d- Resident Ambassador Program

Closed out as an activity at the close of FY2013, and reported in the new Form 50900 Attachment B Section V. Sources and Uses.

FY2011-2- Simplify and streamline HUD approval process for the development, redevelopment, and acquisition of PH

Closed out in FY2013 Report.

FY2011-3- Biennial reexamination for elderly/disabled (PH)

Closed out in FY2013 and replaced with FY2014-4.

FY2011-4- Streamline methods of verification for PH and HCV

Closed out in FY2013 and replaced with FY2014-1.

FY2011-5- Requirements for acceptable documents for PH and HCV

Closed out in FY2013 and replaced with FY2014-1.

FY2012-10- Biennial Reexamination for Elderly/Disabled Participants on Fixed Income (HCV)

Closed out in FY2013 and replaced with FY2014-4.

FY2012-11- Local Project Based Voucher Program for Former Public Housing Residents

Closed out in FY2013 before implementation due to discussions with HUD regarding the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program.

FY2011-6 – Commitment of Project-Based Vouchers (PBV) to SAHA-owned or controlled units with expiring subsidies (HCV)

Closed out in FY2014 and replaced with FY2015-3 Modified Project-Based Vouchers.

FY2011-7 – Remove limitation of commitment on PBV so that PBV may be committed to more than 25% of the units in family developments without required provision of supportive services (HCV)

Closed out in FY2014 as the Agency is no longer seeking authorization to commit more than 25% of units at any one development to PBV without the provision of supportive services. The Agency offers supportive services pursuant to Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) requirements for existing new development projects.

FY2011-8 – Revise Mobility Rules

Closed out in FY2014 and replaced with FY2015-3 Modified Project-Based Vouchers.

FY2013-2 – Simplified Earned Income Disregard (S-EID) - Only HCV Closing Out

Closed out in FY2014 as the activity was never implemented and the housing program has shifted resources to the successful implementation of the Rent Simplification (FY2014-6) and the MDRC/HUD Rent Reform Activity (FY2015-1).

FY2014-2 – Streamline Reexamination Requirements and Methods (HCV)

Closed out in FY2015 due to PIH Notice 2010 - 19 (HA) which gives housing authorities authorization without the need for an MTW waiver.

FY2013-1 – Time-limited Working Household Preference Pilot Program

Closed out in FY2016 and replaced with FY2017-1 to incorporate lessons learned from this pilot

FY2013-3 – Standardize Section 8 and Public Housing Inspection Process

Closed out in FY2016. This activity was designed to unify Section 8 and Public Housing inspection standards. This activity was on hold, pending results of HUD tests at other PHAs. HUD has completed the study and is now conducting a demonstration. SAHA has no plans to participate in the demonstration and will implement new inspection standards for Section 8 in accordance with any new guidelines set forth by HUD.

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

As a block grant agency, SAHA combines PH, HCV, Capital Fund Program (CFP), and Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) funds into a single fund with full funding flexibility.

Sources of MTW Funds include the following:

- HCV Block Grant funding from HUD
- PH Operating Subsidy from HUD
- PH Rental and Other Income represents amounts collected from residents of our PH communities for rents and other miscellaneous charges
- PH CFP (including DDTF) Grants from HUD
- RHF Grants from HUD

SAHA's Board of Commissioners approved the consolidated operating budget on June 2, 2016, for FY2017. Consistent with the MTW plan, funds were obligated and expended to provide funding for the following:

- Salaries and Benefits, Repair Maintenance, Utilities, Protective Salaries (Security Services), Insurance, and Other Expenses that represent the combined operating costs for PH and HCV
- Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) Expense for the HCV Program (payments to landlords)
- Expenditures related to the CFP/DDTF and RHF grants
- Program and administration and implementation of MTW initiatives (described in the next section)
- Section 8 funding shortfall
- Redevelopment of Victoria Plaza
- Expenditures related to capital planning activities
- Preservation and Expansion of Affordable and Public Housing
- Matching funds for the Choice Implementation Grant

MTW Initiatives

In FY2017, the Agency planned to utilize MTW single fund for the program administration and implementation of MTW initiatives. Below is a summary of FY2017 activity.

EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS

SAHA's education-related programming is significant and diverse, and includes:

- REACH Awards: recognize and reward nearly 200 students annually for academic achievement. This fiscal year, the agency awarded 190 students.
- College Scholarship Program: funds scholarships for up to 50 students annually to provide much needed support to ensure higher educational achievement. This fiscal year, the agency awarded scholarships for 43 students.
- Education Summit: provides up to 600 residents annually with access to education and college resources, financial literacy, and other self-help resources. This fiscal year, the agency's Education Summit had 483 residents attend.

RESIDENT AMBASSADOR EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM

The Resident Ambassador Program employed a total of 24 throughout this fiscal year, providing meaningful work experience for residents. SAHA has found that this program is an effective strategy to engage all residents in educational, training, workforce development, and other self-sufficiency programs.

SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM

The Summer Youth Employment Program employed 80 resident youth this fiscal year, providing work experience and capacity development such as resume writing, banking/financial literacy, interview skills, conflict resolution and other life and workforce development soft skills.

HEALTH AND WELLNESS

SAHA sponsors a variety of events to promote health and wellness, including:

- Golden Gala: much-loved annual event that served 579 elderly and disabled residents.
- H2A (Healthy Habits Active) Living Awards: highlight resident involvement and engagement in civic engagement, health, and other quality of life activities. This fiscal year, the agency recognized and awarded residents for the Resident Council Leadership Award, GEM (Go the Extra Mile) Award, Healthy Hero Award, Good Neighbor Award, Fuerza Award, and the H2A Living Award.
- Annual Father's Day initiative: engaged 350 families in positive family activities and recognize fathers' contributions through "El Hombre Noble" awards.

| V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds |
|--|
| A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds |
| Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year |
| <div>PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system</div> |
| Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility |
| <div><p>SAHA's Board of Commissioners approved the consolidated operating budget on June 2, 2016, for FY2017. Consistent with the MTW plan, funds were obligated and expended to provide funding for the following:</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Salaries and Benefits, Repair Maintenance, Utilities, Protective Salaries (Security Services), Insurance, and Other Expenses that represent the combined operating costs for PH and HCV• Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) Expense for the HCV Program (payments to landlords)• Expenditures related to the CFP/DDTF and RHF grants• Program and administration and implementation of MTW initiatives (described in the next section)• Section 8 funding shortfall• Redevelopment of Victoria Plaza• Expenditures related to capital planning activities• Preservation and Expansion of Affordable and Public Housing• Matching funds for the Choice Implementation Grant</div> |

B. Local Asset Management Plan

(Tables from Form 50900)

| V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan | |
|--|----------------|
| B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan | |
| Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year? | <div>Yes</div> |
| Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)? | <div></div> |
| or | |
| | <div>No</div> |
| <p>If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.</p> | |
| Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix? | <div></div> |
| | <div>No</div> |
| <div>N/A</div> | |

C. Commitment of Unspent MTW funds

The Agency has not received written notice of a definition of MTW reserves; therefore, this section of the report is not required to be completed.

(Tables from Form 50900)

| V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds | | | |
| <p>In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.</p> | | | |
| Account | Planned Expenditure | Obligated Funds | Committed Funds |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Type | Description | \$ X | \$ X |
| Total Obligated or Committed Funds: | | 0 | 0 |
| <p style="text-align: center;">In the body of the Report, PHAs shall provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds, including what funds have been obligated or committed to specific projects.</p> | | | |
| <p>Note: Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of obligations and commitments, MTW agencies are not required to complete this section.</p> | | | |

MTW agreement Attachment d: Update on RHF Funds included in the MTW Block grant

Pursuant to the Agency's MTW Agreement (as amended on July 1, 2013; Fourth Amendment), the table below provides an update on the amount of RHF funds included in the MTW Block Grant, the amount of funds spent on construction of new public and/or affordable housing, the number of units being constructed, and the status of construction. Note: [1] Wheatley Phase I total amount as illustrated in the mixed finance F-1 is \$967,870; however, the total amount of \$1,017,870 shown above includes \$50,000 Administration.

