



The Charlotte Housing Authority's mission is to develop, operate, and provide quality housing in sustainable communities of choice for residents of diverse incomes. The agency's local name for the federal Demonstration Program Moving To Work is "Moving Forward", symbolizing the forward movement in creating community, empowering families and building partnerships that break the cycle of generational poverty and promote affordable housing as a community issue, not a CHA issue.

Charlotte Housing Authority
400 East Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28202
A. Fulton Meachem, Jr.
CEO/President

Submitted June 26, 2014

Introduction.....	3
Overview of Charlotte Housing Authority’s short-term and long-term Moving To Work goals and objectives.....	3
General Housing Authority Operating Information.....	7
Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested	19
Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted.....	20
Implemented Activities	20
Not yet Implemented Activities	66
Activities on Hold.....	66
Closed Out Activities.....	67
Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	68
Administrative	71

Board of Commissioners

Geraldine Sumter, *Chair*

Arthur Griffin, Jr., *Vice Chair*

Nancy Crown

William Scurry

Lucy Brown

Shirley Fulton

Executive Leadership

A. Fulton Meachem, Jr., Chief Executive Officer

Harriet Huell, Chief Counsel

Larry Padilla, Chief Operating Officer

Heather Franklin, Chief Financial Officer

Shaunté Evans, Chief Administrative Officer



Introduction

Overview of Charlotte Housing Authority's short-term and long-term Moving To Work goals and objectives.

In December 2007, the Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) executed an agreement with the Department of Urban Housing and Development (HUD) to participate in the Federal demonstration program, Moving to Work (MTW). CHA, along with 39 other housing agencies across the nation, is permitted to receive waivers from some federal regulations in order to implement programs and policies that improve the way housing and services are administered. Additionally, participating agencies have the ability to combine their federal funds into one budget for utilization where needed the most. The purpose of the MTW program is to:

- 1) Reduce cost and achieve greater cost savings in federal expenditures
- 2) Expand housing choices for low-income families
- 3) Give incentives to families with children pursuing self-sufficiency activities

Beginning in 2008 through March 2014, CHA has implemented the following types of activities with these three statutory objectives in mind:

- Rent Reforms
 - Biennial for all households
 - Modified rent calculation with incentive account
- New housing opportunities through collaborations and new development
 - Site-based waiting lists (Public housing and Project-Based Section 8)
 - Supportive housing for persons with disabilities, special needs and homeless
 - Local Rental Subsidy Program
 - Participant and Landlord Tracking Program
 - Increase acquisition and rehabilitation of existing multi-family properties
 - Land acquisition for Future Use
 - New construction of affordable units

- Case management/enhanced services, and
 - Moving Forward Supportive Services
 - Youth Initiatives
 - Work requirements

- Administrative efficiencies with cost savings
 - Adoption of investment policies consistent with state law
 - Modified Project-Based Section 8 inspection procedures
 - Resident Safety Initiatives
 - Good Neighbor Training

CHA provides housing assistance to over 22,000 individuals in the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher program, of which 1,966 are elderly/disabled, 9,806 are between the ages of 18 – 61 and the remaining 10,379 being children. The current average income of households in both assisted programs is \$11,201. In addition, CHA has leveraged resources to make 1,993 affordable housing units and 338 market rate units available to households earning 80% or less of the area median income for Charlotte.

The leadership of CHA is vested in a seven member Board of Commissioners, the CEO/President, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Development Officer, Chief Counsel and the Chief Administrative Officer. The leadership team is focused on carrying out the CHA mission by implementing the following goals and objectives using MTW flexibilities (there are other goals and objectives; however, they do not require MTW flexibility):

Short Term -

Goal: Maintain and increase revenue by pursuing entrepreneurial activities and grant funding.

Objective: Continue to provide housing and supportive services despite the paucity of federal money.

2014 Accomplishments:

- CHA submitted and received funding awards for:
 - Forty (40) additional HUD VASH vouchers \$250,024
 - Wells Fargo grant for Center for Employment Services \$ 50,000
 - Bank of America Grant for Choice Neighborhood Planning Activities \$ 20,000
 - Charlotte Regional Realtor Association Housing Opportunity Fund \$ 1,000
 - Wells Fargo Foundation for Center for Employment Services \$ 10,000
 - Renewal of HUD Housing Choice Voucher FSS Coordinator Grant \$ 47,421
 - Renewal of HUD Public Housing FSS Coordinator ROSS Grant \$ 65,000

- CHA joined with the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County to form a collaborative partnership to accept proposals for Supportive Housing Developments and/or Supportive Housing Programs. The coordinated effort includes funds for rental assistance, supportive services and housing development.
 - The City of Charlotte’s Neighborhood and Business Services Department allocated up to \$1 million for development from the Housing Trust Fund, CHA set-aside fifty (50) Project-Based Housing Choice Vouchers and Mecklenburg County apportioned up to \$800,000 for supportive services.

- CHA allocated additional funding in order to maximize Return on Investment for Capital Projects.

Long Term -

***Goal:* Create vibrant, healthy communities of choice for residents that qualify for federal housing assistance, while collaborating with others to reach those with special needs.**

Objective: Strive to locate housing for families in neighborhoods that are well-resourced.

2014 Accomplishments:

- The families relocated from Boulevard Homes for the HOPE VI Revitalization began returning to the redeveloped property now named The Renaissance.

- CHA’s Real Estate Development Department created a Master Plan for development/redevelopment of several of our sites. These include, but are not limited to, the vacant land at Park and Marsh, Tall Oaks community, Hall House apartments and the Strawn Cottages.
 - CHA completed a preliminary tax credit application, as well as a Housing Trust Fund request from the City of Charlotte for Park and Marsh. The project received a favorable market study from North Carolina Housing Finance Agency requiring no project adjustments and a perfect site score.

- The Charlotte Housing Authority discussed collaborating with A Child’s Place, and the Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools to place families of homeless students in housing utilizing a Housing Choice Voucher. A Child’s Place will provide needed services so these families can stabilize then maintain their housing without a rental subsidy.

- The U.S. Green Building Council, Charlotte Regional Chapter awarded the Green Gala/Sustainable Business award to Strawn Tower.

- CHA relocated the residents of Edwin Tower and began major renovations to the senior high rise.

Goal: Provide programs and services that measurably increase residents' quality of life.

Objective: Continue providing the agency's clients with tools for their success.

2014 Accomplishments:

- CHA re-scoped the Request for Proposals for Supportive Services to ensure the providers were best meeting the needs of our family heads of household seeking to become self-reliant.

- CHA's Client Services Department has partnered with agencies to conduct Work Able programming (job readiness and job placement) at various sites. The Center for Employment Services secured a Memorandum of Agreement with Be Benevolent, (an organization that matches the needs of an organization's client with private donors who select the need they want to contribute to) and continues to expand programming and services at its headquarters, serving more than 1,000 CHA and non CHA residents in FY2014.

General Housing Authority Operating Information

The following tables are required by HUD to describe the housing stock at the Charlotte Housing Authority.

Annual MTW Report			
II.4.Report.HousingStock			
A. MTW Report: Housing Stock Information			
New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year			
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project
Residences at Renaissance	0	3	Mixed-income family development (HOPE VI)
Retreat At Renaissance	20	20	Senior housing property in HOPE VI development
Everett House	10	10	Disabled development owned by supportive housing partner

Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year *	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
30	33	514	514
		Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
		514	506

* From the Plan

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

The Retreat at Renaissance, a senior development, had 70 public housing units come online

Residences at Renaissance, a family development, had 3 public housing and 22 tax credit units come online

Edwin Tower has 175 units offline for rehabilitation

Southside Apartments pulled 1 unit offline for anti drug/crime use

CHA received 40 additional Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers

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

General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

The following sites had capital projects completed: Autumn Place (air handling unit, pad mounted condenser 12 ton), Dillehay (Reroofing), Edwin Tower (additional scope for renovation), Gladedale (Install HVAC), Victoria Square (refurbish 3'x7' storm and entrance doors), Southside (2 units with wheel chair accessibility).

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

Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Tax-Credit	1,819	Developments with tax credit and public housing (owned by CHA's subsidiaries Horizon Development Properties Inc. and Horizon Acquisition Corp., managed by CHA and third party management companies)
State Funded	240	Multi-family project-based Section 8 property managed by third party (CHA has a General Partnership ownership interest)
Market-Rate	338	Affordable rental units with no rental subsidy (owned by CHA's subsidiaries Horizon Development Properties Inc. and Horizon Development Acquisitions, managed by CHA and third party management companies)
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	2,397	

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

If Other, please describe:

N/A

II.5.Report.Leasing

B. MTW Report: Leasing Information

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

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served*	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	N/A	240
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	N/A	39
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	1,300
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	0	1,579

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

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

Housing Program:	Unit Months Occupied/Leased****	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	N/A	2,904
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	N/A	468
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	16,488
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	0	19,860

**N/A – CHA did not use this format of Attachment B for the FY2014 Annual Plan.
The previous Attachment B did not request this information.**

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

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

	Average Number of Households Served Per Month	Total Number of Households Served During the Year
Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only	77	919

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

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

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	N/A	N/A	N/A	276	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	258	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	93%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

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

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	1,209	1,029	0	2,238	34%
2 Person	405	939	0	1,344	20%
3 Person	311	1,006	0	1,317	20%
4 Person	241	764	0	1,005	15%
5 Person	107	371	0	478	7%
6+ Person	62	232	0	294	4%
Totals	2,335	4,341	0	6,676	100%

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized

N/A

Mix of Family Sizes Served

	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	34%	20%	20%	15%	7%	4%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	1,623	1,042	945	684	315	225	4,834
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	34%	22%	20%	14%	7%	5%	102%
Percentage Change	0%	+2%	0%	-1%	0%	+1%	+2%

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages

We have added approximately 145 2 bedroom units to our inventory.

