



homeforward

hope. access. potential.

YEAR 13

Moving to Work

ANNUAL REPORT

Original Submission:

June 26, 2012



Home Forward Board of Commissioners

Harriet Cormack, Chair
David Widmark, Vice Chair
James Smith, Treasurer
Lee Moore, Chair Emeritus
Gretchen Kafoury
David Kelleher
Benita Legarza
Brian Lessler
Shelli Romero

Home Forward Executive Staff

Steve Rudman, Executive Director
Michael Buonocore, Deputy Executive Director
Michael Andrews, Director, Development and Community Revitalization
Rebecca Gabriel, Director, Business Services
Shelley Marchesi, Director, Public Affairs
Dianne Quast, Director, Real Estate Operations
Jill Riddle, Director, Rent Assistance
Todd Salvo, Chief Financial Officer

Home Forward Moving to Work Staff

Betty Dominguez, Policy and Planning Program Director
Melissa Sonsalla, MTW Coordinator

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Introduction and Overview.....	1
General Housing Authority Operating Information	3
Housing Stock Information.....	3
Leasing Information	9
Waiting List Information	11
Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information	13
Long-Term MTW Plan	14
Proposed MTW Activities	N/A
Ongoing MTW Activities	15
FY2012-P1: Rent Reform.....	15
FY2012-P2: Local Blended Subsidy.....	17
FY2012-P3: Local project-based voucher program.....	18
FY2012-P4: Exception payment standards for service-enriched buildings	19
FY2012-P5: Alternate inspection requirements for partner-based programs	20
FY2012-O1: Biennial Inspections	21

FY2012-O2: Limits for zero-subsidy participants.....	22
FY2012-O3: Measures to improve the rate of voucher holders who successfully lease-up.....	23
FY2012-O4: Modified contract rent determinations and payment standard adjustments	24
FY2012-O5: Alternative rents at Rockwood Station, Martha Washington and the Jeffrey.....	25
FY2012-O6: Bud Clark Commons development (formerly known as Resource Access Center).....	26
FY2012-O7: Opportunity Housing Initiative.....	27

Sources and Uses of Funding **31**

Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	31
Sources and Uses of State & Local Funds	32
Sources and Uses of COCC	N/A
Alternative Fee and/or Cost Allocations	33
Use of Single-Fund Flexibility	34

Administrative **36**

Correction of Observed Deficiencies	36
Agency-Directed Evaluations.....	N/A
Performance and Evaluation Report for capital fund activities not included in the MTW block grant	N/A
Certifications / Board Resolution	37

Introduction

Moving to Work (MTW) is a demonstration program that offers public housing authorities the opportunity to design and test innovative, locally-designed housing and self-sufficiency strategies for low income families by allowing exemptions from existing public housing and tenant-based Housing Choice Voucher rules. The program also permits housing authorities to combine operating, capital, and tenant-based assistance funds into a single agency-wide funding source, as approved by HUD. The purposes of the MTW program are to give housing authorities and HUD the flexibility to design and test various approaches for providing and administering housing assistance that accomplish three primary goals:

- Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures;
- Give incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient; and
- Increase housing choices for low-income families.

Home Forward has been designated an MTW agency since 1998. In 2009 we signed a new agreement with HUD that will ensure our participation in the program until 2018, providing a long horizon to implement, test, and assess new initiatives and approaches to our work in support of the MTW program's goals.

Overview of the Agency's ongoing MTW goals and objectives

In FY2012, Home Forward continued to utilize MTW flexibility to tailor our programs in order to best serve the needs of our local community. Our MTW authority gives us the opportunity to explore new ways to meet our goals. We can look critically at how we serve particular populations, ensuring seniors and people with disabilities have a stable home and providing work-focused families with the supports they need to work toward self-sufficiency. We are able to find efficiencies in the work we do, creating cost savings or allowing staff time to focus on other aspects of serving our households. Our use of MTW has also encouraged us to consider alternate strategies for funding our programs and the extensive capital work needed to maintain our public housing portfolio. Through MTW, Home Forward has become an innovative agency, committed to serving our community while continually exploring opportunities for improvement.

A full list of the MTW activities Home Forward employed in FY2012 is included on the following page. More details of these activities and their outcomes can be found in the Ongoing MTW Activities section of this report.

