



SAHA
SAN ANTONIO
HOUSING AUTHORITY
Opportunity Lives Here



MOVING TO WORK

Annual Report | Fiscal Year 2018-2019

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT AND CEO

The San Antonio Housing Authority's (SAHA) vision has long been to create dynamic communities where people thrive. Since receiving the Moving to Work (MTW) designation in 2009, SAHA has made significant progress in realizing its mission. The MTW designation has allowed SAHA the flexibility to transform operations, programs and housing by implementing innovative strategies.

This fiscal year alone, SAHA is estimating more than \$600,000 in cost savings accomplished across multiple MTW activities aimed at creating administrative efficiencies, which have reduced federal expenditures.

The agency implemented a new activity aimed to increase housing choices for low-income families participating in the voucher program. East Meadows II, a new community located on the site of the former Wheatley Courts public housing development, is expected to be completed in May 2020 — increasing housing choices by adding 95 affordable units. 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 more than 1,800 individuals, with 28 graduates and 46 percent of participants employed and the others involved in educational or job training activities. Approximately 65 residents transitioned to self-sufficiency, no longer needing housing subsidy. Our accomplishments as a high-performing agency go beyond our MTW achievements. In 2019, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) recognized SAHA with 16 Awards of Merit — the most of any agency — and two Awards of Excellence.

We 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. This fiscal year, more than 300 residents completed ConnectHome Training — 311 devices were distributed and 245 households connected.

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 streams 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 Fiscal Year 2019 accomplishments in this year's MTW Annual Report.

DocuSigned by:

David Msinoccia
President and CEO

9/30/2019

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 2019: July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

SAHA Board of Commissioners

Morris Stribling, DPM, Chairman
Jessica Weaver, Vice Chair
Charles Clack
Jo-Anne Kaplan
Sofia A. Lopez
Marie R. McClure

SAHA Executive Staff

David Nisivoccia
President and Chief Executive Officer
Ed Hinojosa
Chief Financial Officer
Muriel Rhoder
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
Aiyana Longoria, Director of Internal Audit
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
Lorraine Robles, Director of Development Services and Neighborhood Revitalization
Janie Rodriguez, Director of Human Resources
Thomas R. Roth, Director of Asset Management

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	10
A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION	10
B. LEASING INFORMATION	13
C. WAITING LIST INFORMATION	14
D. INFORMATION ON STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND REQUIREMENTS	15
III. PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES	18
IV. APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES	19
A. IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES	19
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)	37
FY2014-6 – HCV Rent Reform	38
FY2015-1 – MDRC / HUD Rent Reform Study	44
FY2015-2 – Elderly Admissions Preference at Select Public Housing Sites	56
FY2015-3 – Modified Project Based Vouchers	59
FY2017-1 – Time Limited Working Referral Program / Thrive in Five	62
FY2017-2 – Restorative Housing Pilot Program	69
FY2019-1 – Local Small Area Fair Market Rent (SAFMR) Implementation	78
FY2019-2 – Alternate Recertification Process (PH and HCV)	84
B. ACTIVITIES ON HOLD	88
C. CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES	88
V. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS	91
A. SOURCES AND USES OF MTW FUNDS	91
MTW Initiatives	92
B. LOCAL ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN	94
VI. ADMINISTRATIVE	95
Certification of MTW Statutory Compliance	96

Overview

The San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) provides housing to over 65,000 children, adults, and seniors through four housing portfolios – Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers, and Mixed-Income housing programs. SAHA employs approximately 525 people and has an annual operating budget of \$176 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 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.

Strategic Plan

SAHA's Strategic Plan established six long-term strategic goals to be achieved by 2020. In order to ensure timely progress towards those goals, SAHA developed annual Strategic Implementation Plans that set out annual objectives for the fiscal year. Progress has been measured by tracking key metrics for each strategic goal.

Long-term MTW Plan

In January 2017, SAHA staff began developing the concept for a Long-term MTW Plan. Staff recognized the need for a long-term (multi-year) perspective in order to accomplish some of the more complex and impactful agency goals. The group also recognized the challenge of maintaining focus and momentum over multiple budget cycles. Initially, a Long-term MTW Plan was set to be designed to provide a multi-year framework (through 2022/23) to guide the coordinated implementation of agency priorities. The Agency has decided to combine this long-term planning work with its current strategic planning process. This process will produce the Agency's Strategic Plan 2021-2025 to include long-term goals for the Agency's use of MTW flexibilities.

MTW Advisory Committee and MTW Alliances

SAHA has made significant changes to the direction and structure of the MTW Advisory Committee. For many years, the MTW Advisory Committee -- made up of external stakeholders and key SAHA staff -- was focused on providing feedback on the MTW Plan. Starting in January 2018, the Committee convened to discuss alternative roles for the group. One of the alternatives that received broad support was to reconstitute the Advisory Committee as a number of Alliances.

Each Alliance is organized around one of the MTW Statutory Objectives (listed above in the Introduction to this section). The new MTW Alliances started their work in July 2018. Below is a summary of the early planning process the MTW Alliances and work committees engaged in during its inaugural year, FY 2018-2019.

Using a Theory of Change (ToC) planning and evaluation framework, participants were guided in defining long-term goals for the agency's Moving to Work objectives: (1) Increase Housing Choices and (2) Give incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, seeking work, or preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

The process produced a living ToC that reflects at present the collective view of how short-term changes will lead to long-term impacts. This specific and measurable description of change will continue to evolve as the Alliances learn and while also serving as a foundation for strategic planning, on-going decision-making, and evaluation. Other planning milestones achieved include:

- Identified shared goals
- Articulated a vision statement
- Inventoried promising projects

The MTW Alliance and work committees dedicated much of their time to the planning process, but also mobilized on short-term work. Below are some key accomplishments.

- Developed a draft Housing Choice ToC
- Developed a draft Housing Choice Strategic Dashboard
- Developed Phase II of the MTW Activity, 2019-1 Loca SAFMR Implementation
- Began drafting SAFMR ToC
- Developed and implemented a new SAHA Educational Outreach Program
- Developed new SAHA Promotional Materials for the Housing Choice Voucher Program
- Mobilized around the development of a new Mobility Counseling Pilot Program

Featured Success Stories

This year the Agency is honored to share a few of the many success stories from families we have been able to support through a combination of our Family Self-Sufficiency Program and Moving to Work investments.

Bianca

Ms. Bianca, enrolled in the FSS Program on February 1, 2015, with a household income of less than \$8,000. She is a single mother of her daughter, Mia. While in FSS she became employed at Citibank NA, as a phone banker in June 2016, tripling her income. She is enjoying her job so well, that she has decided to make a career of it. Ms. Bianca wants to be the best role model to her daughter by assisting her to excel in school. Currently, she is employed at Citibank as a banker associate earning nearly four times her starting income. Ms. Bianca ended her housing assistance once she was able to pay full rent. Her ambitions are to save money, become a homeowner and eventually own her beauty salon.

Julia

Ms. Julia enrolled in the FSS Program on March 1, 2013, with a household income of less than \$5,000. She is a single mom of three daughters and a son. Ms. Julia was a resident of New Orleans, and a Hurricane Katrina survivor. She completed her Child Development Accreditation at San Antonio College in November 2014. She also completed the SAHA Financial Literacy Class, and continued to improve her credit score with the Financial Empowerment Center. She attended numerous CDI/FSS events like Mother's Day and received bicycles for herself and her son. Ms.

Julia completed the Digital Literacy Passport Program from Connect Home in February 2018. She became a Certified Community Health Worker through the Texas Department of State Health Services October 2017. She is currently employed at a local Independent School District, making eight times her starting income.

Francisco

Mr. Francisco is a Jobs Plus member. He converted to full time employment with Toyotetsu in late October of 2018. He began this career as a temporary employee with Veracity, had perfect attendance, and worked his way up - earning a \$2.50 per hour wage increase. He is ecstatic about having a permanent job and was eager to share a story about how proud he was to be able to buy his child glasses and taking another to the dentist, because he now has job benefits. Mr. Almanza's goal is to become a home-owner.