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

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

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

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

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

Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
Public Housing	Seneca Woods and McMullen Wood experienced some leasing challenges due to City loan requirement restricting rentals to households 24% AMI or below. The developments are FSS and it is hard to find income eligible households who meet the FSS work requirement. CHA previously received a waiver from city, however, it has expired. New marketing strategies are being created which include going to businesses with salaries in the criteria range, as well as reaching out to housing partners to inform them of the availability of units and the requirements.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

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

Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Moving Forward Supportive Services	16	Moved to homeownership or private rental not requiring a housing subsidy
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A

Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	N/A
--	-----

ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	16
---	----

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

II.6.Report.Leasing

C. MTW Report: Wait List Information

Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW and non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program (CHA does not maintain separate list)	Community-Wide	375	Closed	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site Based	2,227	Closed	Yes (April 1 – Dec 6, 2013)
Project-Based Voucher	Site Based	430	Open	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units at Third Party Managed Sites	Site Based	2,251	Open	Yes

More can be added if needed.

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

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

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

N/A
N/A
N/A

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

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

N/A

Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested

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

Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted

THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES ARE USING FLEXIBILITIES GRANTED THROUGH THE AGENCY MTW AGREEMENT, HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY HUD, IMPLEMENTED BY CHA AND ARE ONGOING FROM THE PREVIOUS PLAN YEAR. CHA'S FISCAL YEAR IS APRIL 1 – MARCH 31.

2009 - 1 Agency Wide Biennial

1. CHA was approved to conduct Agency Wide Biennial Reexaminations (reexamine households for eligibility every other year) in FY2014. The activity was implemented in the latter part of FY2014 (October 2013). Prior to an agency wide biennial schedule CHA began performing biennial reexaminations for elderly and disabled households in FY2011.
2. CHA has implemented a biennial schedule in all CHA managed communities and all Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) households regardless of sources of income or type of family. Changes in income, expenses, family composition, etc. must still be reported in the administrative policy timeframes. CHA has no limits on the number of interim reexaminations processed annually at the family's request. Any changes that result in an increase in rent will be documented, but not processed until the biennial. Minimum renters will not be required to complete 90-day minimum rent reviews; however, a property manager may provide resource guidance for the household.

Criminal background checks will continue to be conducted annually for all household members ages 16 and older. Additionally, Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) will still be used during reexamination.

Households with an anniversary in odd months are recertified in odd years (i.e. January - 2015) and households with an even month anniversary are recertified in even years (February - 2016).

The activity is on schedule and considered effective for the overall intent to reduce time spent on reexaminations to allow staff to conduct quality assurance and improved customer

service. Implementation began in October 2013. The bullets below describe the impact, and comparison of baselines and benchmarks for the activity metrics in the table.

- The number of reexaminations was only slightly lower than the year before because CHA did not begin the agency wide reexaminations until October 2013. CHA's HCV program completed 2,991 annual reexaminations and the public housing program completed 1,030 annual reexaminations. The total cost of mailing notices (.48 per notice) for reexaminations decreased from the baseline. There was no benchmark for FY2014 because this HUD mandated metric was added in April 2014.
- The property managers in public housing spent 687 hours on reexaminations and housing specialists spent 1,745 hours on reexaminations for HCV households. This is a decrease from the baseline, but not significant from the year before due to the implementation start date. There was no benchmark for FY2014 because this HUD mandated metric was added in April 2014.
- According to the MTW Delinquency Report in PIC for FY2014 CHA had a reporting rate of 100.08 for HCV and 100.19 for PH. The report takes into consideration the biennial schedule. CHA is performing better than the baseline. CHA does track individual files internally for timeliness of completion and addresses any issues found.
- CHA's rental revenue has decreased from the baseline year which is a negative impact, however, the activity is not intended to increase rental revenue and is not singularly tracked to monitor the activity impact on rental revenue. It is noted that rents are not captured as frequently or early as they would be if the agency was not conducting biennial reexaminations. The activity will continue as proposed because it encourages a head of household to become employed without an immediate rent increase and reduces the amount of time staff spends on reexaminations. CHA maintains that the majority of the population does not have income changes annually.
- The agency had 1,604 participants employed during FY2014. The average PH earned income (412 residents) was \$12,298 and for the HCV program (1,192 participants) the average earned income was \$19,710. The average for both

programs is \$16,004. This is well above the baseline and moving in a positive direction. CHA's participant's income increase and decrease has trended with the economy. Over the last 4 years the income averages have dropped and are now beginning to climb upwards.

- CHA defines transition to self-sufficiency as “no housing subsidy” - moving to homeownership or private housing. For accuracy purposes, CHA will only use the number of households participating in the Moving Forward Supportive Services activity. There were 16 (7 Victoria Square and Claremont, 2 Boulevard Homes originals, 1 Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton, and 10 Housing Choice Voucher program).

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in the cost of task in dollars (postage for biennial reexaminations)	Cost of postage for reexaminations prior to implementation of biennial reexaminations was \$1,973	N/A	There were 4,021 total reexaminations at a cost of \$1,930 in postage.	N/A
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease the time to complete the task in staff hours	PH and HCV spent 3,398 hours prior to implementation of the activity	N/A	PH and HCV spent 2,432 hours in FY2014 for the activity.	N/A
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in the percentage of average error rate in on time Biennial reexaminations	Average on time reexaminations error rate was 0% for PH and .06% for HCV	N/A	PH 0% HCV 0%	N/A

CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had rental revenue of \$4,780,996	N/A	CHA rental revenue was \$3,424,643 in FY2014	N/A
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households participating in the activity	Average earned income prior to implementation \$13,326	N/A	Average earned income in FY2014 is \$16,004	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (positive move out with no subsidy assistance).	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (positive move out with no subsidy assistance) prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	16	N/A

3. The benchmarks for the metrics in the table were not set for FY2014. CHA began using the HUD mandated metrics in the table during FY2015. The activity is determined effective based on the improved or stable performance of the metrics in the table, other than the decrease in rental revenue. CHA realized this financial impact prior to implementation but also realized the merits in implementing the activity for both the residents and staff and has proposed no strategies to alter the activity at this time. The activity will continue to be monitored in this area and adjusted if appropriate.
4. All of the metrics in the table (with accompanying bulleted explanations in #2) have been revised based on HUD MTW Attachment B format.

2010- 1 Rent Reform and Work Requirement

Rent Reform

1. CHA received approval to implement Rent Reform and a work requirement in the FY2010 annual plan. The activity was implemented in FY2011. While elderly and disabled are not required to participate in the work requirement, they are mandated to participate in rent reform. Rent simplification applies to both CHA's public housing and HCV programs. The rent reform and work requirement are split. Only communities receiving case management services are under the work requirement.
2. The activity is on schedule and effective. The new rent calculation is an income-based, stepped rent with stepped escrow deposits. The income bands are a \$2,500 range with the stepped rent being 30% of the range low end. For example, in a \$5,000 - \$7,499 annual income band, the low end of \$5,000 is divided by the 12 months of the year and multiplied by 30%. The total rent payment by the tenant would be \$125. Annual adjusted income will be used to establish the income band. Incentive deposits will begin when the household adjusted income including wages reaches \$12,500 and ends when the household adjusted income reaches 70% of Area Median Income (AMI) or 3 years after reaching 40% of AMI, whichever comes first. Incentive accounts can be disbursed for any reason when they leave subsidized housing if they leave in good standing. But while they continue to receive a subsidy, withdrawals are limited to amounts needed to help participants overcome specific verifiable barriers to work. A ceiling rent was established at CHA Fair Market Rents (public housing only) by bedroom size and is reviewed/updated annually.

Participants are still granted interim rent reexaminations between biennial reexaminations provided they have met the established criteria. If there is a decrease in the family's income or an increase in medical expense or childcare expense which is expected to last longer than thirty days (and will change their flat deduction eligibility), the participant may request that an interim reexamination be performed. Participants must still report changes in family size.

Income earned by seasonal employment will be annualized on a 12 month basis if the employee has maintained employment for more than 60 days. Employees of temporary agencies will be annualized after an initial 30 days of assignments.

Income from assets with a combined value of less than \$5,000 will be excluded. The annual reexamination will include self certification for households with combined assets below \$5,000, or third party verification for assets over \$5,000. Traditional medical and childcare deductions are eliminated. Participants need only verify enough non-reimbursable expenses to meet the requested deduction level listed below.