Overview of Home Forward's MTW Activities

FY2012-P1: Rent Reform	15
Home Forward has implemented large scale reform of our rent calculation.	
FY2012-P2: Local Blended Subsidy.....	17
Home Forward has created a local blended subsidy program, blending Section 8 and public housing funds to subsidize units.	
FY2012-P3: Local project-based voucher program.....	18
Home Forward has created a local project-based voucher program that is tailored to meet the needs of the community.	
FY2012-P4: Exception payment standards for service-enriched buildings	19
Home Forward applies exception payment standards at project-based voucher buildings where service enrichment creates higher costs.	
FY2012-P5: Alternate inspection requirements for partner-based programs	20
Home Forward uses alternate inspection standards for programs where we contract our resources to be administered by partners.	
FY2012-O1: Biennial Inspections	21
Home Forward conducts biennial inspections for qualifying Section 8 households.	
FY2012-O2: Limits for zero-subsidy participants.....	22
Home Forward has implemented limits for families that have a pattern of lowering their income after subsidy ends.	
FY2012-O3: Measures to improve the rate of voucher holders who successfully lease-up.....	23
Home Forward has implemented measures to improve landlord acceptance of Section 8 vouchers in the local community.	
FY2012-O4: Modified contract rent determinations and payment standard adjustments.....	24
Home Forward has a revised policy on the application of payment standards for project-based voucher participants.	
FY2012-O5: Alternative rents at Rockwood Station, Martha Washington and the Jeffrey.....	25
At public housing units for these three sites, Home Forward calculated rent using a simplified method.	
FY2012-O6: Bud Clark Commons development (formerly known as Resource Access Center)	26
Home Forward has modified screening criteria and transfer processes for this development.	
FY2012-O7: Opportunity Housing Initiative.....	27
Home Forward operates OHI at Fairview Oaks, Humboldt Gardens and New Columbia, and through partnership with DHS.	

General Housing Authority Operating Information

Housing Stock Information

MTW Public Housing Units:

Public housing units at beginning FY2012	2,549	
Public housing units added	80	
Public housing units removed	(20)	
System audit adjustment	<u>(5)</u>	
Public housing units at end of FY2012	2,604	
Cumulative Change	55	(2.2%)

Breakdown of Public Housing Units at the end of FY2012

	Bedroom Size				Total Households
	Studio/ 1 BR	2BR	3BR	4+BR	
Elderly/Disabled Units	1,266	6	0	0	1,272
Family Units	329	534	404	65	1,331
Total	1,595	540	404	65	2,604

Units added in FY2012

Development	Description	Units
Bud Clark Commons (formerly Resource Access Center)	30 studio elderly/disabled units	30
Madrona Place Apartments (formerly Jeanne Anne Apartments)	3 one-bedroom, 19 two-bedroom, and 24 three-bedroom family units	46
The Jeffrey	4 one-bedroom elderly/disabled units	4
Total Units added in FY2012		80 units

Units removed in FY2012

Development	Justification	Units
Scattered sites	HUD approved disposition of scattered sites, as first described in our FY2008 MTW Plan	20
Total Units removed in FY2012		20 units

Planned vs. actual changes to housing units:

- We anticipated converting 100 project-based Section 8 units at the Bud Clark Commons to public housing through our Local Blended Subsidy activity. However, there was a delay in the approval process, and those units will be created effective April 1, 2012.
- We anticipated converting 75 project-based Section 8 units at the Martha Washington and the Jeffrey to public housing through our Local Blended Subsidy activity. However, this has been postponed in favor of using the Local Blended Subsidy model upon completion of Stephens Creek Crossing.
- Four units were added at The Jeffrey, as Section 8 voucher holders move out and those units are converted to public housing.
- We anticipated removing our remaining 28 scattered site units in FY2012. However, only 20 were removed. One unit will be kept online as a reasonable accommodation with the current resident. We were unable to sell the other seven units because of the layout of the property and those will be kept in our public housing portfolio.
- The 60 units to be removed to redevelop our HOPE VI Stephens Creek Crossing property were not officially disposed of in FY2012. These units will be formally removed from inventory in FY2013.
- We anticipated removing 1,232 public housing high rise units in ten high-rise properties through a Section 18 Disposition, as part of a mixed-finance strategy to address significant needs. Staff submitted applications for disposition and continue to work with HUD to obtain necessary approvals. See Section III, Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information for more details.

Overview of other housing managed by the Agency

	Number of Properties	Number of Physical Units
Affordable Owned with project-based assistance subsidy	6	496
Affordable Owned without project-based assistance subsidy	<u>12</u>	<u>1,178</u>
Total Affordable Owned Housing	18	1,674
Tax Credit Partnerships	<u>19</u>	<u>2,266</u>
Total Affordable Housing	37	3,940
Duplicated Public Housing Properties/Units	-10	-537
Special Needs (Master Leased)	33	290

FY2012 Capital Expenditures

Community	Activity	Scattered Sites	MTW Funds	Capital Fund	% of Cap Fund	Total Expended	% of Total Expended
Eliot Square	