



# Seattle Housing Authority **Moving to Work** 2019 Annual Report



**April 30, 2020**

# Seattle Housing Authority leadership

## Board of Commissioners

Paul Purcell, Chair  
Paula L. Houston, Ed.D., Vice Chair  
Robert Crutchfield  
Michael Diaz  
Twyla Minor  
Gerald Smiley  
Deborah Canavan Thiele  
Andrew Lofton, Executive Director & Board Secretary-Treasurer

## Executive staff

Andrew Lofton, Executive Director  
Anne Fiske Zuniga, Deputy Executive Director  
Rod Brandon, Director of Housing Operations  
Kerry Coughlin, Director of Communications  
Jared Cummer, Director of Housing Finance and Asset Management  
James Fearn, General Counsel  
Terry Galiney, Director of Development  
Alice Kimbowa, Director of Rental Assistance Programs  
Andria Lazaga, Director of Policy and Strategic Initiatives  
Steve McDowell, Chief Information Officer  
Marc Nilsen, Director of Human Relations  
Lisa Wolters, Director of Intergovernmental Relations  
Shelly Yapp, Chief Financial Officer

## Report prepared by

Lily Sweeney, Policy Coordinator

With contributions and support from: Kim Breed, Andy Chan, Bobby Coleman, Jared Cummer, David Edwards, Dani Fitts, Tristan Heart-Meyers, Ali Kamenz, Chris Klaeyesen, Mark LaBrayere, Ian Langer, Andria Lazaga, Derek Moretz, Miki Naganuma, Eva Rubio-Reboca, Lori Sjoden, Cindy Sribhibhad, Lori Stehlik, Andrew Tuttle, Christa Valles, Scott Woo

## Table of contents

<b>(I) Introduction</b>	4
Overview of short-term and long-term MTW goals and objectives	4
<b>(II) General operating information</b>	6
Housing stock information	6
Leasing information	16
Waiting list information	18
Information on statutory objectives and requirements	19
<b>(III) Proposed MTW activities</b>	22
<b>(IV) Approved MTW activities</b>	23
Implemented activities	24
Not yet implemented activities	76
Activities on hold	77
Closed out activities	78
<b>(V) Sources and uses of MTW funds</b>	85
Actual sources and uses of MTW funds	85
Local asset management plan	86
<b>(VI) Administrative</b>	87
Reviews, audits and inspections	87
Evaluation results	87
MTW statutory requirement certification	87
MTW energy performance contract flexibility data	87
<b>Appendix A: Housing stock and leasing overview</b>	88
<b>Appendix B: New project-based voucher units</b>	92
<b>Appendix C: Household and applicant demographic information</b>	94
<b>Appendix D: Local asset management plan</b>	98

## (I) Introduction

The mission of the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA), a public corporation, is to enhance the Seattle community by creating and sustaining decent, safe and affordable living environments that foster stability and self-sufficiency for people with low incomes.

SHA provided affordable housing to nearly 37,000 people in 2019, with 86% of these living in neighborhoods throughout the city. SHA operates a variety of programs that include agency-operated housing, partner-operated communities and private rental housing.

In 2019, participants included approximately 12,000 children and 13,000 elderly people and people with disabilities. Over 80% of SHA households had annual incomes below 30% area median income while the median income of residents in SHA-subsidized housing was \$13,116.

In keeping with our mission, SHA also supports a wide range of community services for residents, including employment services, case management and youth activities.

Funding for the agency's activities comes from multiple sources including the HUD MTW Block Grant, special purpose HUD funds, other government grants, tenant rents and revenues from other activities.

### Overview of short-term and long-term MTW goals and objectives

#### Short-term goals and objectives

SHA's short-term MTW goals and objectives for 2019 included the following three new strategies:

- **Disregard of student financial aid as income (Strategy 10.H.15):** This activity extends a standard public housing policy to SHA's voucher households. The policy excludes all student financial aid from all income calculations.
- **Incentives for positive tenant departures and housing stability (Strategy 13.P.02):** This activity allows SHA to provide financial incentives to promote housing stability and support public housing households to successfully vacate a public housing unit.
- **Streamlined local timelines and processes for improved leasing success (Strategy 19.H.04):** This strategy allows SHA to adopt local timelines and processes for new and moving with continued assistance voucher households.

All three strategies were implemented fully in 2019. Additional information on each can be found in Section IV: Approved MTW activities.

#### Long-term goals and objectives

MTW is a critical tool in SHA's ability to advance our mission and achieve our strategic goals and objectives. Our long-term MTW goals are to retain the flexibility and stability of the MTW program so we can maximize the impact of the limited federal funding we receive for people with low incomes in our community in need of affordable housing. SHA concentrates our efforts on resources, strategies and partnerships to:

- Expand housing opportunities: creating more affordable housing and diversifying housing choice.
- Promote quality communities: ensuring that all SHA communities offer a high-quality living environment.
- Improve quality of life: investing in services that help people lead healthy, productive lives.

MTW provides the flexibility to design and test various approaches for providing and administering housing assistance while still meeting the goals of MTW and the priorities of our local community.

The COVID-19 pandemic, which struck our community, the nation and the world beginning in early 2020, exemplifies the necessity of MTW. The context in which we operate changed rapidly and dramatically and will continue to do so throughout the rest of the year and likely beyond, but our values and strategic goals did not. Throughout 2019 and into 2020, as we have done for the last 20 years, SHA continues to leverage MTW to adapt and innovate for the benefit of our residents and our community.

## (II) General operating information

### Housing stock information

#### Actual new project-based vouchers

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
Compass Broadview (King County Combined Funders Allocation)	25	18	Leased/Issued	No	Unit set asides for families exiting homelessness through the King County Combined Funders Allocation. Referrals are from YWCA's Rapid Rehousing program. Services include case management, education and employment support and community resource referrals.
Mt. Baker Village RAD2 Conversion	0	53	Leased/Issued	Yes	RAD conversion from Mod Rehab. Project includes a variety of affordable housing units, including family-size units.
Red Cedar	80	80	Leased/Issued	No	Yesler Terrace redevelopment.
St. Martin's on Westlake RAD2 Conversion	0	142	Leased/Issued	Yes	RAD conversion from Mod Rehab. Project is a 53-unit SRO building for chronically homeless men operated by Catholic Housing Services.
The Wintonia Hotel RAD2 Conversion	0	92	Leased/Issued	Yes	RAD conversion from Mod Rehab. Project is a 92-unit SRO building operated by Catholic Housing Services.

<b>105</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>Planned/actual total vouchers newly project-based</b>
------------	------------	--

Please describe differences between the planned and actual number of vouchers newly project-based.

There are two main factors that influenced the difference between the planned and actual number of newly project-based vouchers.

1. SHA dedicated 25 PBVs to the King County Combined Funders Allocation, which were assigned to Compass Broadview (18 vouchers) and the Lewiston Apartments (seven vouchers). The seven vouchers we ended up project-basing for the Lewiston

Apartments were Mainstream Vouchers and are therefore no longer included in our MTW count of PBVs.

2. In 2019, SHA was approached to help administer the vouchers for three Mod Rehab programs that underwent RAD2 conversions (Mt. Baker Village, St. Martin's on Westlake and The Wintonia Hotel). We agreed to the partnership and took over the administration of an additional 287 PBVs.

#### Actual existing project-based vouchers

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
104 <sup>th</sup> Street Townhomes	3	3	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
A Place of Our Own	19	19	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Albion Place	12	12	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services
Aldercrest Apartments	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Arbora Court	40	40	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Aridell Mitchell Home	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Arion Court	36	36	Leased/Issued	Yes	Homeless adults
Aurora House	30	30	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Avalon Place	9	9	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Baldwin Apartments	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Beacon House	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Bellevue/Olive Apartments	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Bergan Place	2	2	Leased/Issued	No	Homeless young adults
Bergan Place	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Brettler Family Place I	51	51	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Brettler Family Place II	21	21	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families and individuals
Broadway Crossing	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Broadway Crossing	9	9	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
Bush Hotel	7	7	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Casa Pacifica I	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Casa Pacifica II	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Cascade Court	3	3	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Cascade Court	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Cate Apartments	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Cate Apartments	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Centerwood Apartments	2	2	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Colonial Gardens	20	20	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Columbia Court	13	13	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Compass Cascade	33	33	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Compass on Dexter	36	36	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Council House	30	30	Leased/Issued	No	Senior housing
CPC 10 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NW	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services
CPC Alderbrook	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services
CPC cluster homes	14	14	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services
Crestwood Place Apartments	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Croft Place	7	7	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
David Colwell Building I	21	21	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
David Colwell Building II	25	25	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Dekko Place	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Delridge Heights Apartments	3	3	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Delridge Triplexes	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
Denny Park Apartments	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Denny Park Apartments	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
DESC - PACT	12	12	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services
Eastern Hotel	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Eastlake Supportive Housing	25	25	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Emerald City Commons	12	12	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Ernestine Anderson	33	33	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Estelle Supportive Housing	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Evans House	49	49	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Fir Street Apartments	7	7	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
First Place	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Four Freedoms House I	126	126	Leased/Issued	No	Senior housing
Four Freedoms House II	25	25	Leased/Issued	No	Senior housing
Fremont Solstice Apartments	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
The Genesee	17	17	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
The Genesee	3	3	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Gossett Place I	12	12	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Gossett Place II	28	28	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Hilltop House	30	30	Leased/Issued	No	Senior housing
Hoa Mai Gardens	70	70	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Holden Manor	1	1	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
Holden Street Family Housing	25	25	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Holiday Apartments	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Humphrey House	81	81	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Imani Village	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Josephinum Apartments	25	25	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Josephinum Stability Project	49	49	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Judkins Park	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Judkins Park	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Julie Apartments I	20	20	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Julie Apartments II	2	2	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Julie Apartments III	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
The Karlstrom	17	17	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Kebero Court	83	83	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Kenyon Housing	18	18	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Kerner-Scott House	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Kingway Apartments	16	16	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Lake City Commons	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Lake Washington Apartments	37	37	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Lakeview Apartments I	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Lakeview Apartments II	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Lakeview Apartments III	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Lam Bow Apartments	30	30	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
Legacy House	22	22	Leased/Issued	No	Senior housing
Leschi House	35	35	Leased/Issued	No	Senior housing
Lincoln Apartments	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Lyon Building	12	12	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Main Street Apartments	2	2	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Main Street Place	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Marion West Apartments	25	25	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Martin Court	28	28	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Martin Court	13	13	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Martin Luther King Family Housing	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Martin Luther King Housing-Katharine's Place	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Martin Luther King Properties	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Mary Avenue Townhomes	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
McDermott Place I	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
McDermott Place II	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Meadowbrook View Apartments	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Mercer Court	3	3	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Monica's Village Place	38	38	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Montridge Arms	13	13	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Morrison Hotel	190	190	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Muslim Housing Services	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
Nhon's House	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Nihonmachi Terrace	20	20	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Nihonmachi Terrace	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Norman Street Apartments	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
NP Hotel	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Oleta Apartments	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
One Community Commons	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
One Community Commons	7	7	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Opportunity Place	145	145	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Ozanam House (formerly Weslake II)	29	29	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Pacific Hotel	4	5	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Palo Studios at the Josephinum	7	7	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals
Pantages Apartments	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Pantages Apartments	11	11	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Pardee Townhomes	3	3	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Park Place I	36	36	Leased/Issued	No	Assisted living
Park Place II	100	100	Leased/Issued	No	Assisted living
Parker Apartments	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Parkview Services	23	23	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing for people with disabilities
Pat Williams Apartments	20	20	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Patrick Place	40	40	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Pioneer Human Services - PACT3	20	20	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
Plymouth on First Hill	77	77	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Plymouth on Stewart	84	84	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Plymouth Place	70	70	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Raven Terrace	50	50	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Ravenna Springs	13	13	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Rose of Lima House	30	30	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Rose Street Apartments	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Samaki Commons	8	8	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Samaki Commons	12	12	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Sand Point Campus	18	18	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Sand Point Family Housing	21	21	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing for families
Sea-Mar Family Housing	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
SHA-SFD Special Portfolio	1	1	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Simons Senior Housing Apartments	86	86	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
SLIHP – High Point	100	100	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
SLIHP – Rainier Vista NE	23	23	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
SLIHP – Tamarack Place	20	20	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Sound Mental Health	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services
Sound Mental Health - FACT	20	20	Leased/Issued	No	Enhanced behavioral health services
South Shore Court (Douglas Apartments)	9	9	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Spruce Street Apartments	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
St. Charles Apartments	61	61	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing
Starliter Apartments – Mt. Baker	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Stone Avenue Townhomes	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Stone Way Apartments	21	21	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Stone Way Apartments	14	14	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Sylvia Odom's Place	64	64	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for individuals who no longer require permanent supportive housing
Traugott Terrace	40	40	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless individuals in recovery
Tyree Scott	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Tyree Scott	6	6	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Views at Madison Phase I	17	17	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Views at Madison Phase I	10	10	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
Views at Madison Phase II	7	7	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Villa Park	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Village Square II Apartments	31	31	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Vivian McLean Place Apartments	4	4	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Westwood Heights East	22	22	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Willie London Properties	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Service-enriched for homeless families (with at least one minor)
WSAH (formerly Longfellow/Wisteria)	19	19	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
Yesler Court	5	5	Leased/Issued	No	Affordable housing
YWCA Women's Residence	15	15	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing

Property name	Number of vouchers newly project-based		Status at end of 2019	RAD?	Description of project
	Planned	Actual			
YWCA Women's Residence	38	38	Leased/Issued	No	Permanent supportive housing for women

<b>3,657</b>	<b>3,658</b>
--------------	--------------

**Planned/actual total vouchers existing project-based vouchers**

Please describe differences between the planned and actual existing number of project-based vouchers

The difference between SHA's planned and actual PBV total is one voucher. One provider partner, Pacific Hotel, requested an additional voucher after SHA's initial 2019 PBV allocation was finalized due to unexpected increased demand.

Actual other changes to MTW housing stock in 2019

N/A

General description of all actual capital expenditures during 2019

In 2019, SHA addressed accessibility upgrades, elevators, exterior rehabilitation, HVAC repairs, interior upgrades and security upgrades in addition to other capital projects.

Accessibility: The parking lot at Holly Court (WA001000041) was patched as it was determined to be a safety and accessibility issue.

Elevators: Elevator upgrades were completed at Phinney Terrace (WA001000092), Pleasant Valley Plaza (WA001000094), Schwabacher House (WA001000092) and Sunrise Manor (WA001000092). Minor elevator upgrades were made at Holly Court (WA001000041) buildings 3 and 6.

Exteriors: Design work was completed for the exterior upgrades at Fort Lawton (WA001000094) and Sunrise Manor (WA001000092). Exterior rehabilitation work was completed at Michaelson Manor (WA001000094). The exterior of Westwood Heights (WA001000023) was sealed to prevent leaking. The gutters at Columbia Place (WA001000093) were replaced. Deck, patio and siding repairs were completed at Fremont Place (WA001000092), Olive Ridge (WA001000013) and various Scattered Sites (WA001000053).

HVAC: Boilers were replaced at Holly Court (WA001000041) and Olive Ridge (WA001000013). The air exchange unit at Pinehurst Court (WA001000092) was replaced.

Interior upgrades: Interior upgrades were completed in numerous Scattered Sites locations (WA001000050 through WA001000057) as part of unit upgrades to single-family units in the portfolio. Bathroom upgrades were completed at Jefferson Terrace (WA001000009) and

Olive Ridge (WA001000013). Interior painting was completed at Fremont Place (WA001000092).

Security: ACAM systems have been installed at Blakely Manor (WA001000095), Carroll Terrace (WA001000094), Fort Lawton Place (WA001000094), Fremont Place (WA001000092), Island View (WA001000093), Michaelson Manor (WA001000094), Nelson Manor (WA001000095), Olmsted Manor (WA001000095), Phinney Terrace (WA001000092), Pleasant Valley Plaza (WA001000094), Primeau Place (WA001000094), Schwabacher House (WA001000092), Sunrise Manor (WA001000092), Wildwood Glen (WA001000093) and Willis House (WA001000095).

Other capital projects: SHA completed various small capital projects at Scattered Sites buildings, including window replacement, siding repair and replacement, exterior painting, appliances, flooring, cabinet replacement, door repair and replacement and window furnishings.

## Leasing information

### Actual number of households served

Number of households served through:	Number of unit months occupied/leased		Number of households served	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
MTW public housing units leased	67,604	67,415	5,634	5,618
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers utilized	109,100	113,981	9,092	9,498
Local, non-traditional: Tenant-based	0	0	0	0
Local, non-traditional: property-based	7,274	8,005	606	667
Local, non-traditional: Homeownership	0	0	0	0
<b>Planned/actual totals</b>	<b>183,978</b>	<b>189,401</b>	<b>15,332</b>	<b>15,783</b>

Please describe any differences between the planned and actual households served

Public housing unit months occupied and households served were on par with projections (within a half a percent).

For the HCV program, the increase in unit months and households served is due to several factors. First, SHA adopted an increase to our market-rate VPS in August 2018 to enable tenant-based voucher holders renting in the private market access to a larger percent of the rental properties in Seattle. Families with children were also able to take advantage of the Family Access Supplement (FAS) adopted in late 2017 which increases buying power in selected neighborhoods in Seattle. SHA continues to adapt its housing counseling support program to support voucher holders with barriers to be more successful in leasing up. Lastly, our Creating Moves to Opportunity program, a pilot program in partnership with national

academic researchers to test interventions to increase leasing success for families with children in high opportunity neighborhoods, has proven successful.

In local, non-traditional, the increase in unit months is primarily attributable to the late-2018 acquisition of the 69-unit Spring Lake Apartments, which was not planned for in the 2019 projections calculated in mid-2018. Aside from very small variations elsewhere, the rest of the difference is due to slightly higher than projected use of tenant-based vouchers in the new Red Cedar development and the rehabilitated buildings at Longfellow Creek, Roxhill Court and Wisteria Court.

Local, non-traditional category	MTW activity name/number	Number of unit months occupied/leased		Number of households to be served	
		Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Tenant-based	N/A	0	0	0	0
Property-based	MTW Activity #20: Local, Non-Traditional Affordable Housing Strategies	7,274	8,005	606	667
Homeownership	N/A	0	0	0	0

**Planned/actual totals**

<b>7,274</b>	<b>8,005</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>667</b>
--------------	--------------	------------	------------

Households receiving local, non-traditional services only	Average number of households per month	Total number of households in the 2019
N/A	N/A	N/A

Discussion of any actual issues/solutions related to leasing

Housing program	Description of actual leasing issues and solutions
MTW public housing	We did not experience leasing difficulties for the vast majority of public housing units in 2019. Overall leasing remained high throughout SHA's public housing portfolios. This is an identified issue that staff have been working to resolve through incentives, such as first month rent concessions and/or security deposit payment plans, and specific family coaching to ensure a better match between households and properties offered
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Seattle's rental market is very difficult to navigate, with high rents and limited supply of housing, especially family-sized housing. However, with the increased VPS and housing counseling supports offered to voucher holders, the leasing success rates were high throughout 2019.
Local, non-traditional	Leasing rates in LNT properties remained high throughout 2019

## Waiting list information

### Actual waiting list information

Waiting list name	Description	Number of households on waiting list	Waiting list open, partially open or closed	Was the waiting list opened during the 2019?
MTW public housing	Site-based	6,857	Partially open	No
MTW Housing Choice Voucher (Tenant-Based)	Community-wide	2,071	Closed	No
MTW Housing Choice Voucher (Project-Based)	Site-based	1,514	Partially open	No
Local, non-traditional	Site-based	0	Partially open	No

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists

There is duplication across waiting lists as households are permitted to be and often are on waiting lists for many housing programs (e.g. public housing and tenant-based vouchers) at the same time. For project-based units, many partners fill their vacancies through the King County-wide Coordinated Entry for All (CEA) system which maintains a central waitlist for permanent supportive housing units. Some partners may maintain their own waiting lists instead of or in conjunction with the CEA system, and applicants may be duplicated because of this as well.