Medical Expenses	Medical Deduction	Childcare Expense	Childcare Deduction
\$0 - \$2,499	\$0	\$0 - \$2,499	\$0
\$2,500 - \$4,999	\$2,500	\$2,500 - \$4,999	\$2,500
\$5,000 - \$7,499	\$5,000	\$5000 - \$7,499	\$5,000
\$7,500+	\$7,500	\$7,500+	\$7,500

Work Requirement

CHA introduced a work requirement where the head of household will be expected to work full-time in the final phase (however, the requirement can be fulfilled by any adult in the household or a combination of the adults in the household). Full-time work is defined as employment for 30 hours or more per week.

The program began launching the Work Requirement in December of 2013. Notices were sent to all residents in January 2014 stating they had a 60-day grace-period before sanctions began on April 1, 2014, as they were at the end of the Introductory Period. Sites impacted by the Work Requirement were the five supportive services pilot communities receiving case management which included Victoria Square, Claremont, Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills. All non-working residents (except the elderly and persons with disabilities) who wanted supportive services at these sites, underwent an assessment to determine the extent of any

barriers to work. Participants who were prepared for work were encouraged to look for work. Participants who were not prepared were given other work participation activities to help them prepare for work, including life skills education, volunteering opportunities, and short-term vocational training. The Housing Choice Voucher participants are not included in the work requirement at this time.

During the first introductory phase of the program, no participants will be sanctioned for failure to comply with the policy. This will give participants time to address barriers to work and better understand the policy.

After the introductory phase has passed, head of households will be expected to exhibit a good-faith effort to find work for a minimum of 15 hours a week and/or participate in other work participation activities, if determined to be appropriate by the case manager. Each additional adult household member will increase the hours of work required by 5 hours/week (i.e. 3 adult household members would be $15 + 5 + 5 = 25$ hours per week for the household).

At the beginning of the final phase of the work requirement, CHA will begin requiring the head of household to work full-time (at least 30 hours/week). Each additional adult household member will increase the number of work hours required by 10 hours/week (i.e. 3 adult household members would be $30 + 10 + 10 = 50$ hours per week for the household).

Residents who fail to comply with the terms of the work requirement policy may be sanctioned. The sanctions will increase in magnitude the longer a participant is in non-compliance, and shall be applied in phases as follows:

Improvement Period: Participant will have a two (2) month grace period to cure non-compliance. If not cured within two (2) months, probationary sanctions will be applied. Residents may be granted extensions if it is in compliance with their established improvement plan.

Probationary Period: Participant will lose 50% of their rental assistance for up to six (6) months. If they fail to correct the non-compliance within six (6) months, non-compliance sanctions will be applied.

Non-Compliance Period: Participant will lose 100% of their rental assistance for six (6) months and will be required to pay the established market rent. Participant still has the option to cure the non-compliance during the 6-month period while they are paying market rent. If the participant fails to cure the non-compliance by the end of the 6-month period they will continue to pay market rent and move to termination.

Termination: Termination will begin and the participant's incentive account, if any, is forfeited due to non-compliance. When applicable (the work requirement does not apply to HCV at this time), HCV participants will lose their voucher eligibility permanently, but can remain unassisted in their current unit; for public housing residents they will lose their eligibility for public housing assistance, will pay ceiling rent (market rent for the unit) and their lease will be terminated for program non-compliance at the annual renewal.

Residents who have a second incident of probation within twelve (12) months of the initial incident of probation will move directly to the non-compliance period of the sanctions.

Residents who have a third improvement period occurrence within twenty-four (24) months of the initial incident of probation will move directly to the non-compliance period of the sanctions.

The activity is on schedule and considered effective for the overall intent to simplify the way rent is calculated in order to reduce time spent and errors in rent calculation, as well as incentivize customers to gain employment without immediate rent increase and create a savings vehicle for those that are eligible. The bullets below describe the impact, and comparison of baselines and benchmarks for the activity metrics in the table.

- The number of reexaminations was only slightly lower than the year before because CHA did not begin the agency wide reexaminations until October 2013. The

property managers in public housing spent 687 hours in reexaminations and housing specialists spent 1,745 hours in reexaminations for HCV households. The total 2,432 hours is a reduction from the baseline. CHA had not considered the cost decrease as a metric for FY2014 because the staff time was being used to complete other participant/agency related business. This HUD mandated metric was added April in 2014.

- The total time spent on reexaminations for both programs (4,021 reexaminations) was 2,432 hours. There was a decrease from baseline. CHA anticipates a greater decrease in FY2015 when the activity has executed a full year of implementation. There was no benchmark for FY2014 because this HUD mandated metric was added April 2014.
- CHA will set the metric for the average error rate in rent calculation during FY2015. At this time the agency has determined that a total of 5% of files (total for both programs) will be randomly pulled for quality control review.
- Rent is calculated at 30% of the lower end of an income band. Therefore, if the household income increases, but does not move outside of the band they will not incur a rent increase. This is a factor in CHA's rental revenue decrease from the baseline year. However, the activity is not intended to increase rental revenue and is not singularly tracked to monitor the activity impact on rental revenue. The activity will continue as proposed because it encourages households to report income increases without an immediate rent increase and provides an incentive by way of a savings vehicle set aside by the agency for the customer.
- The agency had 1,604 participants employed during FY2014. The average PH earned income (412 residents) was \$12,298 and for the HCV program (1,192 participants) the average earned income was \$19,710. The average for both programs is \$16,004. This is well above the baseline and moving towards a positive direction. CHA's participant's income increase and decrease trend has followed the economy. Over the last 4 years the income averages have dropped and are now beginning to climb upwards. This total represents all households participating in the Rent Reform program which includes the households participating in the Moving Forward Supportive Services.

- The only families that had escrow accounts prior to Rent Reform activities were those participating in the HUD FSS program. When CHA implemented the Rent Reform activity, all families with income from wages became eligible for incentive accounts. The total sum of the escrow accounts for 2,099 households (both programs) is \$2,334,557.06. The average per family is \$1,122. The escrow/savings component of this activity is considered a success for the agency and its customers. It is noted that escrow and incentive accounts can be impacted by payouts and transfers.
- CHA does not have a report that distinguishes the number of head(s) of households employed full or part time. The data for those households being provided case management services does provide full and part time numbers; therefore, the number here is not an agency wide representation. It only reflects households participating in the Moving Forward Supportive Services (MFSS) activity. Also, it should be noted that the baseline for this metric is adjusted annually based on the households served.
- The number of households receiving TANF assistance decreased from the baseline. There are factors other than employment that can affect receipt of TANF such as the length of time the individual is receiving the assistance, compliance with the TANF self-sufficiency plan and whether a child under the age of 19 continues to live in the home.
- CHA only provides supportive services to households in the pilot communities receiving case management. Prior to the start of the activity, the only families receiving supportive services were those in the HUD FSS program. Due to MTW flexibilities, CHA has been able to increase the number of households provided comprehensive case management. The baselines and benchmarks change each fiscal year based on the current population of residents residing in the communities. Each pilot community had a benchmark of 100% of households participating in the Moving Forward Supportive Services activity and each Pilot Community fell below the benchmark. The most significant difference in baseline and benchmark was seen in Group 3 Communities (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills), which were being provided services by a third party vendor. CHA

assigned an in house case manager to these communities during FY2014 to improve the lag in performance.

- The average subsidy for the HCV program decreased from the baseline number, however the PH subsidy increased. Voucher utilization can affect HCV subsidy average, while housing stock and tenant rents impact PH and it would take a few years of improved rents to see an impact. Continuing to increase the number of households with income from wages and the income levels of those households will positively impact the subsidy levels.
- CHA defines transition to self-sufficiency as “no housing subsidy”. The number of households that transitioned to homeownership or private housing is 16.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Total cost of rent reform in dollars	The cost of task prior to implementation of activity is \$67,960 (3,398 staff hours x \$20 per hour)	N/A	The cost of the task after implementation of activity decreased to \$48,640 (2,432 x \$20 per hour)	N/A
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease total time to complete the task in staff hours.	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 3,398 hours (38 min recert multiplied by 5,366 households)	N/A	The total amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation decreased to 2,432 hours.	N/A
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in rent calculation task as a percentage.	The average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity will be set in FY2015.	N/A	N/A	N/A

CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenues				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had rental revenue of \$4,780,996	N/A	CHA rental revenue decreased to \$3,424,643 in FY2014	N/A
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households participating in the Rent Reform activity	Average earned income prior to implementation \$13,326	Expected average after implementation (2.5% increase) \$13,659	Average earned income FY2014 increased to \$16,004	Yes
SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Average amount of savings/escrow of households participating in the Rent Reform activity	The average amount of savings/escrow of households participating prior to implementation was \$0	N/A	The average amount of savings/escrow of households participating in the Rent Reform activity after implementation is \$1,122*.	N/A
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Increase in the number of head(s) of households employed full-time	MFSS Head(s) of households employed full time prior to implementation of rent reform activity was 46	N/A	There were 59 MFSS participants employed full time in FY2014.	N/A
SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 349	N/A	Households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 228	N/A
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 308	The FY2014 benchmark was 331 households	278**	No

SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in average amount of HCV and Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$547 for HCV HAP and \$359 for PH	N/A	The average HAP is \$468 and PEL is \$368 at FYE2014.	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (positive move out with no subsidy assistance).	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (positive move out with no subsidy assistance) prior to implementation of the activity is 0	N/A	The number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency in FY2014 was 16.**	N/A

* the average escrow balance includes households in the traditional FSS program and the Rent Reform Incentive accounts

** These are households participating in the Moving Forward Supportive Services activity.

For a full description of the Rent Reform Initiative, see The Hardship Policy, Work Requirement, Rent Reform Overview and examples of alternative rent schedules included in the Appendices.