| Project Name | Units | | | | | | Estimated Completion Date | % of Completion | RHF Grant | RHF Grant Number | RHF Allocation | RHF Funds Expended | Remaining to Expend |
|---|-------|----------------|-----|-----------|-------------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Total | Public Housing | PBV | City HOME | Tax Credits | Market | | | | | | | |
| The Park at Sutton Oaks (Sutton II) | 208 | 49 | | | 113 | 46 | June 2014 | 100% | 2008 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-06 | \$ 2,608,481.00 | \$ 2,608,481.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2008 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-08 | \$ 209,083.10 | \$ 209,083.10 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | Total Sutton II | | \$ 2,817,564.10 | \$ 2,817,564.10 | \$ - |
| The Gardens at San Juan Square (San Juan III) | 252 | 63 | 31 | 27 | 131 | | December 2014 | 100% | 2009 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-09 | \$ 1,408,098.00 | \$ 1,408,098.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2009 RHF 2nd Inc. Add'l | TX59R006504-09 | \$ 918,844.44 | \$ 918,844.44 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2010 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-10 | \$ 1,718,182.56 | \$ 1,718,182.56 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2011 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-11 | \$ 383,875.00 | \$ 383,875.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | Total San Juan III | | \$ 4,429,000.00 | \$ 4,429,000.00 | \$ - |
| Wheatley / CNI (Relocation) | | | | | | | | | 2012 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-12 | \$ 76,939.00 | \$ 76,939.00 | \$ - |
| Wheatley / CNI (Pre-Development Site Prep) | | | | | | | December 2016 | 100% | 2008 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-08 | \$ 337,900.47 | \$ 337,900.47 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2009 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-09 | \$ 91,863.00 | \$ 91,863.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2009 RHF 2nd Inc. Add'l | TX59R006504-09 | \$ 200,461.56 | \$ 200,461.56 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2010 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-10 | \$ 360,291.00 | \$ 360,291.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2010 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-10 | \$ 92,541.44 | \$ 92,541.44 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2011 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-11 | \$ 611,478.99 | \$ 611,478.99 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2011 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-11 | \$ 41,851.00 | \$ 41,851.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2012 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-12 | \$ 98,369.47 | \$ 98,369.47 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2013 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-13 | \$ 549,153.00 | \$ 549,153.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2013 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-13 | \$ 84,890.00 | \$ 84,890.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2014 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-14 | \$ 150,952.00 | \$ 150,952.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2014 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-14 | \$ 9,509.29 | \$ 9,509.29 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | Total Wheatley Pre-Development Site Prep | | \$ 2,629,261.22 | \$ 2,629,261.22 | \$ - |
| Wheatley Phase I / CNI Phase II (East Meadows Phase I) | 215 | 71 | 8 | | 77 | 59 | May 2017 | 100% | 2011 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-11 | \$ 50,000.01 | \$ 50,000.01 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2012 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-12 | \$ 422,399.53 | \$ 422,399.53 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2014 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-14 | \$ 379,376.00 | \$ 379,376.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2014 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-14 | \$ 69,548.71 | \$ 69,548.71 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2015 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-15 | \$ 96,545.75 | \$ 96,545.75 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | Total Wheatley Phase I [1] | | \$ 1,017,870.00 | \$ 1,017,870.00 | \$ - |
| Wheatley Phase II / CNI Phase III (Wheatley Park Senior Living) | 80 | 40 | 36 | | 4 | | Planning | In Progress | 2015 RHF 1st Increment | TX59R006501-15 | \$ 224,868.25 | \$ 224,868.25 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2015 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-15 | \$ 80,032.00 | \$ 80,032.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2015 CFP-DDTF | TX59P006502-15 | \$ 220,088.00 | \$ 220,088.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | 2016 CFP-DDTF | TX59P006502-16 | \$ 832,561.00 | \$ 722,422.19 | \$ 110,138.81 |
| | | | | | | | | | 2016 RHF 2nd Increment | TX59R006502-16 | \$ 80,606.00 | \$ 80,606.00 | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | | | Total Development Activity | | \$ 1,438,155.25 | \$ 1,328,016.44 | \$ 110,138.81 |