### Actual changes to waiting list in the 2019

Waiting list name	Description of actual changes to waiting list
MTW public housing	Yesler Terrace is the only wait list that remained closed through 2019. All other wait lists were open for all of 2019.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher (Tenant-Based)	There were no changes to SHA's voucher waitlist in 2019. It remained closed throughout the year.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher (Project-Based)	Per MTW Strategy 9.H.20, SHA allows partner providers to maintain their own waitlists. Any changes to waitlist structures would be based on providers adjusting to the market, demand or other factors outside of SHA's control.
Local, non-traditional	There were no changes to the structure of the waiting list for LNT properties. One LNT-specific waiting list was established for West Seattle Affordable Housing tax-credit/LNT units in order to fill units newly coming online. By year-end 2019, all of the units were leased for initial occupancy and the waiting list was closed out.

## Information on statutory objectives and requirements

75% of families assisted are very low income

Income level	Number of local, non-traditional households admitted in the 2019
50-80% Area median income	7
30-49% Area median income	15
Below 30% area median income	22
<b>Total local, non-traditional households admitted</b>	<b>44</b>

Maintain comparable mix

Baseline mix of family sizes served (upon entry to MTW)					
Family size	Occupied public housing units	Utilized HCVs	Non-MTW adjustments	Baseline number mix	Baseline mix percentage
1 person	3,317	1,535	785	5,637	51%
2 person	967	1,041	79	2,087	19%
3 person	590	824	0	1,414	13%
4 person	423	529	0	952	9%
5 person	223	259	0	482	4%
6+ person	203	207	0	410	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,723</b>	<b>4,395</b>	<b>864</b>	<b>10,982</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please describe the justification for any “non-MTW adjustments” given above

Since 1999, SHA has done significant asset repositioning and made numerous non-MTW policy changes (such as occupancy standards). In addition, the demographics and availability of other housing resources in the Seattle community has changed.

In 2011, SHA added 894 units from the Seattle Senior Housing Portfolio. Using average occupancy for the most recent three years, the baseline was adjusted to show an increase of 785 one-person households and 79 two-person households.

Since there is not necessarily a direct relationship in unit/policy changes and household size, SHA reserves the right to make further historical adjustments in future reports.

Data issues: Approximately 100 households were not included in the 1998 numbers due to missing historical data for a portion of Holly Park, which was undergoing redevelopment at the time.

Mix of family sizes (in 2019)				
Family size	Baseline mix percentage	Number of households served in 2019	Percentage of households served in 2019	Percentage change from baseline year to current 2019
1 person	51%	9,011	58%	+14%
2 person	19%	2,462	16%	-17%
3 person	13%	1,377	9%	-32%
4 person	9%	1,096	7%	-22%
5 person	4%	687	4%	+10%
6+ person	4%	918	6%	+48%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>15,551</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Please describe the justification for any variances of more than 5% between 2019 and the baseline year (1998).

Since 1998, SHA has undertaken significant asset repositioning. While there is not a one-for-one relationship between unit size and household size, the changes in household size served largely reflect the changes in public housing unit sizes in the past 20+ years. SHA's tenant-based voucher program typically does not consider household size when selecting households from the wait list and therefore the change in the mix is subject to changes outside of SHA's control, such as demographic changes in the broader community (although there was a priority for families with children in association with the Creating Moves to Opportunity demonstration). In addition, our allocation of PBVs to support service-enriched housing locally has increased the number of single-adult households, due to a community-driven focus on prioritizing currently homeless households.

Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency in the 2019

MTW activity name/number	Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency	SHA local definition of self-sufficiency
MTW activity #2: Family self-sufficiency program	636	Number of participants whose primary source of income is wages
MTW activity #5: Local leases	985	Total number of households affected by HOPE VI self-sufficiency requirement whose primary source of income is wages
MTW activity #8: Special purpose housing use	23	Number of households that transition to unsubsidized housing (not including medical respite)
MTW activity #10: Local rent policy	1,580	Number of households in properties with absolute minimum rent that have primary source of income from wages

<p>MTW activity #13: Homeownership and graduation from subsidy</p>	<p>37</p>	<p>Number of households who transitioned to unsubsidized housing due to homeownership and graduation from subsidy strategies.</p>
--	-----------	---

985

Households duplicated across MTW activities

**2,276**

**Total households transitioned to self-sufficiency**

### (III) Proposed MTW activities

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

## (IV) Approved MTW activities

### Implemented activities

MTW activity #1: Development simplification

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #1 was included in SHA’s 1999 MTW Agreement and first proposed in the 1999 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2004. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

#### *Description*

Development simplification helps SHA to move quickly to acquire, finance, develop, and remove public housing properties from its stock in an efficient, market-driven manner. MTW flexibilities allow the agency to respond to local market conditions and avoid delays and associated costs incurred as a consequence of HUD requirements and approval processes. While of greatest impact when the housing market is highly competitive, these strategies present opportunities continuously for SHA to avoid costs and increase housing options as circumstances arise.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Public housing strategies					
1.P.01	Design guidelines: SHA may establish reasonable, modest design guidelines, unit size guidelines and unit amenity guidelines for development and redevelopment activities.	1999 MTW Agreement	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
1.P.02	Streamlined public housing acquisitions: Acquire properties for public housing without prior HUD approval, provided that HUD site selection criteria are met.	1999 MTW Agreement	2004	Active	None

1.P.03	Total Development Cost limits: Replace HUD's Total Development Cost limits with reasonable limits that reflect the local market place for quality construction.	1999 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None
1.P.04	Streamlined mixed-finance closings: Utilize a streamlined process for mixed-finance closings	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Inactive	None
1.P.05	Streamlined public housing demo/dispo process: Utilize a streamlined demolition/disposition protocol negotiated with the Special Applications Center for various public housing dispositions	2000 MTW Plan	2004	Inactive	None
1.P.06	Local blended subsidy: SHA may blend public housing and Housing Choice Voucher funds to subsidize units that serve households earning below 80 percent of Area Median Income.	2018 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None

*Impact*

Development simplification strategies are intended to promote housing choice by allowing SHA to acquire, finance, develop, and remove property in a manner that maximizes our ability to take advantage of market conditions and provide affordable housing throughout Seattle.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #4: Increase in resources leveraged	Amount of funds leveraged in dollars.	\$0	\$5 million, but dependent on project selection and approval from HUD.	\$0	No
Housing choice	HC #1: Additional units of housing made available	Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of development simplification.	0	400 cumulative	0 new in 2019; 0 cumulative	No

	HC #2: Units of housing preserved	Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available.	0	500 cumulative	0 new in 2019; 1,085 cumulative	Yes
	HC #5: Increase in resident mobility	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of development simplification.	0	0	0	Yes

*Data collection methods*

SHA closely tracks all details regarding housing development and acquisition projects, including the number of units developed and acquired and project expenses and revenues, including interest costs and leveraged funds for all mixed-finance and bond-financed programs.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

None.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

SHA's development activities are largely dependent on external factors such as the availability of financing, the real estate market and community priorities. As a result, performance against the benchmarks is neither a positive nor negative reflection of the efficacy of the MTW strategies in Activity #1.

MTW activity #2: Family self-sufficiency program

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #2 was first proposed in the 1999 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2018. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA's JobLink program is an innovative initiative that combines family self-sufficiency (FSS) with other funding streams to allow participants streamlined access to multiple resources. JobLink's mission is to help SHA residents increase their income through employment. JobLink uses one-on-one coaching support to connect residents to employment, education, and resources. The program is open to all SHA residents age 18 and older and helps residents build job preparation and interview skills, teaches financial planning and literacy skills, supports residents to start a small business, connects residents with resources in the community such as childcare and transportation and helps residents sign up for college or vocational training, apply for jobs or explore buying a home.

MTW strategies have been designed to help JobLink expand its impact by providing incentives for participation and using local selection criteria, contract terms and escrow calculation methods. Escrow accounts and short-term incentives such as education, employment and emergency fund payments are distinct strategies and receipt of short-term incentives does not disqualify a household from receiving an escrow disbursement in the future.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<b>Agency-wide strategies</b>					
2.A.01	FSS: Partner with City: Partner with the City of Seattle to share responsibilities and resources for a new integrated FSS program.	1999 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2.A.02	SJI preference + time limits: Preference for Seattle Jobs Initiative participants coupled with time limits.	1999 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2.A.03	FSS escrow accounts: Use local policies for determining escrow calculation, deposits, and withdrawals.	2007 MTW Plan	2018	Active	None
2.A.04	FSS participation contract: Locally designed contract terms including length, extensions, interim goals, and graduation requirements.	2007 MTW Plan	2018	Active	None
2.A.05	FSS Program Coordinating Committee: Restructure Program Coordinating Committee (PCC) to better align with program goals and local resources.	2007 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	MTW authority not needed	None
2.A.06	FSS program incentives: Provide incentives to participants including those who do not receive escrow deposits, including program offerings for non-heads of household and other members not enrolled in HUD's FSS program.	2007 MTW Plan	2018	Active	None
2.A.07	FSS selection preferences: Up to 100 percent of FSS enrollments may be selected by local preferences.	2007 MTW Plan	2018	Active	None

*Impact*

FSS strategies support self-sufficiency by helping SHA residents increase their income through employment. JobLink connects residents to employment, education and resources through one-on-one coaching support. The program helps residents build job preparation and interview skills, teaches financial planning and literacy skills, supports residents to start small businesses, connects residents with resources in the community such as childcare and transportation and helps residents sign up for college or vocational training, apply for jobs or explore buying a home.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Self-sufficiency	SS #1: Increase in household income	Average earned income of JobLink participants	Avg. \$15.96/hour for participants employed at program entry	Avg. \$13.09/hour or higher for participants in JobLink job placements	Avg. \$17.88/hour for participants in JobLink job placements	Yes
	SS #2: Increase in household savings	Average savings/escrow of JobLink participants	Avg. \$484 for participants at program entry	Avg. \$2,500 savings/escrow for JobLink participants	\$2,866 average savings/escrow for JobLink participants	Yes
	SS #3: Increase in positive outcomes in employment status	Number of participants at time of program entry for each category: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employed full-time</li> <li>Employed part-time</li> <li>Enrolled in an educational program</li> <li>Enrolled in a job training program</li> <li>Unemployed</li> <li>Other</li> </ul>	Number of participants at program entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employed full-time: 123</li> <li>Employed part-time: 150</li> <li>Enrolled in an educational program: 144</li> <li>Enrolled in a job training program: 20</li> <li>Unemployed: 362</li> <li>Other: N/A</li> </ul>	Participant outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employed full-time: 120</li> <li>Employed part-time: 40</li> <li>Enrolled in an educational program: 200</li> <li>Enrolled in a job training program: 20</li> <li>Unemployed: N/A</li> <li>Other: N/A</li> </ul>	Participant outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employed full-time: 138</li> <li>Employed part-time: 93</li> <li>Enrolled in an educational program: 205</li> <li>Enrolled in a job training program: 11</li> </ul>	Yes
	SS #5: Households assisted by services that increase self-sufficiency	Number of individuals receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	357 participants	535 participants	927 participants	Yes
	SS #8: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Number of participants transitioned to unsubsidized housing.	2 participants	2 participants	2 participants	Yes

	SS #8: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Number of participants whose primary source of income is wages.	245 participants	245 participants	636 participants	Yes
--	---	---	------------------	------------------	------------------	-----

*Data collection methods*

JobLink tracks participants and outcomes by individual rather than by household and therefore all reported metrics represent individual participants.

Savings/escrow baseline is the average of self-reported bank account balances. Annual outcomes are the average accrued escrow balance of participants with escrow accounts. The benchmark represents 50% of JobLink’s maximum escrow disbursement.

In order to become self-sufficient, particularly in an expensive market like Seattle, additional education and training may be necessary for JobLink participants to obtain a living wage job. Therefore, employment is not always the immediate goal for all JobLink participants and “unemployed” is not a meaningful metric. Employment status data is based on job placements only.

Participants that enroll in job training programs at local community colleges are categorized under educational programs rather than job training in order to avoid duplicate counts.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

None.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

The only metric that was not at or above our benchmark was in job training program enrollment. As noted above, many JobLink participants who are enrolled in job training programs are taking these courses through local colleges. Educational and job training program enrollments combined were 216, or 98% of the combined benchmark of 220.

MTW activity #3: Inspection protocol

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #3 was first proposed in the 1999 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2001. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA uses a cost-benefit approach to unit and property inspections. Current strategies in this approach include using SHA’s own staff to complete HQS inspection of its properties with vouchers and inspecting residences on a less frequent schedule.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
3.A.01	Private sector cost benefit and risk management approaches to inspections such as avoiding duplicative inspections by using other recent inspections for agencies such as the Washington State Housing Finance Commission	1999 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None
3.A.03 (formerly 3.H.03, 3.P.01)	Reduced frequency of inspections: Cost-benefit approach to housing inspections allows Seattle Housing to establish local inspection protocol, including less frequent inspections and interchangeable use of HQS/UPCS/UPCS-V	1999 MTW Plan	2003	Active	None

Voucher strategies					
3.H.01	Inspect SHA-owned properties: Allows SHA staff, rather than a third party entity, to complete inspections of SHA owned properties.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
3.H.02	Fines for no-shows at inspections: Impose fines on the landlord or participant for failing to be present at scheduled inspections.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
3.H.04	Self-certification for minor fails: Self-certification by landlords of correction of minor failed inspection items.	2010 MTW Plan	2010	MTW authority no longer required	None

*Impact*

MTW inspection protocol strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by saving staff time through less frequent inspections and by inspecting SHA's own units rather than contracting this work, with a goal of no negative impact on the quality of housing.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost-effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost of inspections in dollars.	\$429,647 in wages (CY 2000)	\$640,683 or less in wages (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$414,159 in wages	Yes
	CE #2: Staff time savings	Total amount of staff time dedicated to inspections prior to implementation.	18,720 total staff hours	16,640 or fewer staff hours	12,480 hours	Yes
	SHA-specific metric	Total amount of staff hours saved by avoided inspections.	0 hours	500 hours annually	845.5 hours	Yes
Maintain housing quality	SHA-specific metric	Voucher participant-requested inspections per leased vouchers	1.8% (128 requests per 6,997 HHS)	<1.8% annually	0.23% (22 requests per 9,495 HHS)	Yes

	SHA-specific metric	Percent of voucher units that fail inspections	29% failure rate	33% or less	24.9% failure rate (1546 annual fails out of 6208 annual inspections)	Yes
--	---------------------	--	------------------	-------------	---	-----

*Data collection methods*

Hours, costs and time savings for MTW inspection protocol strategies are reported for both HCV and public housing portfolios. HOPE VI communities and Yesler are excluded because their staffing structure for inspections and property management are distinct from the rest of the public housing portfolios and because SHA has different inspection goals for these portfolios. MTW strategies such as less frequent inspections are not applied in HOPE VI communities and Yesler and they are therefore not included in the data for the metrics.

Total hours and costs are reported based on inspections staff wages only. Other costs such as mileage, benefits and overhead are not included. Hours are calculated based on actual number of inspections staff at year end.

Hours saved from avoiding annual inspections for public housing units is based on the total number of units that did not receive a full inspection during the year multiplied by 30 minutes, the average length of each inspection.

The voucher management system records the results of all inspections by type and all inspection requests.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

None.

MTW activity #5: Local leases

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #5 was first proposed in the 1999 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 1999. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA utilizes local lease strategies to incorporate best practices from the private market and to encourage self-sufficiency.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
5.A.01	Self-sufficiency requirement: All households receiving subsidy from SHA (public housing or voucher) in HOPE VI communities must participate in self-sufficiency activities.	1999 MTW Plan	1999	Active	None.
<i>Public housing strategies</i>					
5.P.01	Local lease: SHA may implement its own lease, incorporating industry best practices.	2001 MTW Plan	2011	Inactive	None.
5.P.02	Grievance procedures: Modify grievance policies to require tenants to remedy lease violations and be up to date in their rent payments before granting a grievance hearing for proposed tenancy terminations.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None.

5.P.03	Lease term for public housing units: SHA may offer lease renewals for six months or month-to-month time periods.	2009 MTW Plan	2009	Inactive	None.
5.P.04	Property-specific pet policies: SHA may establish pet policies, which may include the continuation or establishment of pet-free communities or limits on the types of pets allowed, on a building by building basis.	2011 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None.
5.P.05	Leasing incentives: SHA may offer lease incentives to promote the leasing of a public housing unit	2017 MTW Plan	2018	Active	None.

*Impact*

Local lease strategies are intended to promote self-sufficiency by encouraging work-able adults to participate in self-sufficiency activities and housing choice by providing living environments that are pet-free in addition to communities that allow pets.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost of lost rental revenue due to vacancy	\$399,010 (CY 2016)	\$423,929 (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$338,367	Yes
	CE #2: Staff time savings	Total time to lease vacant units	26,527 vacancy days (151,583 hours) (CY 2016)	26,527 vacancy days (151,583 hours)	26,437 vacancy days (151,069 hours)	Yes
Self-sufficiency	SS #1: Increase in household income	Average earned income for households affected by HOPE VI self-sufficiency requirements	\$12,652 (CY 1998)	\$19,707 (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$34,089	Yes

	SS #3: Increase in positive outcomes in employment status	<p>Number/percent of heads of household affected by HOPE VI self-sufficiency requirements who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employed full-time</li> <li>• Employed part-time</li> <li>• Unemployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employed full-time: 183 / 44%</li> <li>• Employed part-time: 179 / 31%</li> <li>• Unemployed: 212 / 25% (CY 2014)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employed full-time: 183 / 44%</li> <li>• Employed part-time: 179 / 31%</li> <li>• Unemployed: 212 / 25%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employed full-time: 585 / 38%</li> <li>• Employed part-time: 464 / 30%</li> <li>• Unemployed: 504 / 32%</li> </ul>	Yes
	SS #4: Households removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	Total number of HOPE VI households receiving TANF	42 households (CY 2014)	42 households	39 households	Yes
	SS #5: Households assisted by services that increase self-sufficiency	Total number of households affected by HOPE VI self-sufficiency requirement receiving self-sufficiency services	172 households (CY 2014)	172 households	163 households	No
	SS #8: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Total number of households affected by HOPE VI self-sufficiency requirement whose primary source of income is wages	316 households (CY1998)	500 households	985 households	Yes

	SHA: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Percent of HOPE VI households whose primary source of income from wages	58% of work-able households <i>without</i> HOPE VI self-sufficiency requirement reported wages as a primary source of income (CY 2014)	Percent is higher than baseline for HOPE VI households with self-sufficiency requirement (61% in 2019)	81% of HOPE VI households report wages as a primary source of income	Yes
--	--	---	--	--	--	-----

*Data collection methods*

Income and unit data is routinely maintained for all household members. Baseline data from 1998 for primary source of income through wages does not include households at Holly Park, for whom this information is not available. Data on HOPE VI public housing households affected by the self-sufficiency requirement excludes Lake City Court. On-site HOPE VI service usage is tracked by our JobLink program.