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

A. Housing Stock Information

i. Actual New Project Based Vouchers

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

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF VOUCHERS NEWLY PROJECT-BASED		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
Alazan	95	0	Not Committed	NA	Proposed Choice Neighborhood Redevelopment

95	0	Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based
----	---	---

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

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

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

Project was not selected for the Choice Neighborhood Grant

ii. Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers

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

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
Gardens at San Juan	31	31	Leased/Issued	No	Mixed-income Community
East Meadows	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Phase I of Wheatley Courts Redevelopment/Phase 2 of Choice Grant
Wheatley Park Senior Living	36	34	Leased/Issued	No	80 Unit Senior Development: Phase 2 of Wheatley Courts Redevelopment/Phase 3 of Choice Grant

75	73	Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based
----	----	---

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

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

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

2 PBV are committed but did not have a HAP in place during the plan year.

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

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

ACTUAL OTHER CHANGES TO MTW HOUSING STOCK IN PLAN YEAR	
FY2019 Actual Changes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34 LIPH Unit Removals: Scattered Sites (8) and Villa Fortuna (26) MTW Voucher - No changes 	
Note: LIPH Victoria Plaza, 185 units - remain offline with status of HUD Approved Comprehensive Rehab	
FY2019 Planned Changes that did not occur	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LIPH East Meadows II, 42 additional units planned to come online during FY2019 will not come online in FY2020 LNT East Meadows II, 119 unit new mixed-income development to come online during FY2020 as part of the Eastside Choice Neighborhood Grant 	

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

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

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALL ACTUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES DURING THE PLAN YEAR						
Grant	Grant Amount	FYB Cumulative Expended	FYE Cumulative Expended	Expended During FY2019	Remaining To Expend	Expended
2015 CFP	\$ 7,539,807.00	\$ 7,324,752.31	\$ 7,539,807.00	\$ 215,054.69	\$ -	100.00%
2016 CFP	\$ 7,805,380.00	\$ 6,454,456.83	\$ 7,805,380.00	\$ 1,350,923.17	\$ -	100.00%
2017 CFP	\$ 7,973,378.00	\$ 894,652.56	\$ 7,973,378.00	\$ 7,078,725.44	\$ -	100.00%
2018 CFP	\$ 12,332,100.00	\$ -	\$ 5,062,921.48	\$ 5,062,921.48	\$ 7,269,178.52	41.05%
2019 CFP	\$ 12,858,734.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,858,734.00	0.00%
		TOTAL FY19	\$ 28,381,486.48	\$ 13,707,624.78	\$ 20,127,912.52	

Property	Description
Blanco	Structural Assessment, Phase III - Add'l Design Professional Services, Basement Structural Repair
Charles Andrews	Int/Ext/Site Improvement Cap Project (Subst Rehab), Subst.Renov. - Site, Bldg, Interior & Parking Improv, Window Water Testing, Geotechnical Engineering Study, Construction Materials Observation-Testing, Int/Ext/Site Improvement Cap Project (Subst Rehab), Subst.Renov. - Site, Bldg, Interior & Parking Improv, Energy Model Review
Cross Creek	Burn Unit #1503 Restoration
Fair Avenue	Fire Pump-Emergency Generator/Sprinkler Feasibility Study, Fire Sprinkler and Alarm Design, Design Firefighter Radio Antenna System, Abatement Environ Svcs
Francis Furey	Hail Damaged Roof Repair/Replacement
Frank Hornsby	Hail Damaged Roof Repair/Replacement
Le Chalet	Elevator Modernization, Electrical Feeder Upgrades (Elevator Room), Elevator Fire Alarm Installation, HVAC Installation
Lila Cockrell	MEP Engineering Consulting (Ph. I-IV), Domestic Hot Water System Replacement
Lincoln	Hail Damaged Roof Repair/Replacement
Matt Garcia	Ext Repairs: Repair Scope Deter & Basic Svcs
Morris Beldon	Hail Damaged Roof Repair/Replacement
O.P. Schnabel	Desktop Environmental Review (DER), Elevator Upgrades
PHA Wide	Operations 1406, Administration 1410, CFFP Debt Service, CFP Project Manager/Inspector Salaries, Physical Needs Assessment
T.L. Shaley	Burn Unit Duplex Reconstruction
Tarry Towne	Hail Damaged Roof Repair/Replacement
Victoria Plaza	Add'l Architectural Services - Addendum #2 Asbestos Study and Design Docs Comprehensive Modernization Fungal Assessment Unit 503 Mold Remediation Unit 503 Asbestos Abatement/Demo Notification Fee Asbestos LCP Consulting
Villa Tranchese	HVAC, Fire Sprinkler, Basement Assessment Asbestos-Lead Paint Inspection and Consultation Sched. #50 Asbestos Consulting Chiller Renovation Sched. #52 Asbestos Abatement (Basement/Ext. Mechanical Rm) Common Area HVAC Chiller Replacement City of SA Sprinkler Permit Fees
Wheatley Park Sr Living	DDTF - Project Manager/Inspector Salaries

B. Leasing Information

i. Actual Number of Households Served

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

At the end of the fiscal year, SAHA served 18,399 households through MTW. Over the plan year, the agency occupied 218,385 unit months.

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED THROUGH:	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED**	
	Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
MTW Public Housing Units Leased	69,900	67,732	5,825	5,596
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized	145,752	148,116	12,146	12,598
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based	NA	NA	NA	NA
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based	2,052	2,537	171	205
Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership	NA	NA	NA	NA

Planned/Actual Totals	217,704	218,385	18,142	18,399
------------------------------	---------	---------	--------	--------

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

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

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

Please describe differences between the Planned and Actual Households Served:

PH: Victoria Plaza (185 units) remains offline for comprehensive modernization.
Vouchers: The program exceeded utilization goals in FY2019 and plans to bring utilization back to the MTW baseline during FY2020.

LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL CATEGORY	MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TO BE SERVED*	
		Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
Tenant-Based	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Property-Based	FY2011-1e Preservation and Expansion of Affordable Housing	2,052	2,537	171	205
Homeownership	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Planned/Actual Totals	2,052	2,537	171	205
------------------------------	-------	-------	-----	-----

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

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

HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL SERVICES ONLY	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS PER MONTH	TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE PLAN YEAR
NA	NA	NA

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

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

HOUSING PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL LEASING ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS
MTW Public Housing	SAHA continues to have a high number of evictions and move outs for various violations within the program. SAHA will ensure the waiting list is monitored on a continual basis and applicants are selected timely to fill the vacant units. The application update process is currently under review to provide more accurate applicant contact information.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	SAHA has exceeded utilization goals while pending Tenant Protection Vouchers for Scattered Sites Disposition and CoC Transition. No current leasing issues.
Local, Non-Traditional	None.

C. Waiting List Information

i. Actual Waiting List Information

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

WAITING LIST NAME	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ON WAITING LIST	WAITING LIST OPEN, PARTIALLY OPEN OR CLOSED	WAS THE WAITING LIST OPENED DURING THE PLAN YEAR
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site-based	27,530	Open	No
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-wide	10,761	Closed	No
Federal Non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program: Moderate Rehabilitation	Moderate Rehabilitation	22,355	Open	No
Project-based Local (Gardens at San Juan Square)	Local Project-Based	33,265	Open	No
Project-based Local (East Meadows Phase I)	Local Project-Based	13,790	Open	No
Project-based Local (Wheatley Park Senior Living)	Local Project-Based	235	Open	No

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:

Currently the total number of households on the waiting lists is 65,340 with average household applying for 2 or more waiting lists.

ii. Actual Changes to Waiting List in the Plan Year

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

WAITING LIST NAME	DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL CHANGES TO WAITING LIST
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	None
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	None
Federal Non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program: Moderate Rehabilitation	None
Project-based Local (Gardens at San Juan Square)	None
Project-based Local (East Meadows Phase I)	None
Wheatley Park Senior Living PBV	None

D. Information on Statutory Objectives and Requirements

i. 75% of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income

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

INCOME LEVEL	NUMBER OF LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL HOUSEHOLDS ADMITTED IN THE PLAN YEAR
80%-50% Area Median Income	30
49%-30% Area Median Income	32
Below 30% Area Median Income	16

Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted 78

ii. Maintain Comparable Mix

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

BASELINE MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (upon entry to MTW)

FAMILY SIZE	OCCUPIED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS	UTILIZED HCVs	NON-MTW ADJUSTMENTS *	BASELINE MIX NUMBER	BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE
1 Person	2,617	3,952	NA	6,569	36%
2 Person	873	2,134	NA	3,007	16%
3 Person	998	2,338	NA	3,336	18%
4 Person	730	2,004	NA	2,734	15%
5 Person	401	1,178	NA	1,579	9%
6+ Person	317	917	NA	1,234	7%
TOTAL	5,936	12,523	NA	18,459	100%

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

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

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.

MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (in Plan Year)				
FAMILY SIZE	BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE**	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED IN PLAN YEAR^	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED IN PLAN YEAR^^	PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM BASELINE YEAR TO CURRENT PLAN YEAR
1 Person	36%	7,077	39%	7%
2 Person	16%	3,269	18%	11%
3 Person	18%	3,071	17%	-7%
4 Person	15%	2,432	13%	-12%
5 Person	9%	1,457	8%	-12%
6+ Person	7%	1,093	6%	-15%
TOTAL	100%	18,399	100%	0

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

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

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

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

- (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
Households by Type	Households 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 householder 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 housing units	524,522	540,148	Yes	3%
	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

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

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

MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY*	MTW PHA LOCAL DEFINITION OF SELF SUFFICIENCY
FY2013-2: Simplified Earned Income Disregard	1	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.
FY2014-6: Rent Simplification	24	
FY2015-1 MDRC/HUD Rent Study	7	
FY2017-1 Time Limited Working Referral Program	0	
FY2017-1 Restorative Housing Pilot Program	0	
FY2019-2 Alternative Recertification Process	32	
	0	(Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities)
	64	Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

III. Proposed MTW Activities

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

Not Applicable.

IV. Approved MTW Activities

A. Implemented Activities

Implemented activities are reported in this section using the following framework per HUD FORM 50900 (OMB Control Number: 2577-0216).

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended

Specify the Plan Year the MTW activity was proposed. Specify the Plan Year the MTW activity was implemented. Provide any Plan Years in which the MTW activity was amended.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships

Provides a description of the MTW activity and detailed information on its impact during the Plan Year. Provides the applicable Standard HUD Metrics tables with numerical information for baselines, benchmarks and outcomes for the Plan Year. Describes how outcomes compared to baselines and benchmarks. Indicates whether the MTW activity is on schedule.

NOTE: For rent reform/public housing term limit activities, a description of the number and results of any hardship requests and details regarding the required “Annual Reevaluation” that the MTW PHA put in place when proposing the MTW activity.

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes

Indicate if the MTW PHA made the planned nonsignificant changes or modifications to the MTW activity given in the Annual MTW Plan in the Plan Year. Indicate any unplanned non-significant changes or modifications to the MTW activity the MTW PHA made in the Plan Year (or state that there were none).

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

Indicate if the MTW PHA made the planned changes or modifications to the metrics given in the Annual MTW Plan in the Plan Year. Indicate any unplanned changes or modifications to the metrics the MTW PHA made in the Plan Year (or state that there were none).

v. Actual Significant Changes

Indicate if any significant changes were made to the MTW activity in the Plan Year through an Annual MTW Plan amendment (or state that there were none).

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the MTW activity was determined ineffective (as described in IV.A.ii above), provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and, if possible, identify potential new strategies to make the MTW activity more effective.

FY2011-1e – Preservation and expansion of affordable housing

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Increase Housing Choices

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved and implemented in FY2011.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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.

Plan Year Update

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.

FY2018 Update: At fiscal year end, SAHA had completed Wheatley Senior Park Living (Choice Phase III, formerly known as Wheatley Courts). The new development is a 9% Low Income Tax Credit project with a total of 80 new units -- 0 market units, 4 tax-credit only units, 40 public housing units layered with tax-credits, and 36 project-based vouchers layered with tax-credits. As a result, the agency added 4 new affordable units under this activity.

FY2019 Update: This activity is on track. No new units were added during FY2019. At fiscal year end, SAHA has begun development of East Meadows II, a 9% Low Income Tax Credit project with 119 units. Leasing is expected in FY2020 - November 2019 and the remainder in January and March. The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. As indicated in the table, the Agency has met the fiscal benchmark.

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	FY2014: 113 FY2015: 158 FY2016: 0 FY2017: 77	FY2014: 113 FY2015: 158 FY2016: 0 FY2017: 77	

		FY2018: 4 FY2019: 0 Cumulative: 352	FY2018: 4 FY2019: 0 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	

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi.Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible 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. As new development plans are finalized, new targets will be set for FY2020 and beyond.

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

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Increase Housing Choices

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved in the FY2011 plan and implemented in December 2011

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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.

Plan Year Update

This activity is on track. At the end of the fiscal year, 148 households were utilizing a set-aside voucher and 55% remained housed for at least 2 years. The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. As indicated in the table, the Agency continues to work with referring partners to increase utilization and facilitate stable housing.

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 met. SAHA continues to request referrals from partners to increase utilization for this program.
	0	up to 200	148	

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%	55%	Benchmark not met.
Percentage of households served that continue to be housed after 1 years	0	90%	52%	Benchmark not met.

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: SAHA continues to work with partners to provide housing to populations facing homelessness. Benchmarks for the percentage of households served after 1 and 2 years continue to not meet benchmarks. The Agency has formed a Housing Choice Alliance with membership from different stakeholders including the partners participating in this activity and will explore additional ways to support the population served by the set-aside program.

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

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Promote Self-Sufficiency and Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved in FY2013 and implemented in FY2014.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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.

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.

Plan Year Update

This activity is not meeting some benchmarks. At the end of the fiscal year, 82 households were utilizing the simplified earned income disregard and 25 households were also active in supportive services. This activity was originally implemented to support the Social Innovation

Fund (SIF) Jobs Plus Pilot (referred to as Westside Jobs Plus Program)-- which ended services at Alazan and Mirasol on March 31, 2016. Households enrolled in S-EID through this pilot were grandfathered into the incentive and allowed to continue their participation in S-EID until the clock expires. Supportive services were also made available to the households through other self-sufficiency programs. The Agency secured additional grant funding in 2014 for a Jobs Plus Program as part of the Agency Eastside Choice Neighborhood initiatives (Annie E. Casey/Eastside Jobs Plus Program). This funding is expected to last until December 2020.

The Agency anticipates the clock to expire for the current 82 households as follows: 49 in FY2020, 28 in FY2021, and 5 in FY2022. The Agency plans to continue to use the S-EID as a financial incentive for grant supported self-sufficiency programs and is pursuing new funding opportunities.

The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. The activity is not meeting the benchmark for employment; however, the current target of 100% employed is a stretch target. While the Agency is not meeting the benchmark for SS#5, all households who were part of the original grant do have access to supportive services on a voluntary basis. The average number of household members on SEID fell short of the benchmark but has shown an increase since the baseline year.

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	Working Households:\$20,802 Total Households: \$12,030	Benchmark met.
SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
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.				
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	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.

	of activity (percent). This number may be zero.			
	0	82	48	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 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	100%	69% 48 out of 70 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?
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	1	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.
	0	up to 200	82 active in S-EID/ 25 actively receiving additional supportive services	Benchmark not 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 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	1	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.
	\$2,123 (82 HOURS * \$25.89)	\$2,123 (82 HOURS * \$25.89)	\$2,123 (82 HOURS * \$25.89)	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.
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	82	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)	4.76	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	\$177,804	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	1.3	Benchmark not met.

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: In general, this activity is working well even though some benchmarks were not met -- including employment and average S-EID participants per household. Because this activity directly supports the Agency's grant-funded self-sufficiency programs, the number of households has varied since implementation. When the activity first began, the Agency had a Jobs-Plus Grant at one of the largest properties on the west side of the city. That grant is now closed and the Agency has a new Jobs Plus Grant as part of its Choice Neighborhood efforts. This program is much smaller and has limited capacity for similar levels of enrollment as the previous grant. In addition, the Agency is running a separate EID at a separate site as part of the HUD Jobs Plus Program. EID for HUDJobs Plus Program is not covered by this MTW waiver; therefore metrics do not reflect those households. Supportive services and financial incentives are program elements that achieve the

best results when offered in combination -- the Agency continues to seek new funding to ensure supportives services can be offered and sustained for the S-EID.

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

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved and implemented in FY2013.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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.

Plan Year Update

This activity is on track. Since implementation, the Agency has saved an estimated \$588,000. The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. All outcomes have met the benchmarks and no explanation is therefore necessary.

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
	4,525 inspections * \$42.90 = \$194,123	4,525 inspections * \$35.06 = \$158,647	4,525 inspections * \$35.06 = \$158,647	Benchmark was met. Savings= \$35,476.
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	4,525 inspections x .5 hours = 2,263 hours	4,525 inspections x .5 hours = 2,263 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.
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

Per Inspection Costs

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Savings
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings	Per Inspection FY13-15: \$76.32 FY16-19: \$42.90	Per Inspection FY13-15: \$20.86 FY16-19: \$35.06	Per Inspection FY13-15: \$55.46 FY16-19: \$7.84

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible 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.

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

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Increase Housing Choices

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended This activity was approved in FY2013 and implemented in January 2014

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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).

Plan Year Update

This activity is not meeting some benchmarks. Since implementation, over 10,000 households have successfully completed the series of courses but the activity has had minimal impact on negative exits. The tables above compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric.