- i. There were 127 hardship requests in FY2014 of which 97 were approved.
3. The benchmark for participating households in supportive services was not met. Group 3 Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills Communities were being provided services by a third party vendor. CHA assigned an in-house case manager to these communities during FY2014 to improve the lag in performance.
4. Due to population changes at the development, the baseline and benchmark change each fiscal year.
5. Many of the metrics are new, but of the existing metrics (those with a FY2014 benchmark) the data collection method did not change.

2008- 1 Good Neighbor Training

1. CHA proposed the Good Neighbor Training (GNT) activity in FY2008. The activity implementation began in FY2008 for HCV households. Public housing households began receiving training in 2011. The training is designed to assist families’ acclimation to a neighborhood. Participants learn more about being “Good Neighbors” by focusing on topics such as building codes and standards, property maintenance, basic zoning regulations, home maintenance, neighborhood involvement, school and amenity locations, and conflict resolution.

2. CHA continues to provide mandated GNT, which is conducted by CHA staff, to all new Housing Choice Voucher and public housing applicants entering the program. Port-Ins are also required to complete Good Neighbor Training. Good Neighbor Training for public housing and HCV existing program participants has been completed. The activity is on schedule and effective.
 - There was a decrease in the number of households terminated for violations related to Good Neighbor Training in FY2014. The outcome was less than the benchmark and the baseline. The training is conducted in-house and enforcement of violations is emphasized to attendees.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#4: Displacement Prevention				
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease)	302 HCV and 50 PH households at or below 80% AMI lost their assistance or needed to move prior to the implementation of the GNT	The benchmark for FY2014 was 10% decrease in HCV to 272 and there was no metric for PH.	There were 133 HCV and 9 PH households that lost their assistance for GNT violations	Yes

3. The benchmark was achieved.
4. CHA added the reporting of PH households that lost housing assistance due to Good Neighbor Training violations.
5. The data collection method did not change.

2008 - 2 Participant and Landlord Tracking Program

1. CHA received approval in the FY2008 annual plan to implement a *Participant and Landlord Tracking Program*. The activity was implemented in FY2008. The agency began tracking the locations of Housing Choice Vouchers in order to address de-concentration of poverty and increase access to affordable housing opportunities in non-concentrated areas.
2. Using the Geographic Information Science (GIS) mapping services of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC), CHA identified each voucher holder within Mecklenburg County (Charlotte, Pineville, Huntersville, Mint Hill, Matthews, Davidson, Cornelius). The results of the mapping indicated that 75% (3,206 of 4,268) of Housing Choice Voucher holders reside in 8 concentrated zip codes within the City of Charlotte (28208, 28215, 28216, 28205, 28217, 28212, 28269, and 28213). CHA identified where both poverty and Housing Choice Voucher participation is low in order to design a program which would encourage participants to move into those areas.

CHA began including information on the benefits of residing in low poverty areas in the voucher briefings, including a list of amenities in non-concentrated zip codes. No additional services are provided to the household. CHA has also worked on reducing this percentage by actively visiting apartment complex management companies, and speaking with landlords who own or manage properties outside of the concentrated areas. Additionally, CHA has formed a Landlord Advisory Group to assist in recruiting properties for Housing Choice Voucher leases and a Neighborhood Advisory Group to solicit suggestions and feedback on how to improve the perception of the Housing Choice Voucher program.

It is noted that the % change can be impacted by the utilization rate and number of vouchers available; therefore, the actual number of vouchers in the concentrated area is

critical to realizing movement for de-concentration purposes. The activity is on schedule and effective.

- While the actual percent of vouchers in concentrated areas fluctuated each quarter of the fiscal year, the number of vouchers in use in non concentrated zip codes never went above 28%. At the close of the fiscal year, the voucher count in neighborhoods of better opportunity was 20% of the total vouchers issued. This does not include special purpose, port ins or project base vouchers. CHA anticipates efforts to consult with the Landlord and Neighborhood Advisory groups will increase rental opportunities in neighborhoods of opportunity.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
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 the activity (increase)	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 25% or 1,062 of 4,268	The benchmark for FY2014 was to increase participation in neighborhoods of opportunity to 30% of total voucher in use.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity decreased to 20% or 1,687 of 3,375	No
HC#7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Increase in the number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	Households receiving this type of service in FY2014 is 505.	N/A

3. The benchmark was not achieved. The activity has endured challenges with mobility activities. Households tend to live where persons or institutions are familiar to them. Additional barriers include transportation, stricter background checks, non acceptance of vouchers in some areas due to stereotypes and the amount of rents charged in some areas prevent moves. The establishment of the Landlord and Neighborhood Advisory group is anticipated to improve the numbers.
4. There was no change in the benchmark or metric.
5. The data collection method did not change.

2009 - 2 Adopt Investment Policies Consistent with State Law

1. HUD approved the *Adoption of Investment Policies that are Consistent with State Law* to achieve a portfolio which is safer, more liquid, and obtains competitive yield in FY2009. The agency implemented this initiative in FY2009. The agency will invest only in securities authorized under state law that will allow the flexibility to invest productively and efficiently. CHA's investments are performed in accordance with HUD regulations and North Carolina Statutes.
2. This activity has allowed CHA to achieve higher earnings on idle funds in a safer, more liquid environment. The interest rates during the baseline period averaged 4.41% per month. The current average interest rate is .12% due to the economy which significantly impacts the amount of earnings received. In past years, CHA experienced a higher interest rate under the new portfolio strategy since implementation began in 2009, resulting in a higher net portfolio return which achieves greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures. The activity is on schedule and effective.
 - CHA's investment policy restricts amounts deposited or invested for different types of investments as a percentage of the overall portfolio. The agency has less ability to invest in commercial paper than in previous years and investments are not yielding as well as in previous years, however, the agency continues to compare the NC

investments portfolio to HUD’s portfolio and maintains it is gaining more interest on dollars leveraged in the NC portfolio.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase amount of funds leveraged in dollars	The increase in amount of funds leveraged prior to the start of this activity was \$0	N/A	The increase in amount of funds leveraged in FY2014 was \$76,588.	N/A

3. The metric was added in April 2014. However, CHA continues to earn more money through the NC investment portfolio than the HUD portfolio on the funds leveraged.
4. CHA has not revised the benchmark or metric for this activity.
5. There is no new data collection method.

2009 - 3 Modify Section 8 Inspection Procedures

1. CHA proposed and received approval to modify the Housing Choice Voucher inspection procedures in the *Fiscal Year 2008 - 2009 Moving Forward Annual Plan* and implemented the procedure in FY2009. The approved modification was a waiver of the requirement for an initial Housing Quality Standard (HQS) inspection on newly constructed project-based or tenant-based voucher units and instead, utilizes local building standards inspection and subsequent issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) as a substitution of the initial or move-in inspection.
2. The activity is on schedule and effective. There were 20 PBV units at The Retreat at Renaissance, 3 PBV units at The Residences at Renaissance and 10 PBV units at Everett House leased in FY2014.

- At the start of the activity, the HQS inspection was \$50. It is now \$55. CHA was able to save \$1,815 by using the Mecklenburg County Building Standards Certificate of Occupancy. This is an activity CHA has determined successful and will continue.
- No staff time is required to carry out the activity.
- All units received the Certificate of Occupancy when scheduled for final inspection.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task in dollars	The cost of HQS inspections was \$50 prior to implementation of the activity (114 units at \$5,700).	The expected cost of the task is \$0 after implementation of the activity.	The cost of HQS inspections for these units was \$0.	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease in the total time to complete the task in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity was 57 hours.	N/A	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 0	N/A
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in the average percent error rate in completing inspections	The average percent failed inspections prior to implementation is 0%	N/A	There were (0) no failed units	N/A

3. Benchmark is determined achieved and this is an effective cost savings activity.

4. The benchmarks and metrics remain the same for FY2014.

5. The data collection method did not change.

2009 - 4 Community Based Rental Assistance

1. CHA operates Traditional Project-Based voucher, Supportive Housing Project-Based and Local Rental Subsidy programs for implementation of Community Based Rental Assistance (CBRA). At the start of this initiative, the City of Charlotte produced a Quality of Life study which classified neighborhoods as “stable”, “challenged” or “threatened”. The City has discontinued use of those terms recognizing the potential negative impact of labeling neighborhoods. CHA now looks at the percent of households below the poverty level.