SHA does not track employment by full-time or part-time status. Instead we provide these figures using a proxy that makes assumptions based on earned income using the minimum wage rate (\$15 per hour for 2019).

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 and SS #1 were updated to reflect inflation. The new rates for calendar year 2019 were calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

In 2019, averages included values of zero where they had previously been excluded.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

None.

MTW activity #8: Special purpose housing use

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #8 was first implemented prior to SHA being granted MTW status in 1999. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA utilizes public housing units to provide special purpose housing and to improve quality of services or features for targeted populations. In partnership with agencies that provide social services, SHA is able to make affordable housing available to households that would not likely be admitted in traditional public housing units. With this program SHA allows partner agencies to use residential units both for service-enriched transitional/short-term housing and for office space for community activities and service delivery. The ability to designate public housing units for specific purposes and populations facilitates this work, by allowing units to target populations with specific service and housing needs or specific purposes.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
8.A.01	Conditional housing: Housing program for those who do not currently quite meet SHA's minimum qualifications	2000 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
8.A.02	Program-specific waiting lists: Operate separate waiting lists (or no waiting list) for specific programs such as service enriched units.	2000 MTW Plan	Prior to MTW participation	Active	None

8.A.03	Service enriched housing: With the help of key partners, SHA may develop supportive housing communities.	2001 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
Public housing strategies					
8.P.01	Agency units for housing and related supportive services: Make residential units available for service-enriched housing by partner agencies.	1999 MTW Agreement	Prior to MTW participation	Active	None
8.P.02	Agency units for services: Make residential units available as space for community activities, management use, and partner agencies providing services in and around the community.	1999 MTW Agreement	Prior to MTW participation	Active	None
8.P.03	Designate LIPH units for specific purposes/populations: SHA may designate properties/units for specific purposes such as elderly.	2000 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
8.P.04	Definition of elderly: Allows change in definition of elderly for HUD-designated elderly preference public housing from 62 to 55.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
8.P.05	Pet-free environments: Establish pet-free environments in connection with selected service enriched housing.	2009 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None

*Impact*

Special purpose housing use strategies are intended to increase housing choice and self-sufficiency by providing service-enriched housing for households that would otherwise be difficult to serve in traditional housing authority units and by enabling services to be available in the community.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #4: Increase in resources leveraged	Amount of funds leveraged in dollars	\$0	\$2M in service dollars	\$628,709 in 2019; over \$3.5 million cumulatively	Yes
Housing choice	HC #5: Increase in resident mobility	Number of households moving to a service-enriched unit	0 households	126 households	126 households	Yes

	HC #7: Households assisted by services that increase housing choice	Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice	0 households	126 households	207 households	Yes
Self-sufficiency	SS #8: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Number of households that transition to unsubsidized housing (not including medical respite)	0 households	50 households	23 households	No
	SHA metric	Number of onsite agencies in SHA's residential units	5 agencies	5 agencies	5 agencies	Yes
	SHA metric	Percent of households that exit service-enriched units for stable housing (transitional, permanent or unsubsidized)	0% of exits	70% of exits	81% of exits (105 of 129 exits in 2019)	Yes

*Data collection methods*

Unit use is tracked by staff in SHA's property management software. All other metrics, including households served, new entries, exits and exit reasons are tracked by the partner agencies themselves and reported at year-end.

Exit destination for medical respite program participants at Jefferson Terrace is not included for households departing for stable and unsubsidized housing destinations because the medical respite program model and goals are different. The goal for most medical respite participants is that they transition to an assisted housing program after completion of their respite care. As a result, failure to transition to unsubsidized housing can in some cases indicate a positive result.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

None.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

The number of households that transitioned from service-enriched units to unsubsidized housing in 2019 is lower than the benchmark. This is likely due to the high cost of market-rate housing in Seattle. We believe this is not necessarily cause for concern about program design, as the number of households departing for stable but subsidized housing destinations, including permanent subsidized housing and rapid reentry, continues to increase year-over-year.

MTW activity #9: Project-based program

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #9 was first proposed in the 1999 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2000. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA uses MTW to develop and implement a local project-based program, providing vouchers to subsidize units in SHA-owned and privately owned properties throughout Seattle. SHA's project-based activities include a large number of MTW strategies to reduce costs, make project-based programs financially feasible for owners, and to provide housing choice in the city. The project-based program promotes housing choice through strategies such as offering site-specific waiting lists maintained by providers (and, therefore, does not issue exit vouchers), expanding the definition of eligible unit types, allowing more project-based units per development and overall, admitting certain types of felons, allocating vouchers to programs and providers (not just units), allowing

payment standards that promote services and the financial viability of projects, and coupling housing assistance with services by working with partners . The project-based program reduces SHA’s costs through strategies allowing project-based owners to self-certify selected inspections and maintain their own waiting list, reducing the frequency of inspections by SHA staff, streamlining admissions, and non-competitively allocating subsidies to SHA units. Project-based program strategies also make contract terms consistent with requirements for other leveraged funding sources.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Voucher strategies					
9.H.01	Cost-benefit inspection approach: Allows SHA to establish local inspection protocol, including self-certification that inspection standards are met at time of move in for mid-year turnovers	1999 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
9.H.02	Assets in rent calculation: Only calculate income on assets declared as valuing \$5,000 or more.	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Inactive (superseded by \$50,000 under 10.H.12)	None
9.H.03	Choice offered at beginning (no exit vouchers): Housing choice is offered at the beginning of the project-based admissions process (by nature of site-specific waiting lists); exit vouchers are not offered.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.04	Contract term: Project-based commitments renewable up to 40 years.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.05	Eligible unit types: Modify the types of housing accepted under a project-based contract - allows shared housing and transitional housing.	2000 MTW Plan	2002	Active	None
9.H.06	HAP contracts: Modify the HAP contract to ensure consistency with MTW changes and add tenancy addendum.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.07	Non-competitive allocation of assistance: Allocate project-based subsidy non-competitively to SHA controlled units, including non-contiguous project-based units within a portfolio.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None

9.H.08	Owners may conduct new and turnover inspections: SHA may allow project-based owners to conduct their own new construction/rehab inspections and to complete unit turnover inspections	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
9.H.09	Percent of vouchers that may be project-based: Raise the percentage of vouchers that may be project-based above HUD limits, including exclusion of replacement vouchers and calculation based on authorized number of vouchers.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.10	Unit cap per development: Waives the 25% cap on the number of units that can be project-based in a multi-family building without supportive services or elderly/disabled designation.	2000 MTW Plan	2008	Active	None
9.H.11	Rent cap-30% of income: Project-based participants cannot pay more than 30% of their adjusted income for rent and utilities.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Inactive	None
9.H.12	Streamlined admissions: SHA may streamline and centralize applications and waiting list processes for project-based HCV units.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.13	Competitive allocation process: Commit vouchers to the City's competitive process for housing funding.	2004 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
9.H.14	Payment standards for SHA units: Allows higher than Voucher Payment Standard for SHA-operated project-based units if needed to support the project budget (while still taking into account rent reasonableness).	2004 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
9.H.15	Subsidy cap in replacement units: Cap subsidy at levels affordable to households at 30% AMI in project-based HOPE VI replacement units where SHA also contributed capital to write-down the unit's affordability to that level.	2004 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None

9.H.16	Admissions-admit felons under certain conditions: Allows for the admission into Project-based Voucher units of Class B and Class C felons subject to time-limited sex offender registration requirements who do not, in the opinion of the owner of the subsidized units, constitute a threat to others.	2005 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
9.H.17	Program-based vouchers: Allocate floating voucher subsidy to a defined group of units or properties.	2003 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
9.H.18	Provider-based vouchers: Provide vouchers to selected agencies to couple with intensive supportive services. The agency master leases units and subleases to tenants.	2007 MTW Plan	2007	Active	None
9.H.19	Streamlined admissions and recertifications: SHA may streamline admissions and recertification processes for provider-based and project-based programs.	2009 MTW Plan	Not yet implemented	Inactive	None
9.H.20	Partners maintain own waiting lists: Allow partners to maintain waiting lists for partner-owned and/or operated units/vouchers and use own eligibility and suitability criteria.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.21 (formerly 9.H.20)	COPES housing assistance payment calculations: Count as zero income for residents who are living in project-based units at assisted living properties where Medicaid payments are made on their behalf through the COPES system	2012 MTW Plan	Prior to MTW participation	Active	None

*Impact*

The project-based program is intended to promote cost effectiveness by reducing staff time and leveraging funding, as well as expanding housing choice by increasing access to service-enriched affordable housing.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost to administer project-based vouchers (in wages)	\$0	\$532,759 or less (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$575,718	No
	CE #2: Staff time savings	Total time to administer project-based vouchers (in staff hours)	0	16,640 or fewer (8.0 FTE)	19,240 hours (9.25 FTE)	No
	CE #4: Increase in resources leveraged	Amount of funds leveraged (in dollars)	\$0	\$200,000 or more	\$5.8 million in 2019	Yes
	SHA metric	SHA hours saved by allowing partners to maintain their own waiting lists and not conducting new/turnover inspections	0	1,400 hours or more	1,185 hours	No
	SHA metric	SHA hours spent on project-based vs. tenant-based vouchers (in FTEs)	0.003 FTE per leased TBV (20 total FTE for 6,227 TBVs)	Staff time per PBV is equal to or less than time per TBV	0.0025 FTE (9.25 total for 3,658 PBVs)	Yes
Housing choice	HC #4: Displacement prevention	Number of households at or below 80% AMI that lose assistance or need to move	0 households	50 households or fewer	43 households	Yes
	HC #5: Increase in resident mobility	Number of households moving to a service-enriched unit	0 households	500 households	790 households	Yes

### *Data collection methods*

SHA maintains detailed tenant, inspection, landlord and voucher allocation information in its voucher management system. Partner agencies maintain waiting list information and commit to service levels in their application for PBVs. Staff hours are calculated based on actual number of PBV staff. Time savings are based on an estimated one hour of time saved processing a new tenant application for each new household served off of a partner's waiting list and 30 minutes per turnover inspection avoided. Comparative time savings between project-based and tenant-based vouchers is calculated based on leased vouchers only and excludes special purpose vouchers and port-outs. Total costs represent staff salary costs only and exclude all overhead, benefits and other costs.

### *Updates*

None.

### *Actual non-significant changes*

None.

### *Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

### *Actual significant changes*

None.

### *Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

SHA did not meet staff time and cost savings benchmarks for administration of the PBV program in 2019 due to the size of the program and the resources needed to administer a project-based program of this size. Each year, PBV counts increase as more partner providers convert their Mod Rehab projects to RAD units, as Yesler units continue to come online through the Yesler redevelopment project and due to our commitment to the City of Seattle's Housing Levy. Since the metrics were first developed in 2013, SHA's PBV program has increased by approximately 15%.

There were also fewer hours saved by allowing partners to administer their own waiting lists and conduct new and turnover inspections because of slower unit turnover rate; however, this number has increased significantly from 2018. As leasing remains high in PBV units and we administer additional PBVs in new RAD projects, we expect this to increase more in 2020.

MTW activity #10: Local rent policy

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #10 was first proposed in the 2000 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2000. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA’s rent policy program tackles a number of objectives, including increased flexibility in the rent calculation process and determining the eligibility of units and payment standards. Rent policies also promote cost effectiveness and self-sufficiency through a minimum rent and asset income threshold and through streamlined rent review processes.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
10.A.01	Streamlined Income Verification: SHA may adopt tax credit rules or the rules of other major funders regarding the length of time income verification documents are considered valid for income review processes.	2014 MTW Plan	2014	Active	None
<i>Voucher strategies</i>					
10.H.01	Rent burden-include exempt income: Exempt income included for purposes of determining affordability of a unit in relation to 40% of household income.	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
10.H.02	Rent cap-use gross income: Rent burden calculated on 40% of Gross Income, up from HUD's standard 30% of Adjusted Income.	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None

10.H.03	Rent Reasonableness at SHA owned units: Allows SHA staff to perform Rent Reasonable determination for SHA owned units.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
10.H.04	Payment standard: SHA may develop local voucher payment standards, including supplements for opportunity areas and different standards for market-rate and affordable housing and shared housing.	2003 MTW Plan	2002	Active	See below
10.H.05	Absolute minimum rent: The minimum rent for all residents will be established annually by SHA. No rent will be reduced below the minimum rent amount by a utility allowance.	2003 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.H.06	Payment standard-SROs: SHA may use the studio payment standard for SRO units.	2003 MTW Plan	2003	Active	None
10.H.07	Tenant-based self-sufficiency incentives: Rent policies to foster self-sufficiency among employable households, including income disregards proportional to payroll tax; allowances for employment-related expenses; intensive employment services coupled with time limits; locally-defined hardship waivers.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.H.08	Imputed income from TANF: Impute TANF income if household appears eligible and has not documented ineligibility. TANF not counted toward income if family is sanctioned.	2006 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.H.09	Rent reasonableness streamlining: Allows SHA to streamline rent reasonable determinations, including automatic annual updates and shared housing.	2006 MTW Plan	2017	Active	None
10.H.10	Rent reviews for entirely elderly/disabled adult households every three years: Income reviews conducted for households with 100 percent elderly and/or disabled adults only every three years (within a period of 40 months).	2009 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None
10.H.11	Recategorized as 13.H.02. See Activity #13.				
10.H.12	Asset income threshold: SHA will establish a threshold for calculating asset income to an amount up to \$50,000 and may allow self-certification of assets below the threshold.	2010 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None

10.H.13	Streamlined medical deduction: SHA will allow self certification of medical expenses.	2010 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
10.H.14	Simplified utility allowance schedule: HCV participants' rent will be adjusted for a Utility Estimate based on the number of bedrooms (defined as the lower of voucher size or actual unit size) and tenant responsibility for payment of energy, heat, and sewer/water under their lease, with a proration for energy-efficient units.	2011 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
10.H.15	Disregard of student financial aid as income: SHA may disregard student financial aid as income.	2019 MTW Plan	2019	Active	None
Public housing strategies					
10.P.01	Absolute minimum rent: Tenants pay a minimum rent (\$50 or more) even if utility allowance would normally result in a lower rental payment or reimbursement.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
10.P.02	Earned Income Disregard: HUD's Earned income Disregard is not offered to public housing residents.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
10.P.03	Every third year rent reviews for entirely elderly/disabled adult households: Rent reviews conducted for households with 100 percent elderly and/or disabled triennially (within a period of 40 months, and with Cost of Living Adjustment in intervening years).	2001 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
10.P.04	Rent freezes: Voluntary rent policy freezes rent in two year intervals.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Inactive	None
10.P.05	TANF rent calculation: Calculate TANF participant rent on 25% of gross income.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Inactive	None
10.P.06	Tenant Trust Accounts: A portion of working public housing residents' income may be deposited in an escrow account for use toward self-sufficiency purposes.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Inactive	None
10.P.07	Ceiling rent two-year time limit: When a tenant's calculated rent reaches the ceiling rent for their unit, the rent will not be increased beyond the rent ceiling for 24 months.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Inactive	None
10.P.08	Impute income from public benefits: SHA may impute income in rent calculation for tenants	2000 Annual Plan	2001	Active	None

	declaring no income who appear eligible for but decline to collect cash benefits				
10.P.09	Partners develop separate rent policies: Allow partner providers and HOPE VI communities to develop separate rent policies that are in line with program goals and/or to streamline.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.10	Studio vs. one-bedroom: Differentiate rents for studios vs. One-bedroom units.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.11	Utility allowance-self-sufficiency and resource conservation: Change utility allowance where metering permits to encourage self-sufficiency and resource conservation.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.12	Utility allowance-schedule: SHA may change utility allowances on a schedule different for current residents and new move-ins.	2008 MTW Plan	2008	Active	None
10.P.13	Streamlined for fixed income: Further streamline rent policy and certification process for fixed income households, including self-certification of medical expenses.	2009 MTW Plan	2014	Active	None
10.P.14	Streamlined rent policy for partnership units: Allow non-profit partners operating public housing units to implement simplified rent policies.	2009 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.15	Utility allowance-frequency of utility allowance updates: SHA may revise the schedule for reviewing and updating utility allowances due to fluctuations in utility rates.	2009 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None
10.P.16	Utility allowance-local benchmark: SHA may develop new benchmarks for "a reasonable use of utilities by an energy conservative household" - the standard by which utility allowance are calculated.	2009 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.17	SSHP rent policy: Rents in SSHP units will be one of five flat rents based on the tenant's percentage of Area Median Income, with annual adjustments and income reviews only every three years.	2011 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None

10.P.18	No HUD-defined flat rents: SHA does not offer tenants the choice of “flat rents” as required of non-MTW agencies (includes alternate calculation for mixed citizenship households).	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
10.P.19 (formerly 10.P.17)	Asset income threshold: SHA will increase the threshold for including asset income in rent contribution calculations to an amount up to \$50,000 and may allow self-certification of assets below the threshold.	2012 MTW Plan	2012	Active	None
10.P.20	Simplified Utility Assistance Payment for HOPE VI communities: HOPE VI participants receive a maximum level of consumption rather than reduction, and incentive for conservation. Annual adjustments are made at the next regularly scheduled annual review or update.	2013 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None
10.P.21	Market rate rent: SHA may charge market rate rent as a penalty for noncompliance with the annual review process.	2005 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
10.P.22	Delay in rent increase for newly employed households: SHA may allow a longer notification period before rent increase if the increase is due to the resident becoming employed after at least six months of unemployment and is self-reported by the resident in a timely manner.	2014 MTW Report	2005	Active	None
10.P.23	Self-employment expenses: Households may declare employment expenses up to a set threshold of gross income without further validation of deductions.	2015 MTW Plan	2015	Active	See below

*Impact*

Local rent policy strategies are intended to promote cost effectiveness by saving staff time and to support self-sufficiency by encouraging households to build income, employment and assets.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost of recertifications (in wages)	\$720,966 in wages (CY 2009)	\$971,156 or less (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$736,347 in wages	Yes
	CE #2: Staff time savings	Total time to complete recertifications (in staff hours)	45,407 staff hours	45,224 or fewer staff hours	25,636 staff hours	Yes
	SHA metric	Total time in savings from local rent policies	2,873 staff hours saved	3,056 or more staff hours saved	4,578 staff hours	Yes
Housing choice	HC #4: Displacement prevention	Number of households at 80% AMI or below who would lose assistance or need to move without local rent policies	69 public housing evictions	69 or fewer evictions	34 court filings for eviction	Yes
Self-sufficiency	SS #1: Increase in household income	Average yearly earned income of households affected by absolute minimum rent	\$13,815 in earned income (CY 1999)	\$21,165 in earned income or more (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$23,430 in earned income	Yes
	SS #3: Increase in positive outcomes in employment status	Number of heads of household who are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employed full-time</li> <li>Employed part-time</li> <li>Unemployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>455 employed full-time</li> <li>552 employed part-time</li> <li>662 unemployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>455 employed full-time</li> <li>552 employed part-time</li> <li>662 unemployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>558 employed full-time</li> <li>623 employed part-time</li> <li>526 unemployed</li> </ul>	Yes

	SS #3: Increase in positive outcomes in employment status	Percent of workable households who are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employed full-time</li> <li>• Employed part-time</li> <li>• Unemployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 34% employed full-time</li> <li>• 34% employed part-time</li> <li>• 33% unemployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 34% employed full-time</li> <li>• 34% employed part-time</li> <li>• 33% unemployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31% employed full-time</li> <li>• 36% employed part-time</li> <li>• 33% unemployed</li> </ul>	Yes
	SS #8: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Number of households in properties with absolute minimum rent whose primary source of income is from wages	1,080 households	1,200 households	1,580 households	Yes

*Data collection methods*

SHA began implementing rent reforms in 2001. However, meaningful data from that time period for staffing and hours spent on recertifications is unavailable. We therefore use 2009 as the baseline year for recertification metrics because data is available and because this year precedes implementation of a round of rent policy strategies that had a measurable impact on staff hours, including implementation of triennial recertifications in the HCV program. SHA conducted a 2013 time study to determine the amount of staff time spent on public housing annual and interim recertifications and a 2011 time study for the HCV program. Reported costs in this category reflect only staff wages attributable to conducting certifications and do not include benefits, taxes, or costs for resources such as postage and paper. Total wages are calculated by multiplying median wage rates for the staff positions times the amount of time per certification times the number of certifications. This methodology is used rather than total wages because many staff are engaged in a number of activities not related to certifications.