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 FY2018: 1,969 FY2019: 2,537	Benchmark met

SAHA Metrics

Negative Program Exit Rates

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Percent of households who attended the program and subsequently exited the housing program for a negative reason (PH + HCV)	39%	39%	44% (227/515)	Benchmark not met

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: While this activity has increased the Agency's ability to outreach to households for self-sufficiency programs and partner referrals, it continues to not meet the goal of decreasing negative exit rates. As a result, the Agency will spend the first 6 months of FY2020 evaluating curriculum and end of participation/move out data to develop new curriculum designed to address the top reasons for negative exits.

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

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved and implemented in FY2014.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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.

Plan Year Update

The FMRs increased in FY2019; therefore, this waiver was not utilized during the fiscal year.

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

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: None.

FY2014-6 – HCV Rent Reform (consolidates previously approved activities into one and renames it to clarify intent)

Previously approved

FY2014-6: Rent Simplification (HCV)

FY2015-4: Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: FY2014-6: Rent Simplification (HCV) was approved in FY2014 and implemented in July 2015. FY2015-4: Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule was approved in FY2015 and implemented in January 2014 for vouchers issued and May 2014 reexaminations.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: This activity has two elements: (1) simplified rent calculation (previously approved under FY2014-6: Rent Simplification) and (2) simplified utility allowance schedule (previously approved under FY2015-4: Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule).

(1) Rent simplification: 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. 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.

(2) Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule: 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).

Plan Year Update

This activity is on track. The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. All outcomes have met the benchmarks and no explanation is therefore necessary.

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

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
	\$25.58 * 1 * 7,499 = \$191,824	\$25.58 * .25 *7,499= \$47,956	\$25.58 * .25 *7,499= \$47,956	
CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after	Whether the outcome meets or

in staff hours (decrease).	implementation of the activity (in hours).	after implementation of the activity (in hours).	implementation of the activity (in hours).	exceeds the benchmark
	1 hour * # Households on Rent Simplification	.25 hours * # Households on Rent Simplification	.25 hours * # Households on Rent Simplification	Benchmark met
	7,499	1,875	1,875	
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%	1%	Benchmark met
CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue (HCV)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase). (Defined as Average Tenant Rent to Owner)	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.
	\$254.24	\$254.24	\$239.23	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	\$4,177	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)				
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.				
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	2,123	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 implementation of	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.

	activity (percent). This number may be zero.			
	29%	29%	28%	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.
	47	47	50	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	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	implementation of the activity (number).	implementation of the activity (number).	
	0	0	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.

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None. The utility allowance schedule was not updated during FY2019. This fiscal year is the first year where both activities are reported on together -- this eliminates duplicate cost savings reporting.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: Baseline and Benchmark calculations are updated every year with the current fiscal year average salary and benefits.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: None.

FY2015-1 – MDRC / HUD Rent Reform Study

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Increase housing choices, reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and promote self-sufficiency.

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved in the FY2015 plan and implemented in March 2015. Participants were selecting starting in March 2015 for June 2015 recertifications. The study was originally scheduled to end in 2018, but has since been extended until FY2021 to ensure researchers are able to gather information from two triennial recertification periods.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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

The Study Selection and Target Population Include:

- Participants were randomly selected for the Study from the pool of eligible vouchers. The Study Group vouchers using the MTW alternative policies described below. The Control Group vouchers are 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.

The key Rent Reform Components applied to the study group include the following six key features:

1. 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.
2. Conduct triennial income recertification rather than annual recertification with provisions for interim recertification and hardship remedies, if income decreases.
3. Streamline interim certifications to eliminate income review for most household composition changes and moves to new units.
4. 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.
5. Simplify the policy for determining utility allowances.
6. Additionally, the Study will offer appropriate hardship protections to prevent any Study Group member from being unduly impacted as discussed in Section 2i below.

Plan Year Update

This activity is on track. The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric.

Hardships: There were a total of 46 hardships received during the fiscal year. At fiscal year-end, 27 had been approved, 16 denied, and 3 were still under review. Most of the hardship requests (41) were the result of an income decrease or loss of income.

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	FY2016: \$13,649 FY2017: \$15,084	FY2016: \$6,413 FY2017: \$0	FY2016: \$6,413 (779 Study Group annuals)	Benchmark met

Certification	<p>FY2018: \$16,539 Year 1-3 Cost: \$45,273 to annually recertify 779 Study Group Households</p> <p>FY2019: \$16,539 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.83 hours per cert Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Annuals Completed: 779 enrolled in study group 	<p>FY2018: \$648 Year 1-3 Cost: \$7,062 to certify Study Group Households Year 1-3 Savings: \$38,211 (\$45,273-\$7,062)</p> <p>FY2019: \$5,866 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time: 0.39 hours per cert Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Annuals Completed 	<p>FY2017: \$0 (0 Study Group annuals) **Updated in FY2019 FY2018: \$648 (65 Study Group annuals) **Updated in FY2019 Year 1-3 Cost: \$7,062 to certify Study Group Households Year 1-3 Savings: \$38,211 (\$45,273-\$7,062)</p> <p>FY2019: \$5,866 (588 Study Group Annuals) FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time: 0.39 hours per cert Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Annuals Completed 	
Cost per Interim Certification	<p>FY2016: \$6,907 FY2017: \$7,633 FY2018: \$8,369 Year 1-3 Cost: \$22,909 for 779 Study Group Households</p> <p>FY2019: \$4,521 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.42 hours per interim Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Interims Completed: 779 enrolled in study group 	<p>FY2016: \$3,124 FY2017: \$3,453 FY2018: \$3,786 Year 1-3 Cost: \$10,364 for 779 Study Group Households Year 1-3 Savings: \$12,545 (\$22,909-\$10,364)</p> <p>FY2019: \$2,041 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.19 hours per interim Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Interims Completed 	<p>FY2016: \$0 (0 Interims) FY2017: \$1,436 (324 Interims) FY2018: \$2,041 (420 Interims) Year 1-3 Cost: \$3,477 for Study Group Households Year 1-3 Savings: \$19,432 (\$22,909-\$3,477)</p> <p>FY2019: \$899 (185 Interims) FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time: 0.19 hours per interim Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Interims Completed 	Benchmark met
Cost of Rent Calculation	<p>FY2016: \$5,427 FY2017: \$8,492 FY2018: \$10,121 Year 1-3 Cost: \$24,040 for 779 Study Group Households</p>	<p>FY2016: \$2,138 FY2017: \$983 FY2018: \$1,397 Year 1-3 Cost: \$4,517 for 779 Study Group Households Year 1-3 Savings: \$19,523 (\$24,040-\$4,517)</p>	<p>FY2016: \$2,138 (779 Calculations) FY2017: \$1,626 (536 Calculations) FY2018: \$3,179 (956 Calculations)</p>	Benchmark met

	<p>FY2019: \$10,121 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.33 hours per calculation Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Calculations Completed: 779 enrolled in study group 	<p>FY2019: \$3,987 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.13 hours per calculation Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Calculations Completed 	<p>Year 1-3 Cost: \$4,540 for Study Group Households Year 1-3 Savings: \$17,097 (\$18,000-\$4,517)</p> <p>FY2019: \$2,561 (770 Calculations) FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.13 hours per calculation Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Calculations Completed 	
Cost to Determine Income from Assets	<p>FY2016:\$21 FY2017:\$23 FY2018:\$25 Year 1-3 Cost: \$68</p> <p>FY2019: \$25 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time to determine Income from Assets: 1.27 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 Times number of Calculations Completed: Of the 779 enrolled in study group .38% will need asset calculations per traditional policy 	<p>FY2016:\$3 FY2017:\$3 FY2018: \$3 Year 1-3 Cost:\$9 Year 1-3 Savings: \$59</p> <p>FY2019: \$3 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time to determine Income from Assets: 0.17 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 Times number of Calculations Completed: Of the study group, the number with assets above \$25,000 	<p>FY2016: \$0 (0 determinations) <i>[Previously reported in error using 1,660 annuals which included birth study and control groups]</i> FY2017: \$8 (1 determination) FY2018: \$8 (1 determination) Year 1-3 Cost: \$16 Year 1-3 Savings: \$52 (\$68-\$16)</p> <p>FY2019: \$8 (1 determination) FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time to determine Income from Assets: 0.17 hours Times average staff wage: \$21.95 Times number of Calculations Completed: Of the study group, the number with assets above \$25,000 	Benchmark met
Cost to Determine utility allowance	<p>FY2016:\$2,952.50 FY2017:\$2,952.50 FY2018:\$2,952.50 Year 1-3 Cost : \$7,777.50</p> <p>FY2019: \$10,121 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming</p>	<p>FY2016:\$1,372.50 FY2017:\$0 FY2018:\$0 Year 1-3 Cost:\$1,372.50 Year 1-3 Savings:\$6,405</p> <p>FY2019: \$10,121 FY2020: forthcoming</p>	<p>FY2016: \$5,427 (779 determinations) <i>[Previously reported in error using 1,660 annuals which included both study and control groups]</i> FY2017: \$4,127 (536 determinations)</p>	Benchmark met

	Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.33 hours per calculation Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Calculations Completed: 779 enrolled in study group 	FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.33 hours per calculation Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Calculations Completed 	FY2018: \$8,070 (956 determinations) Year 1-3 Cost: forthcoming Year 1-3 Savings: forthcoming <hr/> FY2019: \$6,500 (770 determinations) FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.33 hours per calculation Times average staff wage for current FY: \$25.58 FY18 Times number of Calculations Completed 	
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	FY2016: 647 hours FY2017: 647 FY2018: 647 Year 1-3: 1,940 hours FY2019: 647 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Time: 0.83 hours per cert Times number of Annuals Completed: 779 enrolled in study group 	FY2016 :304 hours FY2017: 0 FY2018 25 Year 1-3: 329 hours Savings: 1,611 hours FY2019: 229 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time: 0.39 hours per cert Times number of Annuals Completed for study group 	FY2016: 304 (779 annuals) FY2017: 0 (0 annuals) FY2018: 25 (65 annuals) Year 1-3 Cost: 329 Year 1-3 Savings: 1,611 hours FY2019: 229 (588 annuals) FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark Time: 0.39 hours per cert Times number of Annuals Completed for study group 	Benchmark met

Time To Determine Tenant Rent	FY2016: 257 FY2017: 364 FY2018: 396 Year 1-3: 1,017 hours FY2019: 396 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Tenant Rent: 0.33 hours times the number of rent determinations completed for study group 	FY2016: 101 FY2017: 70 FY2018: 124 Year 1-3: 295 Savings: 722 FY2019: 156 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Tenant Rent: 0.13 hours times the number of rent determinations completed for study group 	FY2016: 101 FY2017: 70 FY2018: 124 Year 1-3: 295 Savings: 72 FY2019: 100 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Tenant Rent: 0.13 hours times the number of rent determinations completed for study group 	Benchmark met
Time to Determine Utility Allowance	FY2016: 257 FY2017: 364 FY2018: 396 Year 1-3: 1,017 hours FY2019: 396 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Utility Allowance: 0.17 hours times the number of UA determinations completed for study group 	FY2016: 257 hours FY2017 :177 FY2018: 31 Year 13 : 749 Savings: 268 FY2019: 396 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Utility Allowance: 0097 hours times the number of UA determinations completed for study group 	FY2016: 257 hours FY2017 :177 FY2018: 31 Year 13 : 749 Savings: 268 FY2019: 254 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to Determine Utility Allowance: 0097 hours times the number of UA determinations completed for study group 	Benchmark met
Time to Determine Income from Assets	FY2016: 1 hours FY2017: 1 FY2018: 1 Year 1-3: 3 hours FY2019: 1 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming 	FY2016: 0.13 hours FY2017: 0.13 FY2018: 0.13 Year 1-3: 0.4 hours Savings: 2.6 hours FY2019: .13 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming 	FY2016: 0 hours FY2017: 0.33 FY2018: 0.33 Year 1-3: 0.66 hours Savings: 2.3 hours FY2019: .33 FY2020: forthcoming FY2021: forthcoming Year 4-6 Cost: forthcoming Year 4-6 Savings: forthcoming 	Benchmark met

	<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%) 	<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%) 	<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 	
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	\$7,704.87	\$7,704.87	\$10,615	Benchmark met

Income of Study Group				
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 the categories identified below prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time				
(2) Employed Part-Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	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.
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				

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: 120 or 36% (2) Employed PT: 66 or 20% (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: TBD (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: TBD (5) Unemployed: 87 or 26% (6) Other: 248 or 74%	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	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?
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	16	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	\$670.36	Benchmark not 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	\$290.31	Benchmark met
SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number).</p>	<p>Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number).</p>	<p>Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.</p>
	0	0	7	<p>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.</p>
HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<p>Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).</p>	<p>Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.</p>	<p>Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).</p>	<p>Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).</p>	<p>Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.</p>
<p>Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).</p>	0	0	0	<p>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.</p>

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: The Agency has agreed to run the demonstration for an additional three years; therefore, all metrics have been updated to reflect this change. CE#1: Cost per annual certification FY17 and FY18 baselines and benchmarks were updated to correct previously reported figures. FY17 and FY18 outcomes were updates as well to correct for errors in reporting; previous outcomes collected data using a date that was not reflective of the anniversary date. Specific changes include:.

- MTW metric for FY16-17 is 0 (previously 212)
- MTW metric for FY17-18 is 65 (previously 536)

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible 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.

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

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Increase Housing Choices

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved and implemented in FY2015.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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 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 has applied are Fair Avenue (216 units) and WC White (75 units).

Plan Year Update

The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. While the benchmarks have not been met, the Agency has been able to improve the ratio and is seeing fewer resident

conflicts at these properties. The benchmarks were originally based on turnover assumptions and the reality of turnover at these properties has resulted in it taking longer to achieve the 80/20 mix.

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).	208 units occupied by elderly family	306 units occupied by elderly family	286 units occupied by elderly family/ 78 additional units occupied by elderly family (286 minus 208)	Benchmark not 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	170 units occupied by elderly family	160 units occupied by elderly family/ 50 additional units occupied by elderly family (160 minus 110)	Benchmark not 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	60 units occupied by elderly family	53 units occupied by elderly family/ 15 additional units occupied by elderly family (53 minus 38)	Benchmark not met.
At Lewis Chatham, number of housing units made available for elderly households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase).	60 units occupied by elderly family	76 units occupied by elderly family	73 units occupied by elderly family/ 13 additional units occupied by elderly family (73 minus 60)	Benchmark not met.

SAHA Metrics

Elderly Household Percentage				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Percentage of units occupied by elderly households	Percentage of units occupied by elderly households prior to	Expected percentage of units occupied by elderly households after	Actual percentage of units occupied by elderly households	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

	implementation of the activity	implementation of the activity	after implementation of the activity	
Total	51%	80%	71%	Benchmark not met.
Fair Avenue	51%	80%	75%	Benchmark not met.
WC White	51%	80%	71%	Benchmark not met.
Lewis Chatham	51%	80%	62%	Benchmark not met.

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: None.

FY2015-3 – Modified Project Based Vouchers

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness and increase housing choices

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved and implemented in FY2015.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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.

Plan Year Update

This activity is on track. The tables above compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. All outcomes have met the benchmarks and no explanation is therefore necessary.

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)	0	0	0	Benchmark met

<i>Previously added units</i>				
Gardens at San Juan Square (FY15)	0	31	31	
East Meadows (FY17)	0	8	8	
Wheatley Senior Park Senior Living (FY18)	0	36	36	
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.
Wheatley Park Senior Living	# of units * average per unit cost (PUC) * 12 months 36 * \$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.
Wheatley Park Senior Living	# of recertifications after 3 years (due to triennial recertification schedule) * average staff time per recertification (in hours) 36 * 1.5 = 54 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	Metrics listed by community below.			
80% AMI	80% AMI	75% AMI	NA	NA – There were no 80% AMI occupants
60% AMI	60% AMI	55% AMI	NA	NA – There were no 60% AMI occupants
50% AMI	50% AMI	45% AMI	34% AMI	Benchmark met
30% AMI	30% AMI	25% AMI	18% AMI	Benchmark met

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: The Agency continues to be able to provide deep subsidized units at new mixed-income developments by allocated modified project-based units. While there are no challenges related to this activity this fiscal year, the activity is connected to FY2011-1e and assumes the challenges noted under FY2011-1e. The Agency expects to allocated additional modified project-based vouchers as part of its FY2020 Expansion Plan. As new development plans are finalized, new targets will be set for FY2020 and beyond.

FY2017-1 – Thrive in Five

(formerly referred to as Time Limited Working Referral Program)

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Promote Self-Sufficiency

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved in December 2016 and implemented in FY2017. The activity was re-proposed to replace a previous pilot which was closed out in FY2016 (FY13-1 Limited Working Preference)

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships: 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.

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 recertification schedule. 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) (MTW Activity: FY13-2 Simplified EID). For households living in Cassiano, the new Cassiano Jobs-Plus program will require an EID.

Plan Year Update

The activity is ongoing and off schedule due to continued low enrollment in FY2019. The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. At fiscal year end, 27 households were enrolled in the program. Many of the benchmarks have not been met. Employment rates for cohorts 2 and 3 were near the target while cohort 1 was well below the target. As discussed below, the Agency has streamlined case management practices to ensure all cohorts are receiving consistent support. While each cohort made income gains, they are not at the level that

would be required to meet the 5 year goal for self-sufficiency. Annual targets assume a steady increase income. Because case management focused on career pathways, it may be more realistic to expect higher income gains in years 4 and 5. The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric.