There is no annual benchmark for this activity because the CHA Board of Commissioners approves CBRA projects on a case by case basis. In selecting families to occupy Project-Based Voucher (PBV) units CHA has delegated determination of program and project eligibility to the PBV owner agent. CHA retains the flexibility to use, as necessary, the public housing program guidelines for PBV participants that reside in mixed-finance communities with regard to various operational and procedural functions, including but not limited to forming resident organizations, grievance procedures, etc. This streamlined approach creates consistency for residents and efficiencies in application for staff. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Traditional Activity

In FY2009, CHA was approved to implement a Community Based Rental Assistance (CBRA) program. The activity was implemented in FY2009. CHA adopted a CBRA process (See Appendix D) to simplify the selection process in order to maximize the number of quality project-based voucher units throughout Charlotte. CHA revised the Community Based Rental Assistance Policy in May 2013 to further increase efforts for deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities. There were 23 new traditional project-based vouchers added in FY2014 (3 at The Residences at Renaissance and 20 at The Retreat at Renaissance).

- CHA negotiated a new scope of supportive services with the third party vendor. In previous contracts services were provided for the entire family. The new scope of services limits the focus and investment to the head of household, though services can still be provided to other family members in the household. The revised contract reduced the cost per household for supportive services to \$1,300 per year.
- CHA has a Special Project Manager that manages the Project-Based voucher HAP contracts in conjunction with the Compliance Division. They estimate between the two staff that it takes 9 hours monthly to process HAPs for all of the traditional CBRA sites. The annual total would be 108 hours.
- Decrease the average error rate of HAP calculation for the PBV developments is a new metric beginning April 2014. CHA will begin documenting the number of errors that are corrected during FY2015.

Supportive Housing Project-Based Activity

In FY2009, CHA was approved to implement Housing for Persons with Disabilities, Special Needs, and Homeless. The activity was implemented in FY2009. The activity enables CHA to expand its role in the supportive housing community by leveraging funding and resources to social service and supportive housing providers. This will help alleviate the existing housing burden, as well as increase the housing subsidy opportunities in the Charlotte community.

The activity has impacted Charlotte's supportive housing projects by enabling local agencies to produce additional units for the targeted population to fill a needed void in Charlotte's continuum of care. Without CHA's fund leveraging or resource commitment, projects may be delayed or not occur. CHA encourages the use of housing subsidies in these partnerships.

Through MTW flexibility, CHA allows supportive housing programs to operate on a month to month lease, rather than requiring them to modify their program to comply with existing HUD regulations requiring 12 month initial leases. This is significant in respect to non-compliance and participant termination.

- The average cost per family for supportive services is not paid for or contracted with CHA. Actual services range from \$3,800 to 7,500 per family for housing and services.
- During FY2014, CHA added 10 new project-based vouchers for supportive housing at Everett House which serves disabled residents. The Salvation Army provides service coordination for the residents at Everett House.

Local Rental Subsidy Activity

The activity was approved in FY2011 as a second amendment to the Plan. The activity was implemented in FY2011. CHA staff developed a local rental subsidy program in partnership with Charlotte Family Housing (CFH). The local rental subsidy program provides a housing subsidy of up to \$500 per month to a maximum of 50 homeless families receiving intensive supportive services (10 to 15 families that need employment and 35 to 40 for working households). Working households are expected to complete the self-sufficiency program within three years with a one year extension and non-working families are given a four year program requirement with a one year extension.

This is a 50-unit pilot program with similar requirements and processes as Charlotte Family Housing's current housing program. The program's criteria are required for each respective group; however, if those referred families are on CHA's waiting list, they will have preference. CFH established operating procedures, landlord relationships, and administrative staff to deliver wrap-around services. The partnership enables delivery of supportive services at no cost to CHA.

The families are either working or participating in a self-sufficiency or educational program and earning less than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). The program targets families who are situationally or transitionally homeless. The program may also provide for the use of the subsidy to prevent homelessness by providing assistance to families ready for transition from local shelters. It is a collaborative effort that joins local agencies which are already providing services to this community with funds from the faith community, the corporate community, and the public sector. CFH uses "the ability to pay" method which bases the tenants rental portion on net income and actual expenses. CHA has

implemented the 30% rule until CFH can provide an updated recalculation policy. CHA pays a subsidy of up to \$500 to help pay the remaining rental amount. The goal is to help families achieve self-sufficiency within three to five years by providing comprehensive family development via social work, intensive case management, and access to services while the family is permanently housed in a stable apartment community.

In FY2015 CHA will provide assistance to Supportive Housing Communities to launch a program titled Scattered Site Apartments which will be similar to the Charlotte Family Housing model.

2. CHA leased up 39 families under the Charlotte Family Housing local subsidy MTW initiative as of March 31, 2014.
 - The average subsidy for the 39 families enrolled in CFH program on March 31, 2014 was \$488. This is lower than the baseline. The maximum subsidy for families in this program is \$500. The subsidy is lower than the average tenant based voucher. There was no benchmark prior to April 2014 due to addition of metric from HUD standard metric requirement.
 - CHA staff that process the subsidy for this program estimate 3 hours monthly, which totals 36 hours per year. This is not something that is anticipated to change.
 - Determining the average error rate in calculating the subsidy for this program will be documented during FY2015 and a metric set in the FY2016 Annual Plan.
 - CFH estimates they spend \$5,000 per year, per family for supportive services.
 - Families participating in the Charlotte Family Housing program are encouraged to be employed because the program limits assistance to three years with one extension if employed and four years if unemployed when entering program. The average earned income is \$12,322. This is a new metric and the FY2014 average earned income will be the baseline.
 - There are 33 households employed, CHA does not have the data to distinguish full time and part time. This will be available in future reports for this activity.
 - There are no families receiving TANF in the CFH program.

- All of the families participating in the CFH program are required to participate in supportive services aimed to increase self-sufficiency. The number of families enrolled is 39. The maximum capacity is 50. The program has never reached capacity; therefore the benchmark has not been achieved. CFH's screening criteria has made finding eligible candidates a challenge. CHA is in the process of re-evaluating their allocation.
- CHA is not the landlord for Charlotte Family Housing households. There is no impact on CHA's rental revenue. This HUD mandated metric is not appropriate.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Traditional Activity				
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease of total cost of task (supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	N/A	Cost of task after implementation is \$1,300 per family per year	N/A
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease total time to complete the task (process PBV payments) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task (process PBV payments) prior to implementation of the activity is 0	N/A	Total amount of staff time to complete the task is 108 hours in staff hours	N/A
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease average error rate in completing a task (HAP calculation) as a percentage.	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is TBD during FY2015	N/A	N/A	N/A

Supportive Housing Project-Based Activity				
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount of leverage prior to implementation of the activity is \$0.	N/A	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$5,650 per family for supportive services	N/A
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of new housing units made available for special needs, homeless or disabled households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase)	114	N/A	10 for FY2014.	N/A
Local Rental Subsidy Activity				
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (cost of average HAP) in dollars	Cost of task (average HAP) prior to implementation of the activity \$547	N/A	The cost of the average HAP is \$488.	N/A
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease in total time to complete the task (process HAP) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time (process HAP) dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	The total time to complete the task is not expected to decrease. Annual staff hours total 36 hours.	N/A

CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease average error rate in completing a task (HAP calculation) as a percentage.	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is TBD during FY2015	N/A	N/A	N/A
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$0.	N/A	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$5,000 per family.	N/A
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation was not available to CHA. The baseline is set at \$12,322	N/A	N/A	N/A
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Employed Full Time	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A

SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	There was no change. Households with TANF remain at 0.	N/A
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency.	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 50.	Household receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 39.(100% of those enrolled thus far).	No
SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in total cost of task (cost of HAP) in dollars	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity \$0	N/A	Cost of task after implementation is \$488.	N/A
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	Households in this program lease from private landlords. There is no impact on rental revenue for CHA	N/A	N/A	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy) prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	Households transitioned to self sufficiency after implementation is 0.	N/A

HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation is 50.	There were 39 households able to move to a better unit or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity.	No

3. Charlotte Family Housing did not utilize the entire 50 subsidies allotted them. The agency has had challenges in identifying participants who meet the screening criteria. CHA is re-evaluating the allocation. The program does select households from CHA's waiting list therefore the activity is still effective and will continue.
4. The benchmarks and metrics were not revised other than the mandated HUD standard metrics added.
5. The data collection method did not change. Additional data collection was required due to the new standard metrics.

2009 - 5 Moving Forward Supportive Services

1. The *Moving Forward Supportive Services* (formerly Currents of Change) was approved in the FY2009 Annual Plan. Implementation began in FY2009. The activity promotes work and self sufficiency.
2. The activity is on schedule and effective. In previous contracts for supportive services funding was provided for the entire family. The new scope of services limits the focus and investment to the head of household, though services can still be provided to other family members in the household. The revised contract reduced the cost per household for supportive services to \$1,300 per year.

Moving Forward Supportive Services are provided to two pilot groups. In the Annual Report we break the sites out into three pilots: Victoria Square and Claremont Pilot 1, Boulevard as Pilot 2 and Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills as Pilot 3. However, under CHA's Moving Forward programming we divide the sites up by program or group. The HOPE VI group, Moving Forward Group 1 (Claremont, Victoria Square and HCV) and Moving Forward Group 2 (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills). The Client Services Department also tracks a comparison site, Dillehay Courts. Dillehay is a large conventional public housing community that does not currently receive supportive services. With the approved changes for Biennial Reexaminations the Dillehay Courts comparison group will no longer be used in the FY 14-15 year, as the number will no longer reflect current incomes and wages.