Update on Total Capital Funds Expended – Active Grants

| As of June 30, 2017 | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Capital Fund Program (CFP) Grant Year | Grant Number | Obligation End Date | Expenditure End Date | Grant Amount | Expended | Remaining To Expend |
| 2012 Capital Fund Program (CFP) | TX59P006501-12 | 3/11/2014 | 3/11/2016 | \$7,410,330.00 | \$7,410,330.00 | \$0.00 |
| 2013 Capital Fund Program (CFP) | TX59P006501-13 | 9/8/2015 | 9/8/2017 | \$7,192,132.00 | \$7,192,132.00 | \$0.00 |
| 2014 Capital Fund Program (CFP) | TX59P006501-14 | 5/12/2016 | 5/12/2018 | \$7,294,109.00 | \$7,041,363.81 | \$252,745.19 |
| 2015 Capital Fund Program (CFP) | TX59P006501-15 | 4/12/2017 | 4/12/2019 | \$7,539,807.00 | \$4,757,493.12 | \$2,782,313.88 |
| 2016 Capital Fund Program (CFP) | TX59P006501-16 | 4/12/2018 | 4/12/2020 | \$7,805,380.00 | \$2,357,165.95 | \$5,448,214.05 |
| 2015 Safety & Security Cassiano | TX59E006501-15 | 6/7/2016 | 6/7/2017 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total Capital Funds | | | | \$37,491,758.00 | \$29,008,484.88 | \$8,483,273.12 |

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.

This fiscal year, SAHA had a total of 189 EHS (Exigent Health and Safety) issues that required action. The majority of EHS issues were related to missing or non-functioning smoke detectors. All EHS issues were addressed by the Agency within 24 hours.

- B. Results of latest PHA-directed evaluations of the demonstration.

SAHA did not have any PHA-directed evaluations of the MTW demonstration.

- C. Certification that the PHA has met the three statutory requirements

See the following page.

Certification of MTW Statutory Compliance

The San Antonio Housing Authority hereby certifies that it (the Agency) 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;

At fiscal year-end, 17,122 households out of a total of 17,704 (97%) households were very low-income (<50% AMI).

| As of 6.30.2016 | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | Total Households | Number below 50% AMI | % Below 50% AMI |
| PH | 5,706 | 5,564 | 98% |
| Vouchers | 11,813 | 11,442 | 97% |
| Other (Local, Non-Traditional) | 185 | 118 | 64% |
| Total | 17,704 | 17,122 | 97% |

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

The Agency's FY2017 MTW families served (annual average) is 18,036 out of 17,861 MTW adjusted baseline denominator (101%). SAHA continues to serve substantially the same number of households as it did upon entering the MTW demonstration.

| | MTW – Serving Substantially the Same | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| | MTW Baseline Denominator | MTW Baseline Numerator (Annual Average Leasing) | MTW Baseline Compliance Calculation |
| PH | 5,715 | 5,767 | 101% |
| Vouchers | 12,146 | 12,098 | 100% |
| Other (Local, Non-Traditional) | --- | 171 | NA |
| Total | 17,861 | 18,036 | 101% |

3) Maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

While all household sizes show a percent change over 5%, the absolute differences between the baseline and FY2017 is no greater than 2%. The overall range of absolute differences across all household sizes is -1% to 3%, indicating the Agency is still serving a comparable mix of households by household size.

| Mix of Family Sizes Served | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------|
| | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person | Totals |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained | 36% | 16% | 18% | 15% | 9% | 7% | 100% |
| Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year | 6,857 | 3,241 | 3,039 | 2,422 | 1,475 | 1,068 | 18,102 |
| Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year | 39% | 18% | 16% | 13% | 8% | 6% | 100% |
| Percentage Change | 8% | 8% | -9% | -9% | -7% | -9% | 0% |
| Absolute Percentage Change | 3% | 2% | -2% | -2% | -2% | -1% | 0% |



David Nisivoccia
President and CEO

9.25.17

Date

Moving to Work Annual Report
Fiscal Year 2014: July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017

Submitted September 30, 2017

Re-submitted December 20, 2018

San Antonio Housing Authority | 818 S. Flores | San Antonio, TX 78204 | www.saha.org