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

HUD Standard Metrics

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:	\$19,550	\$17,344	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	27	20	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%	74% (20 out of 27)	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	Households receiving TANF prior	Expected number of households	Actual number of households	Whether the outcome meets or

receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	to implementation of the activity (number)	receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	exceeds the benchmark.
	0	0	2	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)	27	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	\$332.08	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	\$208.07	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	3.3 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	Cohort 1: \$26,600 Cohort 2: \$21,900 Cohort 3: \$17,713	Cohort 1: \$19,502 Cohort 2: \$14,818 Cohort 3: \$17,713	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	Cohort 1: 11 Cohort 2: 8 Cohort 3: 8	Cohort 1: 6 Cohort 2: 7 Cohort 3: 7	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)	Cohort 1: 100% Cohort 2: 100%	Cohort 1: 55% Cohort 2: 88% Cohort 3: 88%	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)	Cohort 1: 23 Cohort 2: 100 Cohort 3: 50	Cohort 1: 11 Cohort 2: 8 Cohort 3: 8	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	Cohort 1: 95% at 5 years (2021) Cohort 2: 95% at 5 years (2023) Cohort 3: 95% at 5 years (2024)	Cohort 1: 0 Cohort 2: 0 Cohort 3: 0	Benchmark 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	Cohort 1: 5% Cohort 2: 5% Cohort 3: 5%	Cohort 1: 0 Cohort 2: 0 Cohort 3: 0	Benchmark met

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: During FY2019, the Agency reviewed its case management practices in order to apply lessons learned. As a result, households in the original cohort carried over from the previous activity (FY13-1 Limited Working Preference) were transitioned from multiple case managers to a single case manager. The *Thrive in Five* case manager is tasked with all households enrolled in the program. This ensures case management consistency and streamlines coordination between the supportive services department and the housing operations department. In addition, the Agency is currently developing a plan to extend the term-limit for the original cohort to ensure they receive the same level of intensive case management that is needed to be successful in moving out of subsidized housing.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: Due to the limited data availability from the partner, CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged metric has been removed from this activity. The Agency has not been able to secure this data since implementation and does not expect to be able to secure it moving forward.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: In general, the benchmarks have not been met -- some of which are likely the result of setting unrealistic income and employment benchmarks. One of the Agency's strategies for preparing residents for self-sufficiency is promoting education pathways that will lead to employment in targeted

industries in our local economy -- targeted industries with positive future growth opportunities and livable wages. As a result, slower increases in income and employment are expected as residents prepare to enter these industries. In addition to rolling out new marketing materials, the Agency continues to review the referral and admissions process to identify possible solutions for a lower than expected admissions rate. During this fiscal year, the Agency's workforce partner experienced leadership changes which may have caused transition-related challenges for this program. During the first 6 months of FY2020, the Agency will develop an action plan to address low enrollment.

FY2017-2 – Restorative Housing Pilot Program

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Promote self-sufficiency

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was approved in December 2016 and implemented in May 2017.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships

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.

Plan Year Update

This activity is ongoing and off schedule due to low enrollment in FY2019. This pilot was originally scheduled to run for two years. Due to low enrollment, the Agency has decided to extend the pilot to allow time to address low enrollment. As of the end of FY2019, there were four probationers enrolled. As a result, metrics will be reported on once more pilot slots have been filled.

In addition, the Agency has partnered with an external evaluator to evaluate the pilot. The evaluation is not being paid for by the Agency nor is it PHA-directed; rather, the Agency has entered into a Data Sharing Agreement that allows the researchers to conduct their evaluation.

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	\$6475	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
(2) Employed Part- Time	Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program	5% increase	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	Baseline will be established as clients are	5% increase	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report

	admitted into the program			
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program	5% increase	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
(5) Unemployed	Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program	5% decrease	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
(2) Employed Part- Time	Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program	5% increase	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program	5% increase	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program	5% increase	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
(5) Unemployed	Baseline will be established as clients are	5% decrease	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report

	admitted into the program			
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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 of 2-year pilot program)	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 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 FY2020 Report	Forthcoming in FY2020 Report
--	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	------------------------------

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: None.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: The Agency continues to review the referral and admissions process to identify possible solutions for a lower than expected enrollment rate. During the first 6 months of FY2020, the Agency will develop an action plan to address low enrollment.

FY2019-1 – Local Small Area Fair Market Rent (SAFMR) Implementation

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Increase Housing Choices

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was proposed in the FY2019 MTW Plan and approved in June 2018. Implementation began July 1, 2019. Because SAHA meets with clients 120 days in advance of their certification date, the transition to phase I of the new policy was effective October 1 for new admissions and moves and November 1 for recertifications.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships

This activity is designed to achieve the MTW statutory objective to increase housing choices for low-income families, by creating payment standards that better reflect market conditions in different parts of San Antonio, and so making a larger number of San Antonio neighborhoods affordable for voucher households. This activity is a local implementation of HUD's Small Area Fair Market Rents (SAFMR).

Because of the potential impact (positive and negative) on a large number of voucher households, this activity phases in SAFMR over multiple fiscal years in order to control for negative and unanticipated consequences, to make use of the latest research and market data, and to maintain a constant number of households served.

Below are the principles and parameters the Agency used in developing this activity:

(1) Maintain Number of Households Served

- No decrease in capacity to serve the same number of households

(2) Minimize Negative Impact

- Minimize negative impact for existing households in low-cost neighborhoods
- No disparate impact on protected classes, including locally recognized classes (sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, and age)

(3) Make the SAFMR as easy to use as possible

- Households and landlords have limited time and resources; program design should facilitate program implementation

(4) Leverage the Value of the Voucher

- Maximize value of vouchers in targeted growth areas and rapidly changing neighborhoods

This activity makes use of one waiver: establish local submarket payment standards.

(1) Local Submarket Payment Standards

Currently, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) publishes fair market rents (MAFMRs) annually for each metropolitan statistical area in the United States and requires each housing authority to adopt a payment standard schedule for each MAFMR area in its jurisdiction. HUD allows housing authorities to establish the payment standard amounts at any level between

90% and 110% of the published FMR. Payment Standards are used to calculate the maximum subsidy that the PHA will pay each month toward rent and utilities for families with Housing Choice Vouchers.

The current process for establishing payment standards includes analyzing the published MAFMRs when published, presenting the recommended schedule to the Board of Commissioners for approval, and implementing the new schedule over a twelve month phase-in for clients that have a reexaminations and all new admission contracts effective on or after the effective date. Due to biennial and triennial recertifications under the agencies MTW status, the impact to HAP expenditures are typically phased-in over a period of three years. In FY2018, HUD published MAFMRs in September 2018 and SAHA implemented the new payment standards effective January 1, 2019.

Under the new Small Area Fair Market (SAFMR) regulation, the San Antonio Housing Authority is required to implement this process using SAFMRs which are based on ZIP codes as opposed to the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area; however, because the Agency is designated as a Moving to Work (MTW) Program, it is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policy to establish payment standards for tenant-based assistance that differ from the currently mandated program requirements.

The Agency is requesting this waiver in Year 1 (FY2018-2019) for the following:

- (1) Subject to funding availability: Increase Payment Standards in higher cost areas subject to a maximum available subsidy expenditure during the first year (currently estimated at \$1.5M).
- (2) 2-Tier Policy Map: Establish a temporary two-tier Policy Map composed of grouped ZIP codes for Year 1 implementation.
- (3) Exception Overlay: Establish an exception overlay as a mechanism that provides greater flexibility to adjust payment standard schedules to mitigate involuntary displacement in rapidly changing markets and/or coordinate support for place-based redevelopment or revitalization initiatives (such as Choice Neighborhood). The overlay could include entire ZIP codes or smaller geographies such as census blocks, tracts, and locally defined neighborhoods. Areas would be selected based on timely market information and other local information that would support the need for a higher payment standard.
- (4) Exception payment standards: The Agency is requesting to set payment standards outside the 90-110% of the MAFMR and SAFMRs.

Plan Year Update

In general, this activity performed as expected during its first year of implementation. Below are key updates:

- Implementation: Operations staff focused on implementation details during the early months of the fiscal year; developing standard operating procedures, training, forms, communications, and surveys.