Baseline data for 1999 for households whose primary source of income is through wages does not include Holly Park because this data is not available.

SHA does not maintain records on hours worked by participants. Data on employment by full-time, part-time and unemployed status are instead calculated based on total earned income divided by the minimum wage rate (\$15 per hour in 2019).

SHA maintains records in Yardi, the system of record for public housing, of self-employed participants' selection of the streamlined deduction or full verification of actual expenses.

Recertification data exclude Mod Rehab units and port-in voucher households.

#### *Updates*

SHA added one strategy to Activity #10: Local Rent Policy in 2019. It was fully implemented.

- **Disregard of student financial aid as income (Strategy 10.H.15):** This activity extends a standard public housing policy to SHA's voucher households. The policy excludes all student financial aid from all income calculations. After implementation, there was a large reduction in staff time to calculate income for households with students on financial aid. Instead of collecting all information regarding financial aid, certification specialists now only have to verify student status which is a more efficient process.

SHA planned two updates to strategies under Activity #10: Local Rent Policy:

- **Voucher payment standards (Strategy 10.H.04):** SHA's leasing success has seen a marked improvement, which can be attributed in part to the 2018 VPS increase. This change primarily affected tenant-based households from the 2017 Tenant-Based Waitlist who are experiencing an 80% leasing success rate compared to 60% for the 2015 Tenant-Based Waitlist. Additionally, 41% of shoppers are leasing up within 60 days of voucher issuance indicating that the VPS increase has made them more competitive in Seattle's rental market. SHA has not adopted an open one-bedroom standard.
- **Self-employment expenses (Strategy 10.P.23):** After approval of the strategy in the 2019 MTW Plan, procedures for the adoption of Tax Credit rules for self-employment were developed and approved in the fourth quarter of 2019 and planned for roll out in 20200.

#### *Actual non-significant changes*

None.

#### *Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 and SS #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

In our 2019 Plan, SHA added a new strategy to Activity 10: Strategy 10.H.15: Disregard of student financial aid as income. Through the proposal process, we updated our baseline and benchmarks for both metric CE2: staff time savings and our SHA metric. These changes were approved by HUD and will be the baseline and benchmarks used in this and future MTW Reports.

In 2015, the benchmark for CE #1 was reset but the 2018 Report inadvertently used the pre-2015 reset metric as the benchmark. The 2019 Report corrects this error.

The outcome for HC #4 has been changed for 2019. The modified metric indicates the number of court filings for evictions that occurred, which is a more comprehensive measure than evictions alone. Not all court filings for eviction end in a tenant being evicted, but as SHA is trying to reduce both the number of court filings as well as actual evictions or move outs that may result, we will report on the number of court filings for evictions moving forward.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

None.

MTW activity #11: Resource conservation

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #11 was first proposed in the 2000 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2000. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA's resource conservation strategies take advantage of the agency's existing relationships with the City of Seattle and local utility providers, which continuously identify opportunities to increase resource conservation and reduce costs, rather than conducting a HUD-prescribed energy audit every five years. Conservation strategies have already achieved significant energy and cost savings to the agency, including conversion to more efficient toilets and electrical upgrades.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Public housing strategies					
11.P.01	Energy protocol: Employ a cost-benefit approach for resource conservation in lieu of HUD-required energy audits every five years.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None

*Impact*

Resource conservation strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by working continuously with local utility providers and the City of Seattle to identify conservation measures in a timely manner and avoiding the cost of hiring a third party to conduct energy audits every five years.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost of energy audits per year	\$102,000 (CY 2009)	\$121,598 (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$27,989 in staff salaries in 2019	Yes
Agency metrics	Agency metric	Savings from water conservation measures	N/A	\$900,000 per year (since CY 2009)	\$2,127,959 in 2019; \$20.7 million since implementation	Yes
	Agency metric	Savings from electricity conservation measures	N/A	\$147,000 per year (since CY 2009)	\$583,982 in 2019; \$3.5 million since implementation	Yes

*Data collection methods*

SHA maintains detailed utility consumption and rate data supplied by utility providers and SHA's own system. Cost savings measures look solely at the impact of conservation initiatives and are not an agency-wide measure of utility usage. For example, portfolios that were not included in the conservation initiatives are not included in the analysis. Cost savings represent the total amount of energy saved through conservation initiatives and do not distinguish between resulting decreases in expenses for the agency and for tenants.

The baseline cost of energy audits is based on the real cost to SHA of \$51,000 for an energy audit of 520 units in 2009, resulting in a proportionate estimated cost of \$510,000 for 5,200 public housing units. Since energy audits are required only once every five years, this is divided by five to calculate an average annual cost of \$102,000 for the baseline. The cost of energy audits is based on a percentage of the median salary for staff responsible for energy and utility analyses. This analysis does not include factors such as overhead or benefits.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

None.

MTW activity #12: Waiting lists, preferences and admissions

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #12 was first proposed in the 2000 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2000. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA's waiting list, preferences and admission strategies have two primary objectives: to increase efficiencies and to facilitate partnerships with agencies that provide supportive services. SHA's MTW flexibilities in this area allow the agency to provide a greater percentage of vouchers to service providers and make decisions if needed to prevent homelessness. These strategies also expedite admission into the program for partner agencies' clients by allowing agencies to maintain their own waiting lists and allowing applicants referred by selected providers to receive the next available unit.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Agency-wide activities					
12.A.01	Local preferences: SHA may establish local preferences for federal housing programs.	2002 MTW Plan	2002	MTW authority not currently needed	None
Voucher strategies					
12.H.01	Recategorized as 9.H.20. See Activity #9.				
12.H.02	Voucher distribution through service provider agencies: Up to 30% of SHA's tenant-based vouchers may be made available to local nonprofits, transitional housing providers, and divisions of local government that provide direct services for use by their clients without regard to their client's position on SHA's waiting list.	2000 MTW Plan	2002	Active	None
12.H.03	Special issuance vouchers: Establish a "special issuance" category of vouchers to address circumstances where timely issuance of vouchers can prevent homelessness or rent burden.	2003 MTW Plan	2003	Active	None
12.H.04	Admit applicants owing SHA money: Provide voucher assistance to households owing SHA money from prior tenancy under specific circumstances, for example if they enter into a repayment agreement.	2008 MTW Plan	2008	MTW authority no longer required	None

12.H.05	Limit eligibility for applicants in subsidized housing: Implement limits or conditions for tenants living in subsidized housing to participate in the HCV program. For example, before issuing a Public Housing resident a Voucher, they must fulfill the initial term of their public housing lease.	2008 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
12.H.06	Streamlined eligibility verification: Streamline eligibility verification standards and processes, including allowing income verifications to be valid for up to 180 days.	2009 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None
Public housing strategies					
12.P.01	Site-based waiting lists: Applicants can choose from several site-specific and/or next available waiting lists.	1999 MTW Plan	1999	MTW authority not currently needed	None
12.P.02	Partners maintain own waiting lists: Allow partners to maintain waiting lists for partner-owned and/or operated units (traditional LIPH units; service provider units, etc.) and use own eligibility and suitability criteria (including no waiting list).	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
12.P.03	Expedited waiting list: Allow applicants referred by selected partners (primarily transitional housing providers) to receive expedited processing and receive the "next available unit."	2004 MTW Plan	2004	MTW no longer required	None
12.P.04	No waiting list: Allows for filling units without a waiting list.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
12.P.05	Eligibility criteria: Unique eligibility criteria for specific units or properties, such as service enriched units.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented (except for the agency units governed by 8.P.01)	Inactive	None
12.P.06	Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) Waiting List Policy: SHA will not distinguish between senior and non-senior disabled households in filling vacancies in the SSHP portfolio based on bedroom size. The SSHP program will maintain a 90 percent senior, 10 percent non-senior disabled ratio at the AMP level.	2013 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None

*Impact*

Waiting list, preferences and admission strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by reducing avoidable turnover and avoiding costs for tasks that can be fulfilled by service providers.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost of administering waiting lists and admissions, in wages	\$442,791 (CY 1999)	\$678,368 (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$481,915 in staff salaries	Yes
	CE #2: Staff time savings	Total time to administer waiting lists and admissions, in staff hours	24,960 (12 FTEs)	20,800 (10 FTEs) or fewer	16,640 staff hours (8 FTEs)	Yes
Agency metrics	Agency metric	Savings from agencies maintaining their own waiting lists (per year)	\$0	\$24,960	\$0	No
	Agency metric	Number of applicants newly receiving housing through agency referrals or waiting lists	0	75	0	No

*Data collection methods*

Avoided costs from agencies maintaining their own waiting lists is calculated based on savings of \$195 per newly occupied unit for partnership and service-provider operated housing units. The \$195 per unit is derived from the agency's real cost in 2010 of \$879,050 to conduct regular admissions for 4,500 units.

Hours are calculated based on actual number of admissions staff. Staff costs are calculated based on the median wage per position, but do not include other costs such as benefits and overhead.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

SHA did not achieve the benchmark for applicants newly receiving housing through agency referrals or the expedited waiting list, or the related metric regarding time savings from these strategies. The decrease in public housing admissions through the expedited waiting list reflects a management decision to halt the processing of expedited applications in order to increase agency-wide capacity for admissions. Additionally it reflects SHA's increased ability to serve homeless households through general admissions with the secondary review process, which provides an intensive, individualized assessment process for applicants that may lack a current positive rental history and through project-based voucher contributions to the community's housing first efforts. The number of Housing Choice Voucher admissions through agency referrals also decreased to zero in 2019 because the agency-based voucher contracts were structured to not be renewable and as a result the total number has decreased over time until we finally closed out the last one in 2019. We may adjust benchmarks for these activities in future plans and reports.

MTW activity #13: Homeownership and graduation from subsidy

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #13 was first proposed in the 2004 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2004. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA provides support for the multiple ways that households can successfully move away from housing subsidy – not only through homeownership, but also through unsubsidized rentals in the private market. These strategies include End of Participation clocks for households whose income has increased to the point where they no longer require substantial subsidy.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Agency-wide strategies					
13.A.01	Down payment assistance: Allocate MTW Block Grant funds to offer a local down payment assistance program.	2004 MTW Plan	2004	Inactive	None
13.A.02	Savings match incentive: Program that matches savings and provides financial information for participating public housing and HCV households leaving subsidized housing for homeownership or unsubsidized rental units.	2012 MTW Plan	2013	Inactive	None
Voucher strategies					
13.H.01	Monthly mortgage assistance: SHA may develop a homeownership program that includes a monthly mortgage subsidy.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
13.H.02	180-day EOP clock: The 180-day End of Participation “clock” due to income will start when a family’s Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) reaches \$50 or less.	2010 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None

Public housing strategies					
13.P.01	End of Participation for higher income households in mixed-income communities: In mixed-income communities, SHA will remove subsidy when household income exceeds the established limit for six months.	2012 MTW Plan	2016	Active	None
13.P.02	Incentives for positive tenant departures and housing stability: SHA may provide a financial incentive to public housing households who vacate their unit in a manner consistent with SHA unit guidelines.	2019 MTW Plan	2019	Active	None

*Impact*

Homeownership and graduation from subsidy strategies promote self-sufficiency and create housing opportunities for waiting list households by helping participants leave subsidized housing.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total remediation costs in buildings where the incentive is offered	\$416,688 total remediation costs in Bell Tower, Jefferson Terrace, Olive Ridge and Westwood Heights (2017)	\$383,589 in remediation costs (adjusted for inflation)	\$422,101 in remediation costs	No
	SHA metric	Total vacancy time in buildings where the incentive is offered	2,529 total vacancy days for Bell Tower, Jefferson Terrace, Olive Ridge and Westwood Heights (2017)	2,373 total vacancy days (avg. 43 vacancy days per unit)	2,529 total vacancy days (avg. 50 vacancy days per unit)	No

Housing choice	HC #6: Increase in homeownership opportunities	Number of households that purchased a home through homeownership and graduation from subsidy strategies	0	5 or more households	11 households	Yes
Self-sufficiency	SS #8: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Number of households who transitioned to unsubsidized housing due to homeownership and graduation from subsidy strategies	0	25 or more households	37 households	Yes

*Data collection methods*

End of participation information is maintained in SHA’s participant databases. Homeownership is not tracked for households leaving the HCV program due to the end of participation clock.

SHA maintains records of all households vacating their units, including the date of exit, the per-unit costs of unit remediation services (i.e. the work orders related to repairing a unit to prepare it for new tenants) and the number of days the unit is vacant between tenants.

*Updates*

SHA added one strategy to Activity 13: Homeownership and graduation from subsidy in 2019. It was fully implemented.

- **Incentives for positive tenant departures and housing stability (Strategy 13.P.02):** This activity allows SHA to provide financial incentives to promote housing stability and support public housing households to successfully vacate a public housing unit. This activity was piloted during 2019 in SHA’s Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) South portfolio. Of the households in the pilot, 59% received some of their initial security deposit back, plus the enhancement. The pilot was not able to establish a causal relationship between the offer of enhancement and more positive, less costly vacates. Further adjusting and testing may be warranted.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

The metrics proposed and approved for CE #1 and CE #2 in 2019 were total remediation costs and total vacancy time in the four buildings identified for the pilot in Strategy 13.P.02. However, the baseline and benchmark included for CE #2 actually reflected the average vacancy days per unit in each of the four buildings. These metrics also do not reflect staff time savings, per the definition of the metric in the HUD Form 50900. The baseline and benchmark for CE #2 were recalculated based on 2017 numbers to reflect the 2017 total vacancy days in the identified buildings (baseline) and 10% reduction from the baseline (benchmark). This metric was recategorized as an agency metric. The average vacancy days per unit measure was removed as a stand-alone metric and folded into the agency metric.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

In 2019, SHA added Strategy 13.P.02: Incentives for positive tenant departures and housing stability along with three cost-effectiveness metrics. During 2019, SHA piloted the program in our LIPH-South portfolio. Given the small number of move outs and variations in circumstances, the pilot was not able to establish a causal relationship between the offer of enhancement and more positive, less costly vacates. Further adjusting and testing may be warranted.

MTW activity #15: Combined program management

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

In some of its communities, SHA co-locates units funded through project-based vouchers and low income public housing. Combining program management and policies for both of these types of units (referred to as Streamlined Low Income Housing Program, or SLIHP, units) within the same community reduces costs by eliminating redundancies, including duplicative rent reviews and

inspections. It also avoids unnecessary disparities between tenants of the two different types of units. SHA’s current implementation of this activity allows for all units subsidized by project-based housing choice vouchers to be operated like public housing subsidized units in communities that receive both types of subsidy. This streamlined approach includes transfer policies as well as acceptance of slight differences (generally less than \$1) in rent calculation caused by different data systems of record for vouchers and public housing.

MTW activity #15 was first proposed in the 2008 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2008. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
15.A.01	Combined program management: Combined program management for project-based vouchers co-located with public housing or other units in communities operating both subsidy types.	2008 MTW Plan	2008	Active	None

*Impact*

Combined program management strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by decreasing staff time through the elimination of duplicated activities, such as inspections and waiting lists, and the streamlining of rent and other policies that would otherwise be similar, but different, if the units were operated under the separate subsidy programs.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost to complete recertifications for combined program management units (in wages)	\$10,335 (CY 2007)	\$12,852 (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$51,004	No
	CE #2: Staff time savings	Total time to complete recertifications for combined program management units	472 hours	450 hours or fewer	1,815 hours	No

*Data collection methods*

Staff time is calculated based on a 2011 voucher time study and 2013 public housing time study, which found that on average it took 16 minutes to key an annual review in HCV's data system of record, plus an average of 146 total minutes to complete a regular recertification in public housing. The time required for a regular recertification in public housing is used as a proxy for the equivalent amount of time required to complete an annual tax credit certification in the HOPE VI units. The baseline figure is derived from the average total time required to complete a public housing annual review plus the average total time required to complete a project-based voucher annual review.

The data provided on time saved through this strategy reflects only time spent on annual recertifications and does not reflect the added opportunities for efficiencies through unified waiting lists and inspections. Data on cost savings reflects median wage levels only and excludes other factors such as overhead, benefits, and postage.

*Updates*

As of 1/1/2019, our HCV department no longer does any data entry for our SLIPH units. They still engage in staff training and audits related to the combined managed units, which will be included in staff time and staff wage calculations in this and future MTW Reports.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

The baseline and benchmark metrics were established in 2007, when the SLIHP program was much smaller. In 2019, SHA increased the number of units in the program by four-fold, increasing from 143 units at our High Point and Rainier Vista properties to 635 units in 174 buildings. As the number of units increased, so did the number of staff hours and the associated staff wages. As SHA continues to use the flexibilities afforded by this activity in our units, we may choose to add even more units to the SLIHP program. We will review these metrics and consider adjusting them in the future.

MTW activity #18: Short-term assistance

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

SHA is working on multiple fronts with community partners to develop innovative new assistance programs that are designed to be short-term in length. These new programs help households both access and retain housing through one-time or temporary assistance such as rent, deposits, arrears, utility assistance, moving and relocation costs, and temporary housing as needed. Short-term assistance is paired with targeted services when needed, including connections to case management, employment, childcare services, and domestic violence counseling.

SHA's MTW activities for short-term assistance also include disregarding one-time or short-term emergency assistance from other sources to prevent households from losing their housing in determining eligibility and rent contribution.