Moving Forward Supportive Services-FSS Program:

CHA administers the Moving Forward Supportive Services (MFSS) Program, which operates in our conventional sites located at Claremont, Victoria Square as well as in the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program (Group 1). This program is the combination of the traditional family self-sufficiency (FSS) program and the newer MTW Moving Forward Self-Sufficiency program. In 2010, FSS contracts were no longer offered and those who were under a traditional FSS 5-year contract had the option to remain under their FSS contract or roll under the new Moving Forward Supportive Services program. Under this program, applicants must be willing to finish a high school diploma or earn a GED during participation in the program. During the first twelve (12) months they are encouraged to become employed a minimum of 15 hours per week and willing to enroll in school and/or job training. Applicants must demonstrate motivation towards self-sufficiency. Although the contract of participation is still a part of the Moving Forward Supportive Services program, a time frame is not set. Continual progress towards self-sufficiency is expected with an average program time being seven (7) years.

Moving Forward Supportive Services Program:

Beginning April 1, 2013, CHA provides self-sufficiency programming to three conventional public housing sites: (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest, and Tarlton Hills- Group 2) that were previously being served by an outside case management agency. Children's

Home Society (CHS) provides self-sufficiency programming to our relocated Boulevard Homes families (Group 2).

Like the Moving Forward Group 1 program, applicants must be willing to finish a high school diploma or earn a GED during participation in the program. During the first twelve (12) months they are encouraged to become employed a minimum of 15 hours per week and willing to enroll in school and/or job training. Applicants must demonstrate motivation towards self-sufficiency. Although the contract of participation is still a part of the Moving Forward program, a time frame is not set. Continual progress towards self-sufficiency is expected with an average program time being seven (7) years. Many of the active participants in this program have a lot of barriers to self-sufficiency.

The Moving Forward Supportive Services program has had a significant impact on household incomes. Based on the Rent Reform Impact Analysis conducted by Edgemere Consulting (Appendix C), more families with supportive services are employed and they have more earned income than those not receiving supportive services. The activity is on schedule. There were a few unachieved benchmarks, however, the communities being serviced have households ranging in needs and while every effort is made to set realistic goals, as well as achieve them, individual motivation and capacity must be taken into consideration.

Metrics are determined on an annual basis due to program attrition.

CHA (Claremont, Victoria Square)				
Metric	Baseline (April 2013)	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	N/A	Cost of task after implementation of the activity is \$1,300 per household per year	N/A

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 120.	N/A	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 100 hours monthly	N/A
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage.	Average error rate of task (inactive head of household) prior to implementation of the activity is 0%	N/A	Expected average error rate of task (inactive head of household) after implementation of the activity is 5%	N/A
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0		Amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$475,100	
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (1% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Averaged earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$9,163	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of this activity is \$9,254	\$12,221	Yes

SS#2: Increase in household savings				
Increase average amount of escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$1,879	N/A	Average escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$1,502.	N/A
SS#3 Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	14	14	17	Yes
# Employed PT (1-31)	38	38	44	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	7	13	3	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	7	13	3	No
Unemployed	32	≤37	11	Yes
Other (workshop)	0	26	0	No
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0	N/A	Number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 0	N/A
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency.	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 14	N/A	Number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation is 71	N/A

SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of this activity is \$391	N/A	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$391	N/A
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had rental revenue of \$4,780,996	N/A	CHA rental revenue was \$3,424,643 in FY2014	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency.	0	5	7	Yes
CHS (Boulevard Homes Originals)				
Metric	Baseline (April 2013)	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	N/A	Cost of task for FY2014 decreased to \$1,300 per household per year	N/A
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 120.	N/A	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation is 100.	N/A

CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is 7%	N/A	The actual average error rate is 17%	N/A
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	N/A	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$475,100	N/A
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (0% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$7,354	Expected average earned income of household affected by this policy in FY2014 is \$7,354	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$8,828	Yes
SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Increase average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$1,118	N/A	Actual savings of households is \$1,174	N/A
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	24	24	22	No
# Employed PT (1-31)	32	32	37	Yes

SS#4: Households removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	The households receiving TANF is 0.	N/A
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 20	N/A	111 households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency	N/A
SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$616.	N/A	Actual average subsidy per household is \$627 in FY2014	N/A
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had rental revenue of \$4,780,996	N/A	CHA rental revenue was \$3,424,643 in FY2014	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy) is 0	Expected to transition to self sufficiency is 0	Actual transition to self-sufficiency is 2	Yes

CHA (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest, Tarlton Hills)				
Metric	Baseline (April 2013)	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	N/A	Cost of task after implementation is \$1,300 per household per year	N/A
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 120.	N/A	Total time to complete task after implementation is 100 hours	N/A
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is 32%	N/A	Actual error rate was 22% for FY2014.	N/A
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	N/A	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$475,100	N/A

SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (0% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$6,499	Expected earned income was \$6,499	Actual earned income is \$11,697	Yes
SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Increase average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$548	N/A	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation is \$10,877	N/A
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	8	8	20	Yes
# Employed PT (1-31)	15	15	16	Yes
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 12	N/A	Number of households receiving TANF is 11 (3 were removed but 2 new HH's started)	N/A
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 31.	N/A	96	N/A

SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$397	N/A	Actual average subsidy is \$398	N/A
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had rental revenue of \$4,780,996	N/A	CHA rental revenue was \$3,424,643 in FY2014	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy) prior to implementation of the activity is 0	Expected to transition to self sufficiency (no subsidy) is 0	1	Yes

NOTES:

1. All metrics are taken from the FY2014 program metrics

3. CHA revised the case management model to focus more intensely on the head of household's success rather than focusing declining resources on the entire household. The agency also brought one of the pilot communities (Pilot C - Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest, Tarlton Hills) in-house for case management services to improve the outcomes. It is noted that escrow and incentive accounts can be impacted by payouts and transfers.
4. The baselines and benchmarks are reset each year to reflect the population being served.
5. The data collection methods have not changed.

2009- 7 Increase Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Existing Multi-Family Properties

1. CHA received approval to implement Increasing the Acquisition/Rehabilitation of Existing Multi-family Properties; in the 2008 - 2009 MTW Annual Plan. Implementation began in FY2009. In FY2012, CHA received approval to expand this initiative to acquire and rehabilitate existing multi-family properties in mixed-income communities.

2. CHA has found acquisition more cost effective and, at times, it has allowed the agency to add more units to the inventory in a shorter period of time than new construction. Current new construction is at \$120,000 or more per unit. Individuals who resided at the acquired properties were relocated as necessary in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act. The remaining occupied units are filled through attrition with ACC or Project-Based units as they become vacant. Using MTW flexibility, CHA has acquired 918 units, each costing less than \$81,000 per unit.

The activity is on schedule and effective. CHA used FY2014 as a planning year. No new acquisitions were targeted. The agency target for FY2015 is to analyze expiring Low Income Housing Tax Credit sites previously funded through the HOPE VI Program. CHA will also pursue work force development opportunities via acquisition of existing sites or develop affordable housing on existing properties owned by CHA.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (acquire units)	Cost of task (acquire units) prior to implementation of the activity was \$120,000 per unit for new construction	\$0	\$0	Y

HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	There were 0 units planned for FY2014.	There were 0 units planned for FY2014.	Y
HC#4: Displacement Prevention				
Decrease in number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity was 0	N/A	Actual households losing assistance /moving after implementation of the activity is 0 for FY2014	N/A
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity was 0.	N/A	No households were placed through this activity in FY2014	N/A

3. There were no benchmarks for FY2014. CHA's development department used FY2014 to develop a master plan with regards to future projects and funding.
4. There are no revised benchmarks or metrics.
5. The data collection method has not changed.

2009- 8 Land Acquisition for Future Use

1. The agency was approved to implement Land Acquisition for Future Affordable Housing in FY2009. The activity was implemented in FY2009.

- The purpose of the activity is to secure as many good locations, if possible, along the new transit corridors and light rail as well as in rapidly developing areas of Charlotte to expand housing choices. MTW flexibility allows CHA to acquire sites without prior HUD approval, providing that the agency certifies that HUD site selection requirements have been met. This allows CHA to be proactive and competitive in the market when land becomes available. CHA has a surplus of land in inventory, but experiencing challenges in securing development financing; therefore acquiring additional land is not a priority at this time. Steele Creek Seniors has been developed; a tax credit application is pending on Park and Marsh and Krefeld Drive is a property that has been land banked and development scenarios are being assessed for the future. CHA has developed a Five Year Strategic Plan of development activities. Specific land acquisition types have not been identified at the time of the report. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	There were 0 housing units targeted.	There were 0 housing units made available as a result of this activity.	Yes

- No benchmarks were set for FY2014. It was used as a planning year.
- If applicable, the revised benchmarks will be provided in the FY2016 Moving Forward Annual Plan.
- There is no change to the data collection process.