- **Data Integrity:** During the fiscal year, the Agency engaged in intensive data integrity work to ensure the software and key staff were properly adapting to the specialized reporting required for this activity.
- **Hardships:** The Agency received no hardship requests as a result of this activity.
- **Financial Impact:** The Agency was successful in managing expenses related to this activity. The Agency met the cap for Tier 2 payment standards in March 2019.
- **Annual evaluation:** In addition to this report, the Agency is currently completing a more in-depth evaluation of phase I of this activity in collaboration with stakeholders who participate in the SAHA-facilitated MTW SAFMR Technical Work Committee and the MTW Housing Choice Alliance.

The tables below compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. As indicated in the tables, this activity performed as expected during the first transition year.

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.
	\$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.

Note: The Agency does not anticipate any cost savings as a result of this activity. Staff workloads related to the application of the new payment standards is expected to remain the same.

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	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

		hours).	hours).	
	0 hours	0 hours	0 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.

Note: The Agency does not anticipate any cost savings as a result of this activity. Staff workloads related to the application of the new payment standards is expected to remain the same.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	25% (343) of existing voucher clients move to a unit in Tier 2 (FY2017)	More than 25% (~400) of existing voucher clients move to a unit in Tier 2 (FY2019)	32% (353 movers + 348 new admissions) moved to a unit located in Tier 2	Benchmark met

SAHA Metrics

Lease-up Success Rate by Post-Move Tier				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Percent of vouchers issued that were leased-up within 120 days	Tier 1: 85% Tier 2: 90% Tier 1 EO: 91%	Tier 1: 85% Tier 2: 90% Tier 1 EO: 91%	Tier 1: 85% Tier 2: 90% Tier 1 EO: 91%	Benchmark met

Average # of days searching by Post-Move Tier

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average number days between the date the voucher is issued and the date the request for tenancy (RTA) is approved.	58 days	No change in Year 1: Tier 1: 58 days Tier 2: 58 days	Tier 1: 53 days Tier 2: 50 days Tier 1 EO: 44 days	Benchmark met

Average HAP by Tier				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average Housing Assistance Payment by Tier	CY 2017 avg: \$590	Tier 1: \$609 Tier 2: \$616 Tier 1 EO: \$612	Tier 1: \$609 Tier 2: \$616 Tier 1 EO: \$612	Benchmark met

Households moving to a better neighborhood by Post-Move Tier				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Percentage of households <u>self-reporting</u> that they <i>consider the unit for which they submitted a request to be in a better neighborhood than their current place of residence</i> on post-move surveys (increase).	87%	87%	87%	Benchmark met

HCV Concentration by Tier				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HCV households living in each Tier as a percentage of total renter households	Tier 1: 9.4% Tier 2: 2.0%	No Change in Year 1 Tier 1: 9.4% Tier 2: 2.0%	Tier 1: 8.7% Tier 2: 2.0%	Benchmark met

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: Due to the approval process for Phase II to be implemented in FY2020, Phase I will continue running until December 2019/February 2020.

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection

- **HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility:** This HUD required metric calls for the reporting of number of households. The Agency set baselines and benchmarks using a proportion of households and believes the proportion is a better indicator of success. To accommodate HUD reporting requirements, the Agency will report on both. In addition, outcomes will reflect both existing clients who are moving as well as new clients admitted into the program based on their destination.
- **Lease-up Success Rate by Post-Move Tier:** The baseline and benchmark were reset using FY2019 actuals. The metric previously reported a rate of 37.7%. After intensive data integrity reviews, it was determined the original estimate was not accurate. The Agency has since set up tracking protocols that will allow for better data on leasing success rates.
- **Households moving to preferred neighborhood by Post-Move Tier:** This metric was originally developed prior to the finalization of the Agency's post-move survey. The metric has been slightly amended to reflect the actual question being asked: *"Do you consider the unit for which you are submitting a request to be in a better neighborhood than your current place of residence?"*. The metric name is now *Households moving to a better neighborhood by Post-Move Tier*.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None, the Agency recently received approval for Phase II as part of its FY2020 MTW Plan which outlines significant changes to take effect in FY2020.

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: While the Agency generally met the metric benchmarks, Phase I was focused on establishing a new framework for setting payment standards. This activity is not expected to have an immediate impact on many of the metrics; rather, the phased-in approach is expected to lead to slow but steady progress on its objectives while balancing financial impact to the Agency and to the clients served through the voucher program.

FY2019-2 – Alternate Recertification Process (PH and HCV)

MTW Statutory Objective(s): Increase Housing Choices

i. Plan Year Approved, Implemented, Amended: This activity was proposed in the FY2019 MTW Plan and approved in June 2018. Implementation began July 1, 2019. Because SAHA meets with clients 120 days in advance of their certification date, the transition of the new policy was effective in full by November 1, 2018. For AHP, implementation began July 1, 2019. For PH, the new triennial schedule was implemented effective September 1, 2018 for new admissions and November 1, 2018 for recertifications.

ii. Description/Impact/Update/Rent Reform Hardships

This activity has three main components that are designed to streamline and simplify the recertification process: (1) alternate schedule, (2) alternate public housing review procedures, and (3) alternate income verification methods. It consolidates and updates three previously approved activities related to the first two elements (FY2014-4 Biennial Reexaminations, FY2014-5 Triennial Reexaminations, and FY2016-2 Biennial and Triennial Notification of Rent Type Option) and adds a new waiver for the third element.

(1) Alternate Recertification Schedule (PH and HCV)

This proposed activity establishes biennial and triennial schedules for reexaminations for the low income public housing and housing choice voucher programs. The Agency has been using alternative schedules since 2011; this new activity streamlines the schedules across both programs. The effective change will move approximately half of public housing households from biennials to triennials; the other half of public housing households will remain on the biennial schedule. The housing choice voucher program will maintain current reexamination schedules as established in FY2014 under FY2014-4/FY2014-5.

Every household will have the option of interim reexaminations if there is a change in household composition or income according to HCV and PH policy.

Beginning FY2016, SAHA created a local form with an expiration date of 39 months to replace the HUD-9886 Form with its 15 month expiration date. In the future, SAHA may create its own local forms with different expiration dates or other elements to accommodate this activity.

Definitions: For purposes of assigning a recertification schedule to each household, the Agency will utilize the following to apply the two schedules:

Triennial: A household is eligible for a triennial schedule if the household has at least one elderly or disabled household member and the household receives 100% of their income from fixed sources. SAHA defines fixed income as Social Security (SS), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and/or pension.

Biennial: Households not eligible for a triennial schedule are eligible for a biennial schedule.

(2) Alternate PH Review Procedures (PH only)

Typically in the low income public housing program, PHAs are required to review community service requirements and inform public housing residents of the option of paying income-based rent or a flat rent on an annual cycle. Additionally, PHAs are obligated to conduct annual updates of family composition for these public housing families who have chosen to pay flat rent regardless of HUD-allowed triennial recertifications for those families.

As residents move to biennial and triennial recertification schedules, it becomes more efficient to coordinate notification and update requirements in accordance with their new recertification schedules. Therefore, SAHA proposes to conduct review procedures related to community service requirements, flat rent notice and family composition updates for PH individuals at the time of reexamination.

(3) Alternate Income Verification Methods (PH and HCV)

Currently, SAHA accepts self-certification for assets valued below \$5,000. In order to further streamline administrative processes, SAHA will accept the family's self-certification of the value of family assets and anticipated asset income for net assets totaling \$25,000 or less. Third-party verification of assets will still be required for assets totaling a value more than \$25,000.

According to HUD's Verification Hierarchy, SAHA must send a form to third-party sources for verification of income if the tenant-provided documents are not acceptable or are disputed. In order to increase the rate of files completed in a timely manner, SAHA will skip the third-party verification form and instead use oral third party verification when tenant-provided documents are unacceptable.

In addition to streamlining methods of document verification, SAHA wanted to reduce the number of applicants resubmitting documents for approved extensions of voucher (if in HCV Program) and/or reasonable accommodations. SAHA has revised its policy to extend the length of time that applicant-provided documents would be valid for verification purposes. Applicant-provided documents dated within 90 calendar days from the eligibility appointment would be valid. This does not apply to permanent documents such as social security cards, birth certificates, and identification cards.

Both methods will apply to the low income public housing and housing choice voucher programs.

Plan Year Update

This activity is on track. The tables above compare the baselines and benchmarks for each metric. All outcomes have met the benchmarks and no explanation is therefore necessary.