MTW activity #18 was first proposed in the 2013 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2013. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
18.A.01	Interagency Domestic Violence Transfer Program: SHA may join an inter-jurisdictional transfer program to assist residents and program participants who become victims of domestic violence.	2014 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
18.A.02	Emergency Assistance for Housing Stability: SHA may disregard one-time or short-term emergency assistance from other sources to prevent households from losing their housing in determining eligibility and rent contribution.	2014 MTW Plan	2014	Active	None
<i>Voucher strategies</i>					
18.H.01	Short-Term Rental Assistance: SHA may provide funding for short-term shallow rental assistance through cooperative community initiatives to help families, students, adults, and youth obtain and retain housing.	2013 MTW Plan	2013	Inactive	None

*Impact*

Short-term assistance strategies contribute to self-sufficiency by providing youth and adults with the services and financial assistance that they need to remain stable in their housing and/or to obtain housing.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Housing choice	HC #1: Additional units of housing made available	Number of new units for domestic violence survivors made available for households at or below 80% AMI through the interagency domestic violence transfer program (per year)	0	3 or more households	0	No
	HC #4: Displacement prevention	Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move without access to emergency assistance funds	0	0	0	Yes
	HC #5: Increase in resident mobility	Number of households able to move to a better unit (per year)	0	3 or more households	0	No
	HC #7: Households assisted by services that increase housing choice	Number of households receiving services aimed at increasing housing choice (per year)	0	25 or more households	0	No

*Data collection methods*

Outcomes for households are tracked through program records and HMIS.

SHA reports zeroes for the benchmark and annual outcome for emergency assistance for housing stability (Metric HC #4 / Strategy 18.A.02) because the policy allows the agency to disregard this type of emergency assistance and it is not collected from residents/participants

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

None.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

SHA did not achieve our benchmarks for several of the metrics in Activity #18.

- **Metric HC #1 / Strategy 18.A.01:** The interagency domestic violence program was never implemented, and is currently considered an inactive strategy.
- **Metrics HC #5 & HC #7 / Strategy 18.H.01:** SHA did not fund short-term rental assistance in 2019. SHA may adjust the benchmark in the future.

MTW activity #19: Mobility and portability

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #19 was first proposed in the 2013 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2015. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

Mobility and portability strategies are designed to support cost effectiveness and to increase access to targeted units and neighborhoods for voucher holders.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Voucher strategies					
19.H.01	Limiting portability in high cost areas: SHA may deny requests for portability moves to another jurisdiction when the receiving housing authority intends to administer rather than absorb the voucher and the resulting payment standard would be higher than SHA's payment standard.	2013 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
19.H.02	Housing choice moving cost assistance and support: SHA may develop a program for voucher households to provide assistance with housing search, access supplements, deposits and similar costs, outreach and incentives for landlord participation such as risk reduction funds and access supplements.	2014 MTW Plan	2015	Active	None
19.H.03	One year residency requirement before port out: SHA may require that Housing Choice Voucher households live in Seattle for one year before moving with their voucher to a different community.	2015 MTW Plan	2015	Active	None
19.H.04	Streamlined local timelines and processes for improved leasing success: SHA may modify leasing timelines and processes to support leasing success and improve efficiency	2019 MTW Plan	2019	Active	None

*Impact*

Mobility and portability strategies support cost effectiveness by reducing agency costs and time commitments.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Cost effectiveness	CE #1: Agency cost savings	Total cost to complete port-out processing (in wages)	\$17,332 (CY 2014)	\$16,567 in wages (CY 2019 adjusted)	\$2,496 in wages	Yes
	CE #2: Staff time savings	Total time to complete port-out processing (in staff hours)	419 hours	369 hours	90.5 hours	Yes
Housing choice	HC #4: Displacement prevention	Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance	153 expired Moving with Continued Assistance (MWCA) vouchers	76 expired MWCA vouchers	187 expired MWCA vouchers	No

*Data collection methods*

SHA maintains records of households that have ported-out of Seattle in Elite (the current system of record for the HCV program). Time estimates represent initial port out processing only and do not include subsequent activities such as annual port-out updates. Cost estimates represent staff wages and do not include overhead.

SHA also maintains records in Elite of issuance and leasing success for MWCA vouchers.

*Updates*

SHA added a new strategy to Activity 19: Mobility and portability in 2019. It was fully implemented.

- Streamlined local timelines and processes for improved leasing success (Strategy 19.H.04):** In Seattle’s extremely competitive and expensive rental market, voucher holders often need longer than the HUD-limited length of time to lease up successfully. Through this activity, SHA can adopt local timelines and processes for new and moving with continued assistance voucher households. Implementing this activity provided the voucher department with additional authority to assist larger households moving with continued assistance in locating larger units which are often limited in their availability.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

Benchmarking for CE #1 was updated to reflect inflation. The new rate for calendar year 2019 was calculated using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator.

Metric HC #4 was added to measure the income of newly implemented Strategy 19.H.04.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

While SHA did not meet the benchmark for HC #4, we believe this is largely due to the success of the VPS change adopted in August 2018. This change applied the increased VPS to households that were rent burdened in their current unit or would have become so due to a rent increase. This likely incentivized households to remain in their current unit and cancel their MWCA request or voucher. SHA will continue to monitor this issue and may consider updating the benchmark in the future. In addition, the strategy was not implemented with all households receiving MWCA vouchers but rather those for whom the activities would be more effective, namely larger households looking for multi-bedroom units that are often limited in availability in Seattle's rental market.

MTW activity #20: Local non-traditional affordable housing strategies

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #20 was first proposed in the 2013 Annual Plan, per HUD guidance. It was first implemented in 1999. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

SHA sometimes uses MTW Block Grant funds to support affordable housing outside of the traditional public housing and voucher programs. This activity includes both short and long term funding for development, capital improvement, and maintenance of

affordable housing units. It may also provide financial maintenance, such as the contribution of funds to meet an established Debt Coverage Ratio, required for continued operation of the affordable units. SHA follows applicable requirements regarding local non-traditional use of MTW funds.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Agency-wide strategies					
20.A.01	Use of Funds for Local Non-Traditional Affordable Housing: SHA may use Block Grant funds to develop, capially improve, and maintain and operate affordable housing outside of the traditional public housing and voucher programs.	2013 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None

*Impact*

Local Non-Traditional Affordable Housing strategies support housing choice by preserving affordable housing options for households below 80% AMI throughout the city of Seattle.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Housing choice	HC #1: Additional units of housing made available	Number of new units made available for households at or below 80% AMI (cumulative)	0	596 units	724 units (38 new in 2019)	Yes

	HC #2: Units of housing preserved	Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (cumulative)	0	90 units	513 units (120 new in 2019)	Yes
--	-----------------------------------	---	---	----------	-----------------------------	-----

*Data collection methods*

SHA routinely tracks information on all of its housing stock, including funding type.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

None.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

None.

MTW activity #22: Housing assistance for school stability

*2019 approved, implemented, amended*

MTW activity #22 was first proposed in the 2016 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 2016. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below.

*Description*

Stable, quality schools are a core component of neighborhoods of opportunity. SHA is partnering with local service providers and the school district to implement Home from School, a collaborative initiative to support homeless and unstably housed families with children in order to positively impact family and school stability. Student turnover, especially mid school year, creates challenges for schools and for students, both in serving new students and those who remain throughout the year. Residential stability can lead to an uninterrupted school year for students and can prevent fewer school changes that often leave children behind academically.

SHA provides housing assistance to participating families, using multiple means as available, including prioritizing preference for participating families for admission into units within the selected neighborhood, as well as tenant-based vouchers for participating families, with use limited to the school neighborhood. Partnering service providers provide outreach, enrollment, and pre and post-move support, including services such as housing search, assistance with barriers to leasing such as lack of security deposit and utility arrears, and connecting families to neighborhood resources and services.

Participation in the program is voluntary and priority is given to literally homeless families. To continue to receive SHA housing assistance, participating families must remain in the school neighborhood until their children graduate from elementary school.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Agency-wide strategies					
22.A.01	Housing Assistance for School Stability: SHA may provide housing assistance for homeless or unstably housed low-income families with children at selected neighborhood schools.	2016 MTW Plan	2016	Active	None

*Impact*

Housing Assistance for School Stability strategies support self-sufficiency and housing choice by providing homeless families with housing and supports that allow them to keep their children in the same school.

This activity is **on schedule**.

Statutory objective	Metric	Unit of measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark achieved?
Self-sufficiency	SS #5: Households assisted by services that increase self-sufficiency	Number of households receiving services to increase self-sufficiency (cumulative)	0	25 households	56 households (15 new households in 2019)	Yes
Housing choice	HC #5: Increase in resident mobility	Number of households able to move to a unit that allows them to continue their child's enrollment at their current neighborhood or feeder school (cumulative)	0	22 households	33 households (14 new households in 2019)	Yes
	HC #7: Households assisted by services that increase housing choice	Number of households receiving services to increase housing choice (cumulative)	0	25	56 households (15 new households in 2019)	Yes

*Data collection methods*

SHA, Seattle Public Schools and service partners maintain detailed records of participation in the program, including receipt of housing assistance and supportive services.

*Updates*

None.

*Actual non-significant changes*

None.

*Actual changes to metrics/data collection*

None.

*Actual significant changes*

None.

*Challenges in achieving benchmarks and possible strategies*

None.

### **Not yet implemented activities**

MTW activity #21: Self-sufficiency assessment and plan

*2019 approved, implemented, amended, placed on hold*

MTW activity #21 was first proposed in the 2015 Annual Plan. It has not been implemented. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below. The activity was placed on hold in 2017.

*Description*

This activity is intended to increase self-sufficiency by connecting participants to assessments, individualized plans, and community resources designed to help them increase their education, training, and credentials and obtain higher wage jobs.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
21.A.01	Self-sufficiency Assessment and Plan: SHA may make self -sufficiency assessments and planning mandatory for work-able adults	2015 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Not yet implemented	None

*Reactivation*

SHA launched the Workforce Opportunity System pilot in 2015 and at the end of 2017 ended the three-year pilot program without needing to make participation mandatory. Key strategies from the pilot were integrated in the new JobLink program in 2018, which streamlined access to services previously delivered through the Family Self-Sufficiency and Economic Opportunities programs. Mandatory participation has not been needed to date but each year SHA will continue to monitor enrollment and participation and may make changes such as requiring mandatory participation based on those results.

**Activities on hold**

MTW activity #4: Investment policies

*2019 approved, implemented, amended, placed on hold*

MTW activity #4 was first proposed in the 1999 Annual Plan. It was first implemented in 1999. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below. The activity was placed on hold in 2013.

*Description*

SHA’s MTW investment policies give the agency greater freedom to pursue additional opportunities to build revenue by making investments allowable under Washington State’s investment policies in addition to HUD’s investment policies. Each year, SHA assesses potential investments and makes a decision about whether this MTW flexibility will be needed. In 2018 investment flexibility was not needed and all SHA investments followed HUD policies.

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Agency-wide strategies					
4.A.01	Investment policies: SHA may replace HUD investment policies with Washington State investment policies.	1999 MTW Plan	1999	On Hold	None

### *Reactivation*

SHA annually assesses potential investments to determine which investment policies are most beneficial. MTW alternate investment policies were not needed in 2019. However, SHA continues to revisit its investment strategies annually in consideration of both the agency's financial plans and available investment opportunities.

### **Closed out activities**

MTW activity #6: MTW block grant and fungibility

*2019 approved, implemented, amended, closed*

MTW activity #6 was included in SHA's 1999 MTW Agreement. It was first implemented in 1999. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below. The activity was closed out in 2011.

### *Description*

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Agency-wide strategies					
6.A.01	MTW Block Grant: SHA combines all eligible funding sources into a single MTW Block Grant used to support eligible activities.	1999 MTW Agreement	1999	Closed	N/A
6.A.03	Operating reserve: Maintain an operating reserve consistent with sound management practices	1999 MTW Agreement	1999	Closed	N/A

86 (Archival numbering system)	Obligation and expenditure timelines: SHA may establish timelines for the obligation and expenditure of MTW funds	1999 MTW Agreement	1999	Closed	N/A
Voucher strategies					
6.H.01	Utilization goals: Utilization defined by use of budget authority	2003 MTW Plan	2003	Closed	N/A

*Reason for closing*

While the Block Grant, fungibility, operating reserve and utilization goals continue to be active and critical elements of SHA's participation as an MTW agency, this activity may be considered closed out as of 2011, which was the last year that SHA reported on it as a separate activity. HUD no longer allows SHA to establish timelines for the obligation and expenditure of MTW funds. SHA reports on uses of single-fund/block grant fungibility in Section V of this report.

MTW activity #7: Procurement

*2019 approved, implemented, amended, closed*

MTW activity #7 was included in SHA's 1999 MTW Agreement. It was first implemented in 1999. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below. The activity was closed out per HUD guidance in 2011.

*Description*

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
Agency-wide strategies					
7.A.01	Construction contract: Locally-designed form of construction contract that retains HUD requirements while providing more protection for SHA	1999 MTW Plan	1999	Closed	N/A
7.A.02	Procurement policies: Adopt alternative procurement system that is competitive and results in SHA paying reasonable prices to qualified contractors	1999 MTW Plan	1999	Closed	N/A

7.A.03	Wage rate monitoring: Simplified process for monitoring the payment of prevailing wages by contractors	1999 MTW Plan	1999	Closed	N/A
--------	--	---------------	------	--------	-----

*Reason for closing*

While SHA's MTW procurement activity was approved by HUD in the 1999 Annual Plan, HUD has since that time taken the position that it is not an allowable MTW activity.

MTW activity #14: Related nonprofits

*2019 approved, implemented, amended, closed*

MTW activity #14 was first proposed in the 2004 Annual Plan. It was never implemented. The activity was closed out in 2013.

*Description*

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategies</i>					
14.A.01	Related non-profit contracts: SHA may enter into contracts with any related nonprofit.	2004 MTW Plan	Never implemented	Closed	N/A

*Reason for closing*

SHA never implemented this activity, which would have allowed the agency to enter into contracts with related nonprofits. SHA determined that existing partnership structures were adequate without needing additional MTW authority.

MTW activity #16: Local asset management program (LAMP)

*2019 approved, implemented, amended, closed*

MTW activity #16 was included in SHA's 2000 MTW Plan. It was first implemented in 2000. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below. The activity was closed out in 2013.

*Description*

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
<i>Agency-wide strategy</i>					
29 (Archival numbering system)	Local asset management program: Use asset management principles to optimize housing and services	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Closed	N/A

*Reason for closing*

Although SHA maintains the authority to implement the LAMP, and the continued operation of the LAMP remains an essential element of the agency’s participation in the MTW program, this activity may be considered closed out at HUD’s request as of 2013.

MTW activity #17: Performance standards

*2019 approved, implemented, amended, closed*

MTW activity #17 was included in SHA’s 1999 MTW Agreement. It was first implemented in 1999. Subsequent amendments to the activity are included in the table below. The activity was closed out in 2014.

*Description*

Approved strategies in this activity are as below.

Strategy	Description	First identified	First implemented	Current status	Updates
30 (Archival numbering system)	Local performance standards in lieu of HUD measures: Develop locally relevant performance standards and benchmarks to evaluate the agency performance in lieu of HUD’s Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS)	1999 MTW Plan	1999	Closed	N/A

*Reason for closing*

Although SHA continues to maintain and refine alternate performance standards, this activity may be considered closed out at HUD's request as of 2014

## (V) Sources and uses of funding

### Actual sources and uses of MTW funds in 2019

This section describes aspects of Seattle Housing Authority's (SHA or the Authority) revenues and expenditures for 2019, local asset management program, and use of MTW single fund authority.

### Actual sources and uses of MTW funds in 2019

This is SHA's seventh report under the new 50900 requirements issued by HUD in 2013. Public housing authorities continue to submit their financial information through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA) rather than in the MTW report. The following sections provide information on a few aspects of the MTW Block Grant, but they are not comprehensive. Replacement Housing factor (RHF) funding was not allocated in 2019, RHF comments will not be included in this or subsequent reports.

### Actual use of MTW single fund flexibility

The MTW Block Grant is a critical element of MTW participation, allowing MTW housing authorities to combine public housing capital, public housing operating, and most Housing Choice Voucher subsidies into a single source of funding that they are able to allocate to meet local housing and service needs of low-income people in their community. The following table describes how SHA used this single fund flexibility in 2019.

### Describe actual use of MTW single fund flexibility

SHA established an MTW Block Grant Fund under the original MTW Agreement in 1999. Seattle Housing Authority continues to use single fund flexibility under the First Amendment to the MTW Agreement (and now under the Extension Agreement). Funding flexibility allowed under MTW supports a variety of low-income housing services and programs and is central to the agency's Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP). SHA's LAMP includes the whole of its operations, including MTW Block Grant sources and uses.

During 2019, SHA exercised its MTW flexibility to allocate MTW Block Grant revenues among the Authority's housing and administrative programs. This enabled SHA to further its mission and strategic plan by balancing the mix of housing types, services, capital investment, and administrative support to different low-income housing programs and different groups of low-income residents and voucher participants.

In 2019, Seattle Housing used single fund authority of \$29M to support the following local programs:

- Support resident and voucher households achieve greater economic stability through building assets, achieving education goals and gaining job opportunities.
- Community supportive services and health and wellness programs for SHA housing participants such as case management to support housing stability and youth activities to support education achievement.

- Low-income housing acquisition, development, preservation and rehabilitation to increase the capacity to serve more low-income people through SHA-owned and/or managed residential facilities.
- Direct support of local low-income housing operations, assistance, capital repairs and program support to ensure safe, decent and affordable housing.

While these activities benefit from the flexibility of SHA’s MTW Block Grant, nearly all activities are for Section 8 and Section 9 participants and a minor share also benefit local non-traditional MTW activities as defined in PIH Notice 2011-45. SHA remains in compliance with the guidance regarding use of funds described in PIH Notice 2011-45.

### Local asset management plan

Did the MTW PHA allocate costs within statute in 2019?	Yes
Did the MTW PHA implement a local asset management plan in 2019?	Yes
Did the MTW PHA provide a LAMP in the appendix?	Yes

Please provide a brief update on implementation of the LAMP.

Seattle Housing continues to operate under its approved Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP), as first stipulated in the 2010 Plan and in practice since the beginning of its MTW participation. No significant changes were made to Seattle Housing's LAMP during 2019. SHA updates its Indirect Service Fees (ISF) annually; adds new programs if/when created; and, SHA maintains on-site maintenance staffing at selected communities as deemed most efficient to meet local needs. SHA submitted the LAMP with our 2019 MTW Plan and it was approved by HUD in a letter received April 12, 2019.

In compliance with the First Amendment to the MTW Agreement and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Super Circular at Title 2 CFR Part 200 (formerly A-87 requirements), SHA has set up an Indirect Services Fee (ISF). The indirect cost plan is described in more detail in Seattle Housing’s LAMP in the appendices of the MTW Plan. Similar to HUD's COCC and consistent with Circular 200, SHA created a Central Services Operating Center (CSOC) to represent the fee charges and expenses for indirect costs.

As described previously, SHA has developed an indirect services fee (ISF) in compliance with OMB Circular 200 requirements. SHA's CSOC is more comprehensive than HUD's asset management system, which focuses only on fees for services for public housing properties. SHA's mission and work is much broader than public housing and therefore SHA's LAMP is broader. The LAMP includes local housing, for sale activities, limited partnership properties, and other activities not found in traditional HUD programs or public housing agencies. SHA's ISF is based on anticipated indirect costs serving all direct service programs. In accordance with OMB Circular 200 requirements, the ISF is determined in a reasonable and consistent manner based on total units and leased vouchers. The ISF is a standard fee calculated annually per housing unit and leased voucher charged each month to each program. Please see the LAMP in the appendices to review SHA’s Indirect Cost Plan.

## (VI) Administrative

### Reviews, audits and inspections

SHA received no findings from HUD audits and monitoring visits that required actions to correct in 2019.

### Evaluation results

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

### MTW statutory requirement certification

SHA certifies that we have met the three MTW statutory requirements in 2019.

1. At least 75% of families assisted by SHA are very low-income.
  - SHA certifies that it is meeting this statutory objective. HUD, as stated in Section II, will confirm this with PIC data and the information SHA provides in this report on households served by local, non-traditional programs. According to SHA's data at the end of 2019, 82% of households we served were very low-income.
2. SHA continues to assist substantially the same total number of households as would have been assisted had SHA not participated in the MTW demonstration.
  - SHA continued to meet this requirement in 2019. Supporting details in HUD's prescribed format may be submitted separately from this report.
3. SHA has maintained a comparable mix of households (by family size) served as would have been served had SHA not participated in the MTW demonstration.
  - SHA has maintained a comparable mix of families by family size as would have been served absent the demonstration in 2019. While the distribution of family sizes served has shifted since SHA began its MTW participation, these shifts are largely attributed to non-MTW changes such as housing stock and community demographics, as explained in Section II of this report.

### MTW energy performance contract flexibility data

Not applicable.

## Appendix A: Housing stock and leasing overview

In the body of this report, we provide statistics on properties and units funded through the MTW Block Grant. However, SHA owns and manages additional housing stock funded through other sources. In this appendix we provide an overview of SHA's housing stock and leasing rates for units that are both MTW and non-MTW funded.

### Year-end snapshot: Seattle Housing Authority housing stock

#### Public housing stock (MTW-funded)

The Low-Income Public Housing program (also referred to as public housing or LIPH) included 5,894 units as of year-end 2019. Public housing units are in high-rises (large apartment buildings), Scattered Sites units (small apartment buildings and single-family homes scattered throughout the city) and in communities at High Point, Lake City Court, NewHolly, Rainier Vista and Yesler. HUD's MTW Block Grant provides funding to help pay for operating costs exceeding rental income. Households typically pay approximately 30% of their monthly income for rent and utilities. About 100 of these public housing units are utilized by service providers who provide transitional housing or services to residents. About 900 public housing units are part of the Seattle Senior Housing Program (further described in the following Local Housing section). Forty units receiving public housing subsidy through SHA are owned by nonprofits and operated as traditional public housing.

#### Voucher stock (MTW-funded)

The Housing Choice Voucher program is also commonly known as HCV or Section 8. The program is a public/private partnership that provides vouchers (housing subsidies) to low-income families for use in the private rental housing market. At year-end 2019, SHA administered 9,756 vouchers funded through HUD's MTW Block Grant.

Participants typically pay 30 to 40% of their household's monthly income for rent and utilities, depending on the unit that they choose. Voucher subsidies are provided through a variety of means including:

- Tenant-based (tenants can take their vouchers into the private rental market).
- Project-based (the subsidy stays with the unit, property or defined set of properties).
- Program-based (MTW flexibility allows SHA to provide unit-based subsidies that float within a group of units or properties).
- Provider-based (SHA uses MTW flexibility to distribute subsidies through service providers so that they can master lease units and sublet to participants in need of highly-supportive housing).
- Agency-based (tenant-based vouchers distributed through selected partners).

#### Housing stock (non-MTW funded)

SHA also administers units and vouchers that are funded through sources other than the MTW Block Grant.

### *Special Purpose Vouchers*

SHA administers vouchers for special purposes (1,273 as of year-end 2019), such as housing veterans and reuniting families. These vouchers are often awarded competitively and funding is provided outside of the MTW Block Grant.

### *Section 8 New Construction*

The agency has 389 locally-owned units that receive Section 8 New Construction funding. They serve people with extremely low incomes.

### *Moderate Rehab*

SHA administers HUD Section 8 Moderate Rehab funding for 361 units operated by partner nonprofits serving extremely low-income individuals.

### *Other affordable housing*

Other affordable housing programs are operated outside of HUD's MTW Block Grant. They receive no operating subsidy except project-based vouchers in selected properties. SHA may use MTW Block Grant funds for capital improvements in other affordable housing properties serving low-income residents (as authorized by MTW Strategy 20.A.01: Use of funds for local, non-traditional affordable housing). SHA's other affordable housing is not equivalent to HUD's local non-traditional category, but there is some overlap between the two categories.

### *Senior housing*

The Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) was established by a 1981 Seattle bond issue. It includes 23 apartment buildings throughout the city, totaling over 1,000 units affordable to low-income elderly and disabled residents. In 2011, the agency added public housing subsidy to 894 of these units in order to keep rents affordable while addressing needed capital repairs. The agency used MTW authority to maintain the SSHP program's unique rules and procedures despite the introduction of public housing subsidy.

Remaining in the Seattle Senior Housing Program (as of year-end 2019) are 136 units without public housing subsidy.

### *Tax Credit and other housing types*

SHA operates nearly 2,400 units of other types of housing, including locally subsidized housing and unsubsidized housing. Units are located in townhomes and small apartment complexes throughout Seattle, including low- and moderate-income rental housing in the agency's redeveloped family communities (High Point, NewHolly, Rainier Vista and Yesler). These units do not receive ongoing operating subsidy, with the exception of project-based vouchers in selected units.

## Changes in housing inventory

<b>MTW Block Grant-funded housing</b>	<b>YE 2018</b>	<b>YE 2019</b>
Housing Choice Vouchers	9,703	9,756
<i>Tenant-based vouchers</i>	6,133	6,047
<i>Project-based vouchers (partner-owned)</i>	2,872	2,936
<i>Project-based vouchers (SHA-owned)</i>	615	691
<i>Program-based vouchers (SHA-owned)</i>	10	10
<i>Provider-based vouchers</i>	73	72
Public housing	5,894	5,894
<i>SHA-owned*</i>	5,854	5,854
<i>Partner-owned</i>	40	40
<b>Total MTW Block Grant-funded housing units</b>	<b>15,597</b>	<b>15,650</b>

<b>Other HUD-funded housing</b>	<b>YE 2018</b>	<b>YE 2019</b>
Housing Choice Vouchers (Special Purpose Vouchers)	982	1273
<i>Family Unification Program (FUP)</i>	200	275
<i>Housing conversion (tenant protection)</i>	12	14
<i>Mainstream disability vouchers</i>	154	154
<i>RAD</i>	107	321
<i>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)</i>	509	509
Section 8 new construction	129	389
Section 8 Moderate Rehab	575	361
<b>Total other HUD-funded housing units</b>	<b>1,686</b>	<b>2,023</b>

<b>Other affordable housing</b>	<b>YE 2018</b>	<b>YE 2019</b>
Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP)*	136	136
Tax credit housing (without subsidy)	1,288	1,406
Other affordable housing	623	834
Managed by SHA for other owners	0	0
<b>Total other affordable housing units</b>	<b>2047</b>	<b>2376</b>

	<b>YE 2018</b>	<b>YE 2019</b>
<b>Total housing units**</b>	<b>19,330</b>	<b>20,049</b>

\*Includes residential units leased to agencies that provide transitional housing or supportive services and units for live-in staff.

\*\*Due to project-basing and program-basing of Housing Choice Vouchers in other affordable housing, the total housing unit calculation is the sum of all housing units minus MTW Housing Choice Vouchers: project-based (SHA-owned) and program-based (SHA-owned). Units managed by SHA for other owners (if any) are also not included in the total housing calculation.

## Changes in units leased

<b>Housing program</b>	<b>YE 2018</b>	<b>YE 2019</b>
Housing Choice Vouchers (MTW)	9,312	9,495
Housing Choice Vouchers (non-MTW)	666	977
<i>Family Unification Program (FUP)</i>	199	196
<i>Housing conversion (tenant protection)</i>	11	0
<i>Mainstream disability vouchers</i>	69	130
<i>RAD</i>	0	289
<i>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)</i>	387	362
Public housing	5,657	5,496
Section 8 new construction	549	389
Section 8 Moderate Rehab	553	344
Other affordable housing^	1,928	2,314

	<b>YE 2018</b>	<b>YE 2019</b>
<b>Total units leased</b>	<b>18,665</b>	<b>19,015</b>

*^ Does not include local SSHP units operated by partners; does include residential units leased to agencies that provide transitional housing or supportive services and units for live-in staff. May include households who are represented in other programs such as HCV Section 8.*

*Data note: Some of the year-end 2018 projections were revised for the 2019 Report. Units set aside for administrative units have been removed, and some MTW TBVs were reallocated to RAD and PBV and some housing conversion vouchers were reallocated to TBVs. These changes reflect movement of how the vouchers are categorized and utilized in the local context.*

## Appendix B: New project-based voucher units

SHA awarded 385 new project-based vouchers in 2019. The projects are detailed below.

<b>Compass Broadview</b>							
<b>Project description</b>	<p>Compass Housing Alliance opened Compass Broadview in March 2019, offering 58 units (including family-size 2- and 3-bedroom units) of permanent supportive affordable housing in Seattle's Broadview neighborhood. The project-based units have been designated as set asides for families exiting homelessness, and Bellwether Housing will accept referrals from YWCA's Rapid Rehousing program. Case management, education and employment support and community resource referrals are provided.</p> <p>Amenities on-site include a community room, activity room, media room, on-site playground and parking. The building is restricted access and has laundry facilities on-site.</p> <p>The non-project-based voucher units are 30-50% AMI designated units.</p>						
<b>Total units in property</b>	58						
<b>Number of project-based units in property</b>	<b>0 BR</b>	<b>1 BR</b>	<b>2 BR</b>	<b>3 BR</b>	<b>4 BR</b>	<b>5+ BR</b>	<b>Total</b>
	0	0	15	3	0	0	<b>18</b>

<b>Mt. Baker Village RAD2 Conversion</b>							
<b>Project description</b>	<p>Mt. Baker Village completed conversion under RAD from a Moderate Rehabilitation contract to a project-based HCV contract. The newly renovated property in the Mt. Baker neighborhood, operated by Mt. Baker Housing, offers a variety of affordable housing units, including family-size units.</p>						
<b>Total units in property</b>	156						
<b>Number of project-based units in property</b>	<b>0 BR</b>	<b>1 BR</b>	<b>2 BR</b>	<b>3 BR</b>	<b>4 BR</b>	<b>5+ BR</b>	<b>Total</b>
	0	60	56	23	3	0	<b>142</b>

<b>Red Cedar</b>							
<b>Project description</b>	<p>Seattle Housing Authority opened Red Cedar, a 119-unit building dedicated to affordable housing, in March 2019. The building offers a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom units. 80 of those units are project-based vouchers.</p> <p>Amenities on-site include keycard access, a central courtyard with play area, on-site laundry, 60 bike stalls and a two-level parking structure with 73 parking spots for mid-size and compact vehicles. Retail and social services are also available in the building.</p> <p>Red Cedar replaces three previous public housing buildings at Yesler Terrace demolished with HUD approval in February 2017.</p>						
<b>Total units in property</b>	80						
<b>Number of project-based units in property</b>	<b>0 BR</b>	<b>1 BR</b>	<b>2 BR</b>	<b>3 BR</b>	<b>4 BR</b>	<b>5+ BR</b>	<b>Total</b>
	0	12	42	22	4	0	<b>80</b>

<b>St. Martin's on Westlake RAD2 Conversion</b>							
<b>Project description</b>	<p>St. Martin's on Westlake is a 53-unit SRO building for chronically homeless men operated by Catholic Housing Services. St. Martin's had been operating through the Moderate Rehabilitation program since 1987 and completed a RAD2 conversion in October 2019.</p>						
<b>Total units in property</b>	53						
<b>Number of project-based units in property</b>	<b>0 BR</b>	<b>1 BR</b>	<b>2 BR</b>	<b>3 BR</b>	<b>4 BR</b>	<b>5+ BR</b>	<b>Total</b>
	53	0	0	0	0	0	<b>53</b>

<b>The Wintonia Hotel RAD2 Conversion</b>							
<b>Project description</b>	<p>The Wintonia Hotel is a 92-unit SRO building in Seattle's Capitol Hill neighborhood operated by Catholic Housing Services. This building had been operating through the Mod Rehab program since 1994 and completed a RAD2 conversion in October 2019.</p>						
<b>Total units in property</b>	92						
<b>Number of project-based units in property</b>	<b>0 BR</b>	<b>1 BR</b>	<b>2 BR</b>	<b>3 BR</b>	<b>4 BR</b>	<b>5+ BR</b>	<b>Total</b>
	92	0	0	0	0	0	<b>92</b>

## Appendix C: Household and applicant demographics

This appendix provides demographic data on SHA households residing within the City of Seattle and all applicants to SHA housing. Unless otherwise noted, data represents year-end information (December 31, 2019) for which the category is known. Variations in totals from table to table indicate detailed data may be missing. Additional data notes are provided at the end of this appendix.

### Current SHA household data

#### Race and ethnicity (in people)

Race/ethnicity	Black/African/African-American	White	Asian/Asian-American	Latinx	Native American/Alaska Native	Native Hawai'ian/Pacific Islander	Multi-racial	Other	Not specified	Total
Public housing	5,142	2,398	1,684	604	105	85	125	0	87	10,230
Housing Choice Voucher	8,741	3,643	1,840	1,068	336	241	390	0	0	16,259
Other	1,943	1,130	614	259	65	32	58	2	471	4,574
Total	15,826	7,171	4,138	1,931	506	358	573	2	558	31,063

#### Income distribution as a percent of area median income (in households)

Income range	<30% AMI	30-49% AMI	50-80% AMI	>80% AMI	Not specified	Total
Public housing	4,567	648	212	42	27	5,496
Housing Choice Voucher	6,727	989	233	36	0	7,985
Other	1,052	255	149	54	1,122	2,632
Total	12,346	1,892	594	132	1,149	16,113

Age distribution (in people)

Age group	Youth <18	Adults 18-61	Seniors 62+	Not specified	Total
Public housing	2,876	4,172	3,182	0	10,230
Housing Choice Voucher	5,706	7,601	2,952	0	16,259
Other	1266	2131	615	562	4,574
Total	9,848	13,904	6,749	562	31,063

People with disabilities (in people)

Disability status	Not disabled	Youth <18 with a disability	Adults 18-61 with a disability	Seniors 62+ with a disability	Total
Public housing	7,441	64	1,379	1,346	10,230
Housing Choice Voucher	10,971	285	2,758	2,245	16,259
Other	3,597	33	564	380	4,574
Total	22,009	382	4,701	3,971	31,063

Households served by unit size (in households)

Unit size	0 BR	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5+ BR	Total
Public housing	793	2,968	874	658	166	37	5,496
Housing Choice Voucher	2,414	2,002	2,079	1,085	302	98	7,980
Other	600	1,036	661	256	37	9	2,599
Total	3,807	6,006	3,614	1,999	505	144	16,075

Households served by length of participation (in households)

Length of participation	<2 years	2-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15-19 years	20+ years	Total
Public housing	422	1,245	1,471	1,107	677	574	5,496
Housing Choice Voucher	832	1,956	1,951	1,657	1,248	340	7,984
Other	583	635	702	346	216	147	2,629
Total	1,837	3,836	4,124	3,110	2,141	1,061	16,109

Current waitlist/applicant data

Race and ethnicity (Head of Household data only)

Race/ethnicity	Black/African/African-American	White	Asian/Asian-American	Latinx	Native American/Alaska Native	Native Hawai'ian/Pacific Islander	Multi-racial	Not specified	Total
Public housing	1,537	1,523	1,116	358	112	18	72	230	4,966
Housing Choice Voucher	1,873	1,258	298	364	99	103	216	1	4,212
Other	594	1,257	780	158	38	7	35	124	2,993
Total	4,004	4,038	2,194	880	249	128	323	355	12,171

Income distribution as a percent of area median income

Income range	<30% AMI	30-49% AMI	50-80% AMI	>80% AMI	Not specified	Total
Public housing	4,302	546	95	23	0	4,966
Housing Choice Voucher	3,682	405	405	125	0	4,212
Other	160	2,403	113	12	0	2,993
Total	8,144	3,354	613	160	0	12,171

Additional data notes for Appendix C

- Public housing data excludes occupants of employee units.
- Race and Ethnicity: HUD defines Ethnicity as Hispanic/Non-Hispanic and separate from Race. If an individual reports ethnicity as 'Hispanic,' then SHA counts them under Latinx in this report; otherwise the individual is counted under the applicable Race category.
- Housing Choice Voucher data excludes port-outs and includes port-ins.
- Other data excludes households in properties that are represented in other data tables (such as tenant-based Housing Choice Vouchers holders leasing "Other" SHA units).
- Length of participation data excludes households whose original move-in date is temporarily unavailable.
- Waitlist/applicant data does not include applicants for Special Portfolio and Tax Credit units. It does not include waitlist data for units that are managed through the Coordinated Entry for All program.

## Appendix D: Local asset management plan

### Introduction

The First Amendment to the Amended and Restated Moving to Work (MTW) Agreement (“First Amendment”) allows the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) to develop a Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP) for its public housing program. SHA is to describe our LAMP in the Annual MTW Plan, to include a description of how it is implementing project-based management, budgeting, accounting and financial management and any deviations from HUD’s asset management requirements. Under the First Amendment, SHA agreed our cost accounting and financial reporting methods would comply with the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Super Circular at Title 2 CFR Part 200 (formerly A-87 requirements) and agreed to describe our cost accounting plan as part of the LAMP, including how the indirect service fee is determined and applied. The materials herein fulfill SHA’s commitments.

### Framework for SHA’s Local Asset Management Program

#### Mission and values

SHA was established by the City of Seattle under State of Washington enabling legislation in 1939. SHA provides affordable housing to about 31,000 low-income people in Seattle, through units SHA owns and operates or for which SHA serves as the general partner of a limited partnership and as managing agent and through rental assistance in the form of tenant-based, project-based and provider-based vouchers. SHA is also an active developer of low-income housing, redeveloping communities we own and operate and rehabilitating and preserving existing assets.

SHA operates according to the following mission and values:

#### *Our mission*

Our mission is to enhance the Seattle community by creating and sustaining decent, safe and affordable living environments that foster stability and increase self-sufficiency for people with low incomes.

#### *Our values*

As stewards of the public trust, we pursue our mission and responsibilities in a spirit of service, teamwork, and respect. We embrace the values of excellence, collaboration, innovation and appreciation.

SHA owns and operates housing in neighborhoods throughout Seattle. These include the four large family communities of NewHolly and Rainier Vista in Southeast Seattle, High Point in West Seattle and Yesler in Central Seattle. In the past nineteen years, SHA has undertaken redevelopment or rehabilitation of all four family communities, a new family community in Lake City and 23 of our public housing high-rise buildings, using mixed financing with low-income housing tax credit limited partnerships and/or American Recovery and Restoration Act (ARRA) funds. As of year-end 2019, SHA is the general partner in seventeen limited partnerships. SHA

has been in the process of creating two more partnerships and dissolving one of our existing LPs/ with sixteen in operation and one in construction.

SHA had approximately 600 employees and a total operating and capital budget of \$292 million for Annual Report year 2019.

## Overarching policy and cost objectives

SHA's mission and values are embraced by our employees and ingrained in our policies and operations. They are the prism through which we view our decisions and actions and the cornerstone to which we return in evaluating our results. In formulating SHA's LAMP, our mission and values have served as the foundation of our policy/cost objectives and the key guiding principles.

Consistent with requirements and definitions of 2 CFR 200, SHA's LAMP is led by three overarching policy/cost objectives:

1. **Cost-effective affordable housing:** To enhance the Seattle community by creating, operating and sustaining decent, safe and affordable housing and living environments for low-income people, using cost-effective and efficient methods.
2. **Housing opportunities and choice:** To expand housing opportunities and choice for low-income individuals and families through creative and innovative community partnerships and through full and efficient use of rental assistance programs.
3. **Resident financial security and/or self-sufficiency:** To promote financial security or economic self-sufficiency for low-income residents, as individual low-income tenants are able, through a network of training, employment services, and support.

## Local Asset Management Program: Eight guiding principles

Over time and with extensive experience, these cost objectives have led SHA to define an approach to our LAMP that is based on the following principles:

- 1. In order to most effectively serve low-income individuals seeking housing, SHA will operate its housing and housing assistance programs as a cohesive whole, as seamlessly as feasible.**

We recognize that different funding sources carry different requirements for eligibility and different rules for operations, financing, and sustaining low-income housing units. It is SHA's job to make funding and administrative differences as invisible to tenants/participants as we can, so low-income people are best able to navigate the housing choices and rental assistance programs SHA offers. We also consider it SHA's job to design our housing operations to bridge differences among programs/fund sources and to promote consolidated requirements, wherever possible. It is also incumbent on us to use our MTW authority to minimize administrative inefficiencies from differing rules and to seek common rules, where possible, to enhance cost effectiveness, as well as reduce the administrative burden on tenants.

This principle has led to several administrative successes, including use of a single set of admissions and lease/tenant requirements for Low-Income Public Housing and project-based Housing Choice Voucher tenants in the same property. Similarly, we have

joint funder agreements for program and financial reporting and inspections on low-income housing projects with multiple local and state funders.

An important corollary is SHA's involvement in a community-wide network of public, non-profit and for-profit housing providers, service and educational providers and coalitions designed to rationalize and maximize housing dollars, whatever the source, and supportive services and educational/training resources to create a comprehensive integrated housing and services program city- and county-wide. As such, not only is SHA's LAMP designed to create a cohesive whole of SHA housing programs, it is also intended to be flexible enough to be an active contributing partner in a city-wide effort to provide affordable housing and services for pathways out of homelessness and out of poverty.

**2. In order to support and promote property performance and financial accountability at the lowest appropriate level, SHA will operate a robust project and portfolio-based budgeting, management and reporting system of accountability.**

SHA has operated a property/project-based management, budgeting, accounting and reporting system for the past twenty-two years. Our project-based management systems include:

- Annual budgets developed by on-site property managers and reviewed and consolidated into portfolio requests by area or housing program managers.
- Adopted budgets at the property and/or community level that include allocation of subsidies, where applicable, to balance the projected annual budget – this balanced property budget becomes the basis for assessing actual performance.
- Monthly property-based financial reports comparing year-to-date actual to budgeted performance for the current and prior years.
- Quarterly portfolio reviews are conducted with the responsible property manager(s) and the area, housing program managers and SHA's Asset Management Team.

SHA applies the same project/community-based budgeting system and accountability to its non-federal programs.

**3. To ensure best practices across SHA's housing portfolios, SHA's Asset Management Team provides the forum for review of housing operations policies, practices, financial performance, capital requirements, and management of both SHA and other housing authorities and providers.**

A key element of SHA's LAMP is the Asset Management Team (AMT), comprised of senior leadership staff from Housing Operations, Asset Management, Development, Executive, Legal, Finance, Budgets, Communications, Policy and the Housing Choice Voucher department. The interdisciplinary AMT meets bi-weekly throughout the year and addresses:

- All critical policy and program issues facing individual properties or applying to a single or multiple portfolios, from rent policy to smoke-free buildings to rules for in-home businesses.

- Portfolio reviews and follow-up, where the team convenes to review with property management staff how well properties are operating in relation to common performance measures (e.g. vacancy rates; turnover time); how the property is doing in relation to budget and key reasons for deviations; and property manager projections and/or concerns about the future.
- Annual assessment of capital repair and improvement needs of each property with property managers and area portfolio administrators in relation to five-year projections of capital preservation needs. This annual process addresses the capital needs and priorities of individual properties and priorities across portfolios.
- Review and preparation of the annual MTW Plan and Report, where key issues for the future are identified and discussed, priorities for initiatives to be undertaken are defined, and where evaluation of MTW initiatives are reviewed and next steps determined.

The richness and legitimacy of the AM Team processes result directly from the diverse Team composition, the open and transparent consideration of issues, the commitment of top management to participate actively on the AM Team, and the record of follow-up and action on issues considered by the AM Team.

**4. To ensure that SHA and residents reap the maximum benefits of cost-effective economies of scale, certain direct functions will be provided centrally.**

Over time, SHA has developed a balance of on-site capacity to perform property manager, resident manager and basic maintenance/handyman services, with asset preservation services performed by a central capacity of trades and specialty staff. SHA's LAMP reflects this cost-effective balance of on-site and central maintenance services for repairs, unit turnover, landscaping, pest control, and asset preservation as direct costs to properties. Even though certain maintenance functions are performed by central trade crews, the control remains at the property level, as it is the property manager and/or area or program manager who calls the shots as to the level of service required from the "vendor" – the property services group – on a unit turnover, site landscaping, and maintenance and repair work orders. Work is not performed at the property by the central crews without the prior authorization of the portfolio manager or his/her designee. And all services are provided on a fee for service basis.

Similarly, SHA has adopted procurement policies that balance the need for expedient and on-site response through delegated authorization of certain dollar levels of direct authority for purchases, with Authority-wide economies of scale and conformance to competitive procurement procedures for purchases/work orders in excess of the single bidder levels. Central procurement services are part of SHA's indirect services fee.

**5. SHA will optimize direct service dollars for resident/tenant supportive services by waiving indirect costs that would otherwise be borne by community service programs and distributing the associated indirect costs to the remaining direct cost centers.**

A large share of tenant/resident services are funded from grants and foundations and these funds augment local funds to provide supportive services and self-sufficiency services to residents. In order to optimize available services, the indirect costs will be supported by housing and housing choice objectives.

There are a myriad of reasons that led SHA to this approach:

- Most services are supported from public and private grants and many of these don't allow indirect cost charges as part of the eligible expenses under the grant;
- SHA uses local funds from operating surpluses to augment community services funding from grants; these surpluses have derived from operations where indirect services have already been charged;
- SHA's community services are very diverse, from recreational activities for youth to employment programs to translation services. This diversity makes a common basis for allocating indirect services problematic; and,
- Most importantly, there is a uniform commitment on the part of housing and housing choice managers to see dollars for services to their tenants/participants maximized. There is unanimous agreement that these program dollars not only support the individuals served, but serve to reduce property management costs they would experience from idle youth and tenants struggling on their own to get a job.

**6. SHA will achieve administrative efficiencies, maintain a central job cost accounting system for capital assets, and properly align responsibilities and liability by allocating capital assets/improvements to the property level only upon completion of capital projects.**

Development and capital projects are managed through central agency units and can take between two and five or more years from budgeting to physical completion. Transfer of fixed assets only when they are fully complete and operational best aligns responsibility for development and close-out vs. housing operations.

The practice of transferring capital assets when they are complete and operational, also best preserves clear lines of accountability and responsibility between development and operations; preserves the relationship and accountability of the contractor to the project manager; aligns with demarcations between builders risk and property insurance applicability; protects warranty provisions and requirements through commissioning; and, maintains continuity in the owner's representative to ensure all construction contract requirements are met through occupancy permits, punch list completion, building systems commissioning, and project acceptance.

**7. SHA will promote service accountability and incorporate conservation incentives by charging fees for service for selected central services.**

This approach, rather than an indirect cost approach, is preferred where services can be differentiated on a clear, uniform, and measurable basis. This is true for information technology services and for Fleet Management services. The costs of information technology services, hardware and software, are distributed based on department headcount and weighted by employee job function, i.e. field employees were weighted much less than office staff.

The Fleet service fee encompasses vehicle insurance, maintenance, and replacement. Fuel consumption is a direct cost to send a direct conservation signal. The maintenance component of the fleet charge is based on a defined maintenance schedule for each

vehicle given its age and usage. The replacement component is based on expected life of each vehicle in the fleet, a defined replacement schedule, and replacement with the most appropriate vehicle technology and conservation features.

#### **8. SHA will use its MTW block grant authority and flexibility to optimize housing opportunities provided by SHA to low-income people in Seattle.**

SHA flexibility to use MTW Block Grant resources to support its low-income housing programs is central to our Local Asset Management Program (LAMP). SHA will exercise our contractual authority to move our MTW funds and project cash flow among projects and programs, as the Authority deems necessary to further our mission and cost objectives. MTW flexibility to allocate MTW Block Grant revenues among the Authority's housing and administrative programs enables SHA to balance the mix of housing types and services to different low-income housing programs and different groups of low-income residents. It enables SHA to tailor resource allocation to best achieve our cost objectives and therefore maximize our services to low-income residents and applicants having a wide diversity of circumstances, needs, and personal capabilities. As long as the ultimate purpose of a grant or program is low-income housing, it is eligible for MTW funds.

### LAMP implementation

#### Comprehensive operations

Consistent with the guiding principles above, a fundamental driver of SHA's LAMP is its application comprehensively to the totality of SHA's MTW program. SHA's use of MTW resource and regulatory flexibility and SHA's LAMP encompass our entire operations; accordingly:

- We apply our indirect service fees to all our housing and rental assistance programs;
- We expect all our properties, regardless of fund source, to be accountable for property-based management, budgeting, and financial reporting;
- We exercise MTW authority to assist in creating management and operational efficiencies across programs and to promote applicant and resident-friendly administrative requirements for securing and maintaining their residency; and,
- We use our MTW block grant flexibility across all of SHA's housing programs and activities to create the whole that best addresses our needs at the time.

SHA's application of its LAMP and indirect service fees to its entire operations is more comprehensive than HUD's asset management system. HUD addresses fee for service principally at the low-income public housing property level and does not address SHA's comprehensive operations, which include other housing programs, business activities, and component units.

#### Project-based portfolio management

We have reflected in our guiding principles above the centrality of project/property-based and program-based budgeting, management, reporting and accountability in our asset management program and our implementing practices. We also assign priority to our multi-disciplinary central Asset Management Team in its role to constantly bring best practices, evaluations, and follow-

up to inform SHA's property management practices and policies. Please refer to the section above to review specific elements of our project-based accountability system.

A fundamental principle we have applied in designing our LAMP is to align responsibility and authority and to do so at the lowest appropriate level. Thus, where it makes the most sense from the standpoints of program effectiveness and cost efficiency, the SHA LAMP assigns budget and management accountability at the property level. We are then committed to providing property managers with the tools and information necessary for them to effectively operate their properties and manage their budgets.

We apply the same principle of aligning responsibility and accountability for those services that are managed centrally, and, where those services are direct property services, such as landscaping, decorating, or specialty trades work, we assign the ultimate authority for determining the scope of work to be performed to the affected property manager.

In LIPH properties, we budget subsidy dollars with the intent that properties will break even with actual revenues and expenses. Over the course of the year, we gauge performance at the property level in relation to that aim. When a property falls behind, we use our quarterly portfolio reviews to discern why and agree on corrective actions and then track their effectiveness in subsequent quarters. We reserve our MTW authority to move subsidy and cash flow among our LIPH properties based on our considered assessment of reasons for surplus or deficit operations. We also use our quarterly reviews to identify properties whose performance warrants placement on a "watch" list.

## Cost allocation approach

### *Classification of costs*

Under 2 CFR 200, there is no one universal rule for classifying certain costs as either direct or indirect under every accounting system. A cost may be direct with respect to some specific service or function, but indirect with respect to the Federal award or other final cost objective. Therefore, it is essential that each item of cost be treated consistently in like circumstances, as either a direct or an indirect cost. Consistent with 2 CFR 200 cost principles, SHA has identified all of its direct costs and segregated all its costs into pools, as either a direct or an indirect cost pool. We have further divided the indirect services pool to assign costs as "equal burden" or hard housing unit based, as described below.

### *Cost objectives*

2 CFR 200 defines cost objective as follows: *Cost objective means a function, organizational subdivision, contract, grant, or other activity for which cost data are needed and for which costs are incurred.* The Cost Objectives for SHA's LAMP are the three overarching policy/cost objectives described earlier:

- Cost-effective affordable housing.
- Housing opportunities and choice.
- Resident financial security and/or self-sufficiency.

Costs that can be identified specifically with one of the three objectives are counted as a direct cost to that objective. Costs that benefit more than one objective are counted as indirect costs.

Attachment 1 is a graphic representation of SHA's LAMP, with cost objectives, FDS structure and SHA Funds.

### *Direct costs*

2 CFR 200 defines direct costs as follows: *Direct costs are those that can be identified specifically with a particular final cost objective.* SHA's direct costs include but are not limited to:

- Contract costs readily identifiable with delivering housing assistance to low-income families.
- Housing Assistance Payments, including utility allowances, for vouchers
- Utilities
- Surface Water Management fee
- Insurance
- Bank charges
- Property-based audits
- Staff training
- Interest expense
- Information technology fees
- Portability administrative fees
- Rental Assistance department costs for administering Housing Choice Vouchers including inspection activities
- Operating costs directly attributable to operating SHA-owned properties
- Fleet management fees
- Central maintenance services for unit or property repairs or maintenance
- Central maintenance services include, but are not limited to, landscaping, pest control, and decorating and unit turnover
- Operating subsidies paid to mixed income, mixed finance communities
- Community Services department costs directly attributable to tenants services
- Gap financing real estate transactions
- Acquisition costs
- Demolition, relocation and leasing incentive fees in repositioning SHA-owned real estate
- Homeownership activities for low-income families
- Leasing incentive fees
- Certain legal expenses
- Professional services at or on behalf of properties or a portfolio, including security services
- Extraordinary site work
- Any other activities that can be readily identifiable with delivering housing assistance to low-income families
- Any cost identified for which a grant award is made (such costs will be determined as SHA receives grants)
- Direct Finance staff costs
- Direct area administration staff costs

### *Indirect costs*

2 CFR 200 defines indirect costs as *those (a) incurred for a common or joint purpose benefiting more than one cost objective, and (b) not readily assignable to the cost objectives specifically benefitted, without effort disproportionate to the results achieved.* SHA's indirect costs include, but are not limited to:

- Executive
- Communications
- Most of Legal
- Development (most Development staff charge directly to the Development Fund; only certain staff and functions in this department are indirect charges)

- Finance
- Purchasing
- Human Resources
- Most of Housing Finance and Asset Management (based on functions, this staff is split among indirect cost, direct charge to the capital budget and charges to MTW direct property services)
- Administration staff and related expenses of the Housing Operations Department that cannot be identified to a specific cost objective

*Indirect service fee: Base, derivation and allocation*

SHA has established an Indirect Services Fee (ISF) based on anticipated indirect costs for the fiscal year. Per the requirements of 2 CFR 200, the ISF is determined in a reasonable and consistent manner based on total units and leased vouchers. Thus, the ISF is calculated as a per-housing-unit or per-leased-voucher fee per month charged to each program. Please see Attachment 2 to review SHA's Indirect Services Fee Plan.

*Equitable distribution base*

According to 2 CFR 200, *the distribution base may be (1) total direct costs (excluding capital expenditure), (2) direct salaries and wages, or (3) another base which results in an equitable distribution.* SHA has found that unit count and leased voucher is an equitable distribution base when compared to other potential measures. Testing of prior year figures has shown that there is no material financial difference between direct labor dollar allocations and unit allocations. Total units and leased vouchers are a far easier, more direct and transparent, and more efficient method of allocating indirect service costs than using direct labor to distribute indirect service costs. Direct labor has other complications because of the way SHA charges for maintenance services. Using housing units and leased vouchers removes any distortion that total direct salaries and wages might introduce. Units leased vouchers is an equitable distribution base which best measures the relative benefits.

*Derivation and allocation*

According to 2 CFR 200, where a grantee agency's indirect costs benefit its major functions in varying degrees, such costs shall be accumulated into separate cost groupings. Each grouping shall then be allocated individually to benefitted functions by means of a base which best measures the relative benefits. SHA divides indirect costs into two pools, "equal burden" costs and "hard unit" costs. Equal burden costs are costs that equally benefit leased voucher activity and hard, existing housing unit activity. Hard unit costs primarily benefit the hard, existing housing unit activity.

Before calculating the per unit indirect service fees, SHA's indirect costs are offset by designated revenue. Offsetting revenue includes 10 percent of the MTW Capital Grant award, a portion of the developer fee paid by limited partnerships, limited partnership management fees, laundry revenue, dividend or savings from insurance companies and purchasing card discounts for early payment, commuting reimbursements from employees and a portion of Solid Waste's outside revenue.

A per unit cost is calculated using the remaining net indirect costs divided by the number of units and the number of leased vouchers. For the 2019 budget, the PUM cost for housing units was \$56.25 and for leased vouchers was \$23.15.

#### *Annual review of ISF charges*

SHA will annually review its indirect service fee charges in relation to actual indirect costs and will incorporate appropriate adjustments in indirect service fees for the subsequent year, based on this analysis.

#### Differences: HUD Asset Management vs. SHA Local Asset Management Program

Under the First Amendment, SHA is allowed to define costs differently than the standard definitions published in HUD's Financial Management Guidebook pertaining to the implementation of 24 CFR 990. SHA is required to describe in this MTW Annual Report differences between our Local Asset Management Program and HUD's asset management program. Below are several key differences, with additional detail reflected in Attachment 3 to this document:

- SHA determined to implement an indirect service fee that is much more comprehensive than HUD's asset management system. HUD's asset management system and fee for service is limited in focusing only on a fee for service at the Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) property level. SHA's LAMP is much broader and includes other affordable housing and other activities not found in traditional HUD programs. SHA's LAMP addresses the entire SHA operation.
- SHA has defined its cost objectives at a different level than HUD's asset management program. SHA has defined three cost objectives under the umbrella of the MTW program, which is consistent with the issuance of the CFDA number and with the current MTW Contract Agreement (expires 12/31/2028). HUD defined its cost objectives at the property level and SHA defined its cost objectives at the program level. Because the cost objectives are defined differently, direct and indirect costs will be differently identified, as reflected in our LAMP.
- HUD's rules are restrictive regarding cash flow between projects, programs, and business activities. SHA intends to use its MTW resources and regulatory flexibility to move its MTW funds and project cash flow among projects without limitation and to ensure that our operations best serve our mission, our LAMP cost objectives, and ultimately the low-income people we serve.
- HUD intends to maintain all maintenance staff at the property level. SHA's LAMP reflects a cost-effective balance of on-site and central maintenance services for repairs, unit turnover, landscaping, and asset preservation as direct costs to properties.
- HUD's asset management approach records capital project work-in-progress quarterly. SHA's capital projects are managed through central agency units and can take between two and five or more years from budgeting to physical completion. Transfer of fixed assets only when they are fully complete and operational best aligns responsibility for development and close-out vs. housing operations.

Please consult Attachment 3 for additional detailed differences between HUD's asset management program and SHA's LAMP. However, detailed differences for SHA's other housing programs are not provided.

### *Balance sheet accounts*

Most balance sheet accounts will be reported in compliance with HUD's asset management requirements and some will deviate from HUD's requirements, as discussed below:

- Cash
- Petty cash
- Prepaid expenses and deferred charges
- Materials inventory
- Contract retention
- Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability
- Pension liability or asset
- Deferred inflows and deferred outflows

SHA will deviate from HUD's asset management requirements by reporting the above account balances as assets or liabilities maintained centrally. They will not be reported by AMP or program. Through years of practice, we believe that maintaining these accounts centrally has proven to be the most cost effective and least labor-intensive method. Although these balance sheet accounts are proposed to be maintained centrally, the related expenses will continue to be reported as an expense to the appropriate program, department and/or AMP, based on income and expense statements. It is important to note that maintaining the above balance sheet accounts centrally will not diminish SHA's obligation or ability to effectuate improved and satisfactory operations and to develop and adhere to its asset management plan. This is consistent with the new Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for the MTW program.

### Enclosures:

Attachment 1: Structure of SHA's LAMP and FDS reporting

Attachment 2: 2020 Indirect Services Fee plan

Attachment 3: Matrix: HUD vs. SHA indirect and direct costs

Appendix D: Attachment 1

SHA cost objectives, FDS reporting structure and SHA funds

Local Asset Management Program:  
Use MTW flexibility to operate housing and assistance programs as seamlessly as feasible.

Direct cost objectives			Housing					Rental assistance	Community services
	FDS columns	MTW	Indirect services costs	AMPs	Other housing	Other business activities	LP component units	MF developments & home ownership	Other housing
Funds	Capital WIP unallocated costs IT capital projects 100 480	400	Various, including LIPH portion of LP CUs	104 122 127 137 193/216 /228 352-354 357 591	150 190 194 195 198 199 450 470	19 LPs LIPH portion reported in AMPs	700 704-709 711-712 718-719 723-736 738-747	139 168	125 CS grants

<b>Fund name</b>	<b>Fund number</b>
General	100
Seattle Senior Housing	104
Bayview Tower	127
Ref 37	137
Housing Choice Vouchers	139
Housing Assistance Payments	150
Mod Rehab	168
Local fund	190
Local housing program	193/216/228
House ownership	194
SHA land and parks	195
Development	198
Wakefield	199
Holly II and III	352-353
Rainier I	354
High Point North	357
Indirect services costs	400
Impact Property Services	450
Impact Property Management	470
MTW fund	480
Baldwin	591
MF developments & home ownership	700-747

Appendix D: Attachment 2

Indirect cost allocation plan: Calendar year 2019

Department	2019 Estimated Budget	All units	Hard Units only
Executive Total	2,498,413	2,498,413	
Asset Management	290,679		290,679
Finance	3,901,086	3,901,086	
Housing Operations	1,848,597		1,848,597
HCV	115,206	115,206	115,206
<b>HR: Allocated based on staff</b>	2,217,415	803,327	1,414,088
Prior Year Inc/Exp reconciliation - expense	(558,835)	<b>(558,835)</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,312,561</b>	<b>\$ 6,759,197</b>	<b>\$ 3,668,570</b>
Percentage	100%	66%	34%
Less fixed revenues	(3,467,386)		
Remaining OH to allocate PUM	6,845,175	4,486,556	2,358,619
Units		16,153	5,937
PUM cost		\$23.15	\$33.11
<b>PUM Cost to equal burden units</b>			<b>\$23.15</b>
<b>PUM fee to hard units</b>			<b>\$56.26</b>
<b>INDIRECT REVENUE</b>			2019 Estimate
Capital Grant Admin			1,552,200
10% of Developer Fee cash			204,225
LP Management Fees			1,055,301
Laundry Fee Revenue			149,060
Insurance Dividend			160,000
City Benefit Reimbursement			96,600
Solid Waste Services			250,000
<b>Total Fixed Revenues</b>			<b>\$ 3,467,386</b>
.			
.			
<b>UNIT SUMMARY</b>			<b>Total</b>
Housing Units			5,937
Total Vochers		10,646	
Leased Vouchers at 92.9% of utilization			9,892
Total Mod Rehab		648	
Divide by two for work equivalency			324
<b>Total Units</b>			<b>16,153</b>

<b>INDIRECT SERVICES FEE BY COMMUNITY</b>			
		<b>Indirect Services Rates</b>	
		Equal Burden Units	23.15
		Hard Units	56.25
<b>Low Income Public Housing</b>			
<b>Development No.</b>	<b>Community Name</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>2019 Budget</b>
1	Yesler	124	83,700
9	Jefferson Terrace	299	201,825
13	Olive Ridge	105	70,875
15	Bell Tower	120	81,000
17	Denny Terrace	220	148,500
23	Westwood Heights	130	87,750
31	Tri Court	87	58,725
37	Jackson Park Village	41	27,675
38	Cedarvale Village	24	16,200
41	Holly Court	66	44,550
50	Scattered Sites	59	39,825
51	Scattered Sites	121	81,675
52	Scattered Sites	60	40,500
53	Scattered Sites	112	75,600
54	Scattered Sites	71	47,925
55	Scattered Sites	128	86,400
56	Scattered Sites	87	58,725
57	Scattered Sites	73	49,275
86	High Rise Rehab Phase I	704	475,200
87	High Rise Rehab Phase II	687	463,725
88	High Rise Rehab Phase III	586	395,550
92	Seattle Senior Housing North	231	155,925
9	Seattle Senior Housing South	138	93,150
94	Seattle Senior Housing Central	246	166,050
95	Seattle Senior Housing City Funded	279	188,325
<b>Total Low Income Public Housing</b>		<b>4,798</b>	<b>3,238,650</b>
<b>Other Housing Programs</b>			
104	Seattle Senior Housing	68	45,908
201	127th & Greenwood	6	4,051
139	Rental Assistance	9892	2,747,998
168	Mod Rehab	324	90,007
193	Local Housing Program	177	119,496
354	Rainier Vista I - Escallonia	184	124,222
357	High Point N	344	232,241
234	Ritz	30	20,254
352	New Holly II - Othello	96	64,812
353	NewHolly III - Desdemona	219	147,851
591	Baldwin Apartments	15	10,127
<b>Total Other Housing Programs</b>		<b>11,355</b>	<b>3,606,966</b>
<b>Total Management Fee</b>		<b>16,153</b>	<b>6,845,616</b>

Limited Partnership Units and Restricted Fee Units				
	Property		2019 Units	2019 Budget
089	731 Tamarack (RV)		83	35,496
0xx	736 RV III Northeast		118	52,200
085	733 High Point S		256	34,800
091	727 Lake City Village		86	33,660
<b>Total HOPE VI Limited Partnerships</b>			<b>543</b>	<b>374,832</b>
292	734 South Shore Apts fka Douglas		44	20,592
735	735 Aldercrest		36	19,263
738	738 1105 E Fir/Kebero		103	71,688
739	739 Leschi House		69	48,024
743	743 Raven LP		83	57,768
744	744 Hoa Mai Gardens		111	73,260
745	745 Red Cedar		59.5	39,270
746	746 Holly Park I Re-Redeve		305	121,068
0xxx	747 West Seattle LP		204	13,920
<b>Total Restricted Units</b>			<b>1,015</b>	<b>680,469</b>
<b>Total</b>				<b>1,055,301</b>

Appendix D: Attachment 3

Matrix: HUD's Tables 7.1: Fee/indirect expense  
HUD vs. SHA Local Asset Management Program (LAMP)

<b>Low-income public housing</b>	
<b>Fee/indirect expense per HUD</b>	<b>Fee/indirect expense per SHA LAMP</b>
1.	<p>Actual personnel costs for individuals assigned to the following positions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive direct and support staff</li> <li>• Human Resources staff</li> <li>• Regional managers</li> <li>• Corporate legal staff</li> <li>• Finance, accounting and payroll staff</li> <li>• IT staff including Help Desk</li> <li>• Risk Management staff</li> <li>• Centralized procurement staff</li> <li>• Quality control staff, including quality control inspections</li> </ul>
2.	<p>Purchase and maintenance of COCC arrangements, equipment, furniture and services</p>
3.	<p>Establishment, maintenance, and control of an accounting system adequate to carryout accounting/bookkeeping for the AMPs</p>
4.	<p>Office expense including office supplies, computer expense, bank charges, telephone, postage, utilities, fax and office rent related to the general maintenance and support of COCC</p>
5.	<p>The cost of insurance related to COCC buildings, equipment, personnel to include property, auto, liability E&amp;O and casualty.</p>
6.	<p>Work with auditors for audit preparation and review of audit costs associated with the COCC.</p>
7.	<p>Central servers and software that support the COCC (not projects)</p>
1.	<p>Actual personnel costs for individuals assigned to the following positions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive direct and support staff</li> <li>• Human Resources staff</li> <li>• Corporate legal staff</li> <li>• Finance, accounting and payroll staff, except non-supervisory accounting staff (considered front-line bookkeepers)</li> <li>• Separate IT Fee for Service</li> <li>• Risk Management staff</li> <li>• Most centralized procurement staff</li> </ul>
2.	<p>Purchase and maintenance of indirect services (IS) arrangements, equipment, furniture and services</p>
3.	<p>Establishment, maintenance, and control of an accounting system adequate to carryout accounting/bookkeeping for the AMPs</p>
4.	<p>Office expense including office supplies, computer expense, bank charges, telephone, postage, utilities, fax and office rent related to the general maintenance and support of IS.</p>
5.	<p>The cost of insurance related to COCC buildings, equipment, personnel to include property, auto, liability E&amp;O and casualty.</p>
6.	<p>Work with auditors for audit preparation and review of audit costs associated with the IS.</p>
7.	<p>Central servers and software that support the IS (not projects)</p>

<b>Low-income public housing</b>			
<b>Fee/indirect expense per HUD</b>		<b>Fee/indirect expense per SHA LAMP</b>	
8.	Commissioners' stipend and non-training travel.	8.	Commissioners' stipend and non-training travel.
9.	Commissioners' training that exceed HUD standards	9.	Commissioners' training that exceed HUD standards
10.	The cost of a central warehouse, unless, with HUD approval, the Agency can demonstrate that the costs of maintaining this warehouse operation, if included with the costs of the goods purchased, are less than what the project would otherwise incur if the goods were obtained by on-site staff.	10.	The cost of a central warehouse, unless, with HUD approval, the Agency can demonstrate that the costs of maintaining this warehouse operation, if included with the costs of the goods purchased, are less than what the project would otherwise incur if the goods were obtained by on-site staff.

<b>Housing Choice Voucher</b>			
<b>Fee/indirect expense per HUD</b>		<b>Fee/indirect expense per SHA LAMP</b>	
1.	A share of the personnel costs for HCV staff assigned to the COCC.	1.	A share of the personnel costs for HCV staff assigned to Indirect Services ("IS"). Some executive staff costs allocated to IS.
2.	Establish, maintain and control an accounting system adequate to carryout accounting/ bookkeeping for the HCV program	2.	Establish, maintain and control an accounting system adequate to carryout accounting/ bookkeeping for the HCV program
3.	General maintenance of HCV books and records	3.	General maintenance of HCV books and records
4.	Supervision by COCC management staff of overall HCV program operations	4.	Supervision by IS management staff of overall HCV program operations
5.	Procurement	5.	Centralized Procurement staff
6.	Preparation of monitoring reports for internal and external use.	6.	Preparation of monitoring reports for internal and external use.
7.	Preparation, approval and distribution of HCV payments, not HAP	7.	Preparation, approval and distribution of HCV payments, not HAP
8.	COCC staff training, and ongoing certifications related to HCV program.	8.	IS staff training, and ongoing certifications related to HCV program. Certifications are an ongoing cost of keeping trained staff.
9.	Travel for COCC staff for training, etc. related to HCV program	9.	Travel for IS staff for training, etc. related to HCV program
10.	COCC staff attendance at meetings with landlords, tenants, others regarding planning, budgeting, and program review.	10.	IS staff attendance at meetings with landlords, tenants, others regarding planning, budgeting, and program review.

## Housing Choice Voucher

Housing Choice Voucher	
Fee/indirect expense per HUD	Fee/indirect expense per SHA LAMP
11. Work with auditors and audit preparation.	11. Work with auditors and audit preparation.
12. Indirect cost allocations imposed on the HCV program by a higher level of local government.	12. Indirect cost allocations imposed on the HCV program by a higher level of local government.
13. Hiring, supervision and termination of front-line HCV staff.	13. Hiring, supervision and termination of front-line HCV staff.
14. Preparation and submission of HCV program budgets, financial reports, etc. to HUD and others.	14. Preparation and submission of HCV program budgets, financial reports, etc. to HUD and others.
15. Monitoring and reporting on abandoned property as required by states.	15. Monitoring and reporting on abandoned property as required by states.
16. Investment and reporting on HCV proceeds.	16. Investment and reporting on HCV proceeds.
17. Storage of HCV records and adherence to federal and/or state records retention requirements.	17. Storage of HCV records and adherence to federal and/or state records retention requirements.
18. Development and oversight of office furniture, equipment and vehicle replacement plans.	18. Development and oversight of office furniture, equipment and vehicle replacement plans.
19. Insurance costs for fidelity or crime and dishonesty coverage for COCC employees based on a reasonable allocation method.	19. Insurance costs for fidelity or crime and dishonesty coverage for IS employees based on a reasonable allocation method.
20. Commissioners' stipend and non-training travel.	20. Commissioners' stipend and non-training travel.
21. Commissioners' training that exceed HUD standards	21. Commissioners' training that exceed HUD standards

Matrix: HUD's Tables 7.2: Direct expense  
HUD vs. SHA Local Asset Management Program (LAMP)

Low-income public housing	
Direct expense per HUD	Direct expense per SHA LAMP
1. Actual personnel costs of staff assigned directly to AMP sites	1. Actual personnel costs of staff assigned directly to AMP sites
2.	2. Area management site costs allocated to AMPs within area
3.	3. Direct procurement staff
4. Repair & maintenance costs, including:	4. Repair & maintenance costs, including:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centralized maintenance provided under fee for service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centralized maintenance provided under fee for service (IPS)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance supplies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance supplies</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contract repairs e.g. heating, painting, roof, elevators on site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contract repairs e.g. heating, painting, roof, elevators on site</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make ready expenses, including painting and repairs, cleaning, floor replacements, and appliance replacements;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make ready expenses, including painting and repairs, cleaning, floor replacements, and appliance replacements;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preventive maintenance expenses, including repairs and maintenance, as well as common area systems repairs and maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preventive maintenance expenses, including repairs and maintenance, as well as common area systems repairs and maintenance</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance contracts for elevators, boilers, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance contracts for elevators, boilers, etc.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other maintenance expenses, Section 504 compliance, pest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other maintenance expenses, Section 504 compliance, pest</li> </ul>
5. Utility costs	5. Utility costs
6. Costs related to maintaining a site-based office, including IT equipment and software license allocations.	6. Costs related to maintaining a site-based office, including IT equipment and software license allocations.
7. Advertising costs specific to AMP, employees or other property	7. Advertising costs specific to AMP, employees or other property
8. PILOT	8. PILOT
9. All costs of insurance for the AMP	9. All costs of insurance for the AMP
10. Professional services contracts for audits, rehab and inspections specific to the project.	10. Professional services contracts for audits, rehab and inspections specific to the project.
11.	11. Inspector costs are allocated to the projects as a direct cost.

<b>Low-income public housing</b>			
<b>Direct expense per HUD</b>		<b>Direct expense per SHA LAMP</b>	
12.	Property management fees, bookkeeping fees, and asset management fees.	12.	Property management fees, bookkeeping fees, and asset management fees.
13.	Certain litigation costs.	13.	Certain litigation costs.
14.	Audit costs (may be prorated)	14.	
15.	Vehicle expense	15.	Separate Fleet Fee for Service
16.	Staff recruiting and background checks, etc.	16.	Staff recruiting and background checks, etc.
17.	Family self-sufficiency staff and program costs	17.	Family self-sufficiency staff and program costs
18.	Commissioners' training up to a limited amount as provided by HUD	18.	Commissioners' training up to a limited amount as provided by HUD
19.		19.	Building rent

<b>Housing Choice Voucher</b>			
<b>Direct expense per HUD</b>		<b>Direct expense per SHA LAMP</b>	
1.	A share of the personnel costs for HCV staff assigned to the COCC.	1.	A share of the personnel costs for HCV staff assigned to Indirect Services (IS). Some executive staff costs allocated to IS.
2.	Establish, maintain and control an accounting system adequate to carryout accounting/ bookkeeping for the HCV program	2.	Establish, maintain and control an accounting system adequate to carryout accounting/ bookkeeping for the HCV program
3.	General maintenance of HCV books and records	3.	General maintenance of HCV books and records
4.	Supervision by COCC management staff of overall HCV program operations	4.	Supervision by IS management staff of overall HCV program operations
5.	Procurement	5.	Centralized Procurement staff
6.	Preparation of monitoring reports for internal and external use.	6.	Preparation of monitoring reports for internal and external use.
7.	Preparation, approval and distribution of HCV payments, not HAP	7.	Preparation, approval and distribution of HCV payments, not HAP
8.	COCC staff training, and ongoing certifications related to HCV program.	8.	IS staff training, and ongoing certifications related to HCV program. Certifications are an ongoing cost of keeping trained staff.
9.	Travel for COCC staff for training, etc. related to HCV program	9.	Travel for IS staff for training, etc. related to HCV program
10.	COCC staff attendance at meetings with landlords, tenants, others regarding planning, budgeting, and program review.	10.	IS staff attendance at meetings with landlords, tenants, others regarding planning, budgeting, and program review.

## Housing Choice Voucher

Direct expense per HUD		Direct expense per SHA LAMP	
11.	Work with auditors and audit preparation.	11.	Work with auditors and audit preparation.
12.	Indirect cost allocations imposed on the HCV program by a higher level of local government.	12.	Indirect cost allocations imposed on the HCV program by a higher level of local government.
13.	Hiring, supervision and termination of front-line HCV staff.	13.	Hiring, supervision and termination of front-line HCV staff.
14.	Preparation and submission of HCV program budgets, financial reports, etc. to HUD and others.	14.	Preparation and submission of HCV program budgets, financial reports, etc. to HUD and others.
15.	Monitoring and reporting on abandoned property as required by states.	15.	Monitoring and reporting on abandoned property as required by states.
16.	Investment and reporting on HCV proceeds.	16.	Investment and reporting on HCV proceeds.
17.	Storage of HCV records and adherence to federal and/or state records retention requirements.	17.	Storage of HCV records and adherence to federal and/or state records retention requirements.
18.	Development and oversight of office furniture, equipment and vehicle replacement plans.	18.	Development and oversight of office furniture, equipment and vehicle replacement plans.
19.	Insurance costs for fidelity or crime and dishonesty coverage for COCC employees based on a reasonable allocation method.	19.	Insurance costs for fidelity or crime and dishonesty coverage for IS employees based on a reasonable allocation method.
20.	Commissioners' stipend and non-training travel.	20.	Commissioners' stipend and non-training travel.
21.	Commissioners' training that exceed HUD standards	21.	Commissioners' training that exceed HUD standards