Local Non-Traditional Initiatives

2011 - 2 Convert Units to Public Housing

1. CHA was approved to implement an activity to utilize public housing units to serve homeless families at Hampton Creste Apartments and to implement a supportive self-sufficiency program in a 2nd amendment to the FY2011 Annual Plan. The agency began implementation in FY2011.
2. The apartments are owned by CHA's non-profit subsidiary, Horizon Development Properties, Inc. and have been refinanced and rehabilitated into a mixed-income community. The activity was branded the Supportive Housing Innovative Partnership (SHIP). The Salvation Army (TSA) is responsible for providing the supportive services.

There are 60 ACC units operating as part of the mixed-income community. The SHIP program provides services to homeless families with children, such as intensive home-based case management and evidence-based programs and services that address severe emotional, social, developmental, educational, and employment challenges that homeless families may face entering permanent housing are provided; 40 of the remaining 153 units are restricted to families making 40% area median income and the remaining 113 units are restricted to families making 80% area median income.

There were 64 ACC households served in the SHIP program during FY2014 but only 54 on the last day of the fiscal year. CHA's purchase of the apartment complex enables 60 homeless families to have housing and services to end their cycle of homelessness. Due to the population served, the fluctuation is expected. The activity is on schedule and considered effective.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE:4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	N/A	\$125,000	N/A
SS#1: Increase In Household Income				
Increase in average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$5,331 (28 families)	N/A	The actual average earned income during FY2014 is \$12,792 (64 families)	N/A
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Employed Full-Time	Head of households employed full-time prior to implementation of the activity is 15	N/A	There are 13 households with income of full time employment	N/A
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 12	N/A	There are 25 households receiving TANF*	N/A
SS#5: Households assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in the number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	CHA expects 60 housing units of this type after implementation of the activity.	There were 64 households served during the year.	Yes

SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	N/A	The average subsidy is \$360.	N/A
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had rental revenue of \$4,780,996	N/A	CHA rental revenue was \$3,424,643 in FY2014	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in the number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency. (housing with no subsidy)	There were 0 households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to this activity.	CHA expects 70% (42 of first 60 families) to transition to housing with no subsidy.	This is a 3 year program. There were 0 households transitioned in FY2014.	N/A
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	There were 64 households provided housing in a better unit as a result of the activity	N/A

* Participants are encouraged to obtain needed stabilization assistance which includes TANF

3. The Salvation Army provides case management services to the families. There are other community partners involved in the program. The partnership is working as planned and no strategies are necessary.
4. No metrics or benchmarks were revised.
5. There was no change to data collection method.



2011 - 3 New Construction of Affordable Units

1. The activity was approved in March 2010 as Construction of the Lofts at Seigle Point as a first amendment to the FY2011 plan. The activity was implemented in FY2011. The activity was renamed to New Construction of Affordable Units to serve a broader scope with an amendment approval in FY2012. CHA proposes to develop properties into mixed-income communities. The projects will include units intended for a wide range of income levels, from market rate to units that are affordable to those earning less than 30% area median income (AMI). Adding these units will increase housing choices for those needing affordable housing. The selected environment will be an ideal situation for residents to excel in CHA's Moving Forward program.

2. There are currently two projects under this activity:
 - The Lofts at Seigle Point is the final on-site component of the Seigle Point HOPE VI redevelopment of the former Piedmont Courts. However, HOPE VI funding is not included in this project. CHA broke ground on the Lofts at Seigle Point in December 2012. The project is 55% completed as of June 2014. Project is off schedule due to rain. The project will include 190 units of which 80% will be for lease to individuals at 80% AMI and below and 20% will be affordable.

The overall Seigle Point community has a 10,000 square foot community building, 204 tax credit apartments, 31 market rate townhomes, and an amenity area with a playground, tennis & basketball courts, greenway, and shelter area.

- CHA has partnered with Laurel Street Residential (LSR) to develop and build the residential units and community center on-site as part of the Boulevard Homes HOPE VI revitalization plan. The Retreat at Renaissance, a 110 unit independent living development for seniors, was the first phase of the project. The development was 100% leased during FY2014.

The second and third phases, The Residences at Renaissance, will consist of 224 units of rental housing for families. The 2nd phase is presently under construction.

Twenty-eight (28) of the units (3 Public Housing, 3 Project-Based, 22 Tax Credit) in Phase II were leased in FY2014. The residential buildings proposed include three story apartment buildings, two story direct access apartment buildings and two story townhomes, configured in one- to three-bedroom units. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Metric	Baseline	FY2014 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	N/A	There were 138 units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	N/A
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	N/A	There were 138 households able to move to a better unit as a result of the activity.	N/A

3. Due to weather conditions, construction was delayed.

4. The benchmarks or metrics were not revised.

5. There was no new authorization added.

NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES

CHA proposed three activities in the FY2015 Moving Forward Annual Plan. These were pending HUD approval at the close of the fiscal year. At the time of submission, approval had been received.

1. Streamline Project -Based Voucher and Public Housing in Mixed-Income Developments
2. Biennial Inspections for Housing Choice Voucher program
3. Public Housing No Assistance Termination

ACTIVITIES ON HOLD

2009 - 6 Youth Initiatives

1. In FY2009, CHA was approved to establish a Cooperative Agreement to Form Partnerships with Communities In School (CIS), Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS), Partners in Out of School Time (POST), and the Charlotte Housing Authority Scholarship Fund (CHASF) in order to connect CHA participants to programs and services that address truancy, post-secondary education preparation, and academic performance improvement. The Agreement has expired; however, CHA's focus continues to be on providing services for youth that are assisted by CHA housing programs as a means to help break the cycle of generational poverty. The authority will be seeking other partners and initiatives which can provide outcomes for the desired metrics for CHA's student portfolio. CIS's data was reporting aggregate data and did not allow CHA to see the progress of its student population.
2. CHA will use FY2015 as a planning year to identify new collaborations for serving the youth residing within our portfolio.

2009-1 Acquisition of General Partnership Interest

1. *Acquire the General Partnership interest in the Little Rock Apartments* - This activity was approved in March 2010, but was made as a first amendment to the FY2011 plan. In June, 2011, CHA, acting through its subsidiary Horizon Acquisition Corp. (Horizon), acquired the general partnership interest in Little Rock Apartments, a 240-unit Section 8 multi-family project adjacent to the Boulevard Homes site (now known as The Renaissance).

2. Due to budget restraints, CHA's endeavor to provide services and opportunities to Little Rock's residents such as self-sufficiency and employment services is delayed. Once a plan for services has been approved, appropriate baselines, benchmarks, and measures will be developed and implemented.

CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES

Biennial Review Process

1. A biennial review process for elderly and disabled heads of households was approved by HUD for FY2009. Implementation of the *Biennial Review Process* began December 2010.
2. The activity is being closed out because the agency has implemented an agency wide Biennial Process. The elderly and disabled will be reported on as part of the entire agency report on s skipped/conducted.
3. The activity was closed out FYE 2013.

Site-Based Waiting Lists for Public Housing and Project-Based Housing Choice Voucher

1. CHA was approved to *implement the site-based waiting lists for public housing and Project-Base Housing Choice Voucher units* in FY2009. The activity began in the same year.
2. CHA continues to manage the waiting lists for public housing and project-based voucher units at the site level. CHA considers this activity a success due to no 3rd offers in FY2013.
3. This activity was closed out effective FYE 2013.

Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

Unspent MTW funds will be utilized for those initiatives that have been described in the MTW Report and Plan such as rent reforms, new housing opportunities and new developments, case management and administrative efficiencies. The majority of the funds are slated for the development of housing units. The intent of our redevelopment approach is to minimize the capital outlay of CHA sources while facilitating development, meeting the mission of the organization and generating revenue to further financial sustainability of the Agency and development of affordable housing. More specifically funds have been committed for the following projects:

Real Estate Division Projects

Edwin Tower	6,031,056
Strawn Master Plan	1,958,526
Lofts at Seigle	1,037,500
Hampton Creste	261,700
Strawn/Parktowne	410,000
Park at Marsh/Savanna Woods	586,500
Boulevard Homes HOPE VI (Renaissance)	8,725,000
Hall House	409,029
Tall Oaks	606,653
Total	20,025,964

AMP Projects

Gladedale	135,952
Southside	23,430
Meadow Oaks	105,012
Total	264,393

Total Committed MTW Funds 20,290,357

V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

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

Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

- 1. Center for Employment Services (CES) – Facility that promotes employment and self-reliance by providing space to local service providers that provide career development opportunities at no cost. Partners include Charlotte Works, Jacob’s Ladder Job Center West, The Benefit Bank, City Dive, Inc and Grace-Mar Services Inc. Building maintenance is delivered by the property management. CES services are offered to Housing Choice Voucher participants, Family Self-Sufficiency participants and non-FSS residents. The CES outcomes for FY2014:**
 - There were 1,078 visits to the center; 504 were first time visits.
 - 43% (54 of 125) of CHA residents became employed using the CES employment services program.
 - 46% (74 of 159) of CHA residents enrolled in CES structured programs.
 - 65% (32 of 48) of CHA residents obtained jobs after completing pre-employment training course.
- 2. With Every Heartbeat Is Life – CHA residents are trained as Community Health Workers for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute’s With Every Heartbeat is Life (WEHL) initiative. They utilize a manual to train community residents about health issues and show them ways to live healthier lives.**
- 3. Resident Safety Initiative – CHA implemented Resident Safety Initiatives to reduce Part I crime incident statistics for all CHA sites. The Resident Safety Division measures the Part I crimes as defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program for the fiscal year. Part I crimes include burglary, assault, rape, homicide, robbery, arson, motor vehicle theft, and larceny. The initiatives include private security at the elderly sites year round and at the family and scattered sites during the summer months. Surveillance cameras are in operation at four senior high rises and 13 family/scattered sites. FY2014 accomplishments include:**
 - 18% reduction in Part I crimes at CHA managed sites
 - 3% reduction in Part I crimes at third-party managed sites
 - Discovery of \$487,977 in program fraud of which \$167,666.71 has been collected.
- 4. Edwin Tower – a 12-story 174 unit community undergoing comprehensive interior and exterior renovations.**

V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan

B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?

	or	No
	or	No

Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

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

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

	or	No
--	----	----

CHA does not use a Local Asset Management Plan.