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). Definition: Cost of staff time	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.
	HCV: \$407,067 PH: \$201,964.50 Total: \$609,032	HCV: \$161,845 PH: \$108,806.10 Total: \$270,651 Expected savings: 338,381	HCV: \$113,729 PH: \$82,423 Total: \$196,152 Actual savings: \$412,880	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). Definitions: Total time to complete recertifications during the fiscal year.	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.
	HCV: 15,914 hours PH: 8,325 hours Total: 24,239 hours	HCV: 6,327 hours PH: 4,485 hours Total: 10,812 hours Expected savings: 13,427 hours	HCV: 4,446 hours PH: 3,398 hours Total: 7,844 hours Actual savings: 16,395 hours	Benchmark met

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV: 16% PH: 45%	HCV: 16% PH: 40%	HCV: 16% PH: 25%	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.
Definition: Total HAP + UAP Costs plus Total Rental Revenue from public housing residents	HCV: \$2,524,901 PH: \$948,394 Total: \$3,286,608	No change expected	HCV: \$2,508,226 PH: \$1,015,778 Total: \$3,524,004	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.

iii. Actual Non-Significant Changes: None

iv. Actual Changes to Metrics/Data Collection: The baseline and benchmark for CE#3 HCV was updated from 31% and 25% to 16% and 16%, respectively. Previous figures were not isolating error rates for asset and method of verification processes. The baseline and benchmarks for CE#1 were updated for HCV to include updated salary data. The baseline and benchmark for CE#5 PH was updated from \$761,707 to \$948,394 after further review of previous data tracking methods.

v. Actual Significant Changes: None

vi. Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies: None

A. Activities on Hold

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

B. Closed Out Activities

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 be 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).

FY2014-1 – 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 F2016 and replaced with FY2017-1 to incorporates 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.

FY2014-4 – Biennial Reexaminations (HCV and PH)

FY2014-5 – Triennial Reexaminations (HCV)

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

Both the Biennial and Triennial activities were approved in FY2014 and implemented in January 2014. FY2016-2 was approved and implemented in FY2016. All three activities were closed out IN FY2018 and replaced with the approved FY2019-1 Alternative Recertification Process. FY2019-2 has three main components that are designed to streamline and simplify the recertification process: (1) alternate schedule, (2) alternate public housing review procedures, and (3) alternate income verification methods. It consolidates and updates three previously approved activities related to the first two elements (FY2014-4 Biennial Reexaminations, FY2014-5 Triennial Reexaminations, and FY2016-2 Biennial and Triennial Notification of Rent Type Option) and adds a new waiver for the third element. In addition, reporting cost savings on each of these activities is confusing and redundant. The new activity will track the cost savings of the the streamlined recertification process across both programs and all households.

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

i. Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

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

As a block grant agency, SAHA combines PH, HCV, and Capital Fund Program (CFP) 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

ii. Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year

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

SAHA's Board of Commissioners approved the consolidated operating budget on June 7, 2018, for FY2019. 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
- Section 8 funding shortfall: \$1.5 million
- Preservation & Development: \$33.9 million
 - Choice Implementation matching funds for Wheatley Courts Transformation: \$1.5 million
 - Development of Chavez Multi-family Property: \$5.5 million
 - Expenditures related to capital planning activities: \$400 thousand
 - Funding for rehabilitation of Victoria Plaza: \$10 million
 - Additional funding for East Meadows Development: \$600 thousand
 - Preservation and Expansion of Affordable and Public Housing: \$15.9 million

- MTW Initiatives: Program and administration and implementation (described in the next section): \$1.4 million

iii. Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

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

ACTUAL USE OF MTW SINGLE FUND FLEXIBILITY

The Agency uses moving to work funds to support the Community Development Initiatives Department for MTW program administration and implementation. These funds allow the Agency to provide higher quality supportive services to residents than would otherwise be permitted by grant funding alone. In addition, the Agency is able to more effectively engage with partners and leverage resources for the benefit of the residents.

Below are specific program uses of the moving to work funds that are not covered by other authorizations reported in other sections of this report.

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

- REACH Awards: recognize and reward students annually for academic achievement.
- College Scholarship Program: funds scholarships for students annually to provide much needed support to ensure higher educational achievement.
- Education Summit: provides residents with access to education and college resources, financial literacy, and other self-help resources.

Resident Ambassador Empower Program: The Resident Ambassador Program provides 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: This program provides students with 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 serves 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.
- Annual Father's Day initiative: engages families in positive family activities and recognize fathers' contributions through "El Hombre Noble" awards

Fiscal Year 2019 MTW Initiatives Outcomes

Below are key outcomes for the Agency's resident services initiatives. All initiatives are supported by the Agency's investment in the MTW Program Administration.

MTW INITIATIVES SCORECARD

★ Exceeds | ✔ Met Target or On Track
! Near Target | ✗ Did not Meet Target

	Metric	FY2019 Target	FY2019 Actual	FY2019 Status
① Improve Quality of Life for residents	Events/Activities Hosted	1,500	1,756	★
	Residents Participating	18,000	44,190	★
	Active Resident Councils	30	25	!
② Provide Access to resources and non-SAHA programs	Food Assistance Value	\$1,300,000	\$1,272,973	!
	Count of Household Food Assistance Deliveries	11,000	50,387	★
	Referrals for Services	3,000	8,197	★
	In-kind value	NA	\$183,626	--
	Health Fairs	36	53	★
	Residents Participating	NA	821	--
	Number of Awards (REACH & Scholarships)	250	84	✗
	REACH Awards	200	60	✗
	College Scholarships	50	24	✗
	Total Awarded Amount	\$50,000	\$31,955	✗
	REACH Awards	NA	\$1,885	--
	College Scholarships	NA	\$30,070	--
	Summer Youth Employed	80	68	✗
③ Improve Resident Capacity	FSS/Jobs Plus Participants	1,500	1,813	★
	Residents enrolled into education and training	35%	30%	!
	Residents maintaining employment	40%	46%	★
	Resident Council training	4	4	✔
	Early Engagement sessions [Activity FY2014-2]	10	11	★
	Participants	2,000	2,537	★
	Residents completing ConnectHome Training	200	311	★
	Devices Distributed	200	311	★
	Households Connected	200	245	★
	Households Assessed by Elderly Disabled Services	1,468	--	--
	Households maintaining independence	80%	--	--
	Resident Ambassadors Employed	24	21	!
④ Facilitate residents to achieve Self-Sufficiency	FSS Graduates	TBD	28	✔
	Escrow Total	TBD	\$206,662	✔
	Escrow Average	TBD	\$7,381	✔
	GED/HS Diplomas Earned	TBD	38	✔
	Certifications Earned	TBD	99	✔
	Residents Securing Employment	TBD	322	✔
⑤ Improve Agency Performance	Grant dollars secured	NA	\$1,600,000	✔
	EIF dollars raised	NA	\$90,000	✔
	Scholarships Secured (NAHRO)	NA	5	✔

Note: "--" On Hold: Elderly Disabled Services is currently revamping its data system and process.

B. Local Asset Management Plan

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

Not Applicable

VI. Administrative

A. Reviews, Audits and Inspections

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 316 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. Evaluation Results

Results of latest PHA-directed evaluations of the demonstration.

SAHA is not currently engaged in any agency-wide evaluations of its MTW program.

C. MTW Statutory Requirement Certification

Certification that the PHA has met the three statutory requirements in the Plan Year of: (1) ensuring that at least 75% of households assisted by the MTW PHA are very low-income, (2) continuing to assist substantially the same total number of households as would have been assisted had the MTW PHA not participated in the MTW demonstration, and (3) maintaining a comparable mix of households (by family size) served as would have been served had the MTW PHA not participated in the MTW demonstration.

See the following page.

D. MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data

Not Applicable

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, 17,755 households out of a total of 18,194 (98%) households in public housing and MTW vouchers were very low-income (<50% AMI). In addition, 62% of LNT new admissions were 50% and below.

	Total Households	Number below 50% AMI	% Below 50% AMI
PH at FYE	5,596	5,481	98%
Vouchers at FYE	12,598	12,274	97%
LNT at admissions	78	48	62%
Total	18,272	17,803	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: The Agency's FY2019 MTW families served (annual average) is 18,198 out of 17,867 MTW adjusted baseline denominator (102%). SAHA continues to serve substantially the same number of households as it did upon entering the MTW demonstration.

	MTW Baseline	FY2019 Average Leasing	MTW Baseline Compliance Calculation
PH	5,721	5,644	98%
Vouchers	12,146	12,343	102%
Other (Local, Non-Traditional)	---	211	NA
Total	17,867	18,198	102%

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: The Agency continues to serve a comparable mix of households by household size.

Mix of Family Sizes Served

	MTW Baseline	FY2019 Percentage (FYE)	Percentage Change
1-person	36%	38%	2%
2-person	16%	18%	2%
3-person	18%	17%	-1%
4-person	15%	13%	-2%
5-person	9%	8%	-1%
6-person+	7%	6%	-1%



David Nisivoccia
President and CEO

9.30.19

Date

Moving to Work Annual Report
Fiscal Year 2019: July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

Submitted September 30, 2019

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