V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds

C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds

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

Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
Capital Project	Real Estate Division Projects	N/A	\$20,025,964
Maintenance	AMP Projects	N/A	\$264,393
Total Obligated or Committed Funds:		0	20,290,357

The narrative in the beginning section of Sources and Uses details the explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds.

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

Administrative

A. There are no HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue.

B. Most current evaluation results of the demonstration program:

The Center for Urban and Regional Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (CURS) has been evaluating the Charlotte Housing Authority's (CHA) Moving Forward program for the past five years. The evaluation objectives are to monitor and provide feedback on program implementation and to assess the outputs and impacts of CHA's Moving Forward Program. The key research questions are:

- What are the major obstacles to implementing Moving Forward initiatives, and how were they overcome?
- To what extent has the Moving Forward program (i) achieved greater cost efficiencies; (ii) increased housing choices; (iii) assisted residents in achieving self-sufficiency; and (iv) improved CHA residents' quality of life?
- What impacts has participating in the Moving Forward program had on the CHA and its operations?

These research questions are being addressed through: (i) analysis of data from CHA's database management systems; (ii) surveys and interviews of CHA residents; (iii) key informant interviews with CHA and partner organization staff and board members; and (iv) the collection and analysis of secondary data sources such as the Charlotte Quality of Life database and Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data.

Summary of Activity for FY2014

Throughout FY 2014 CURS has continued to collect primary and secondary data on the aforementioned research questions, in addition to completing the following:

- Production and release of the second Interim Report on the program;
- Dissemination of evaluation results to the CHA Board of Commissioners, administrators of other participating MTW sites, and HUD officials;

- Completion of in-depth interviews with residents of the five work requirement pilot developments; and
- Development and administration of a survey of Section 8 residents to assess their health, satisfaction, and work effort. This will establish a baseline for future MTW initiatives that will focus on the HCV program.

In November 2013, CURS released its second Moving Forward interim assessment. This report updates the baseline report (released in May 2011) with findings from the evaluation's previous two years. The report reviews program implementation, highlights CHA's use of the financial and programmatic flexibility afforded by MTW, and offers recommendations for improving the program. The findings suggest that while the implementation of the MF program has generally gone smoothly communication difficulties, staff turnover, and software problems have caused some implementation problems and delays.

Budget flexibility afforded by MTW has allowed CHA to expand housing options, enhance case management services, and increase capital projects funding, even as overall HUD support has declined. Strategic under spending of the capital budget from 2009 to 2011 allowed CHA to draw on reserves in FY2012 to significantly increase spending on new housing developments. Additionally, relying on purchase/rehabilitation instead of more-expensive new construction allowed CHA to realize considerable per-unit cost savings in expanding housing options. Operating revenues have grown by over 25% from FY2009 through 2012, largely driven by a 124% increase from Horizon Development, Inc., a CHA subsidiary that owns several mixed-income properties. While expenses have also increased during this same period, these have shifted toward direct service provision (e.g., maintenance and case management) and away from costs associated with performing administrative tasks.

The interim report also documents how CHA has utilized MTW flexibility to expand housing choices. CHA increased the number of housing units it supports by 1,825 between 2008 and 2012, with the most substantial increase coming from affordable and project-based HCV communities. Concurrently, the neighborhood conditions surrounding CHA-supported

housing - especially conventional public housing and family mixed-income units - showed improvements in crime rates, youth achievement, and physical characteristics.

The final goal of MTW is to promote economic independence and self-sufficiency among residents. As part of a pilot MTW project, CHA has provided on-site case management services to residents living in five communities slated for implementation of a work requirement. Case managers work with residents to improve their employment options and provide other support such as training, education, transportation, and childcare. Sixty-eight (68%) percent of Section 9 residents subject to the work requirement report working with a case manager or participating in other Moving Forward employment or social service programs. According to End of Month reports filed by case managers, head-of-household employment rates in the five work requirement developments have remained constant over the study period. Case managers expressed several concerns in key informant interviews, including what they believe to be a misplaced emphasis on short-run resident employment, insufficient time to work with children and others in the household, delays in enforcing the work requirement, and lack of communication between CHA and contracted case management staff.

CURS recommendations include (i) improving communication both within CHA and between the Authority and outside contractors; (ii) revisiting several MTW self-sufficiency initiatives, including following through with work requirement-related sanctions and emphasizing education and training as a means for tenants to achieve self-sufficiency; (iii) continuing to embrace the flexibility embodied in the MTW program to expand mixed-income and project-based HCV opportunities in high-quality neighborhoods; (iv) improving case management and exit address data collection; and (v) increasing partnerships with local social service agencies.

Beyond the interim report, CURS staff disseminated evaluation findings in two presentations during FY2014. In November 2013, Dr. William Rohe presented evaluation design and methodology, findings, and recommendations to the CHA Board of Commissioners. In addition, Dr. Michael Webb and Kirstin Frescoln presented evaluation results at the February

2014 Moving to Work Conference in Washington, DC, to an audience of administrators of other MTW sites and HUD officials.

In January 2014, CURS researchers conducted in-person interviews with 21 residents of work-requirement pilot sites. One of CHA's MTW innovations is the implementation of a work requirement, where tenants at five pilot developments must work 15 hours per week, attend an approved educational program, or face rent sanctions and eventual eviction. While CHA announced this new policy several years ago, its implementation was delayed until January 2014 due to the economic downturn. The goal of these interviews is to understand residents' perception of and reactions to both the recently-implemented work requirement and the on-site case managers.

In contrast to the interim surveys, which indicated that few residents were aware of the work requirement in early 2013, our interviews demonstrated that knowledge of the policy has improved considerably. Nearly all (20 of 21) interviewees knew of the requirement and over half (11 of 21) were aware that tenants must work 15 hours per week or face sanctions. However, significant confusion exists concerning hardship exemptions, and residents have mixed feelings about the work requirements' 'fairness;' while nearly all acknowledge that people *should* be working, they worry about difficulty finding a job given the economy coupled with childcare and transportation expenses. Nearly all interviewees have worked with the on-site case managers, and two-thirds of residents believe that their case managers have helped connect them to jobs, schooling opportunities, or transportation assistance.

Finally, CURS developed and administered a baseline Housing Choice Voucher survey that seeks to understand resident satisfaction with their housing, neighborhood, and services provided by CHA; employment and work history, health and wellness, and basic demographic information. The survey was sent to a random sample of approximately 1,000 HCV participants; households that did not respond to the first mailing received two additional surveys approximately one month apart. As of April 2014, approximately 60% of households have completed the survey; CURS will analyze their responses over the summer of 2014.

Ongoing and future activities

Primary activities planned for FY 2015 include:

- Analyzing and reporting results of the Housing Choice Voucher survey. As mentioned previously, this activity was begun in late 2013, and three rounds of surveys have been sent resulting in a 60% response rate. CURS' staff will analyze the results over summer 2014 and report them to CHA in the next interim report.
- Publication of a white paper summarizing MTW innovations across all participating housing authorities. CURS' staff has been compiling these innovations from MTW annual reports and will present a report that summarizes the various innovations by category. This is intended to provide the CHA with information on how their program elements compare to those of other MTW authorities. We also hope that it will be of interest to housing authorities nationwide.
- Conducting an additional round of key informant interviews with members of the CHA Board of Commissioners, key CHA administrators, and case managers associated with the Moving Forward program.
- Conducting follow-up interviews with the 21 individuals who were interviewed about their understanding and views of the MF work requirement.
- Developing, administering, analyzing and reporting the 3rd Section 9 resident survey. The survey will be used to assess the impact of the Moving Forward program on the health, satisfaction, and work effort of residents.
- Continuing to collect secondary data on client and unit characteristics, budgets and expenditures, and client progress toward self-sufficiency.
- Continuing to conduct exit interviews with those who have left CHA housing.
- Preparing the 3rd interim report that summarizes the past two years of evaluation findings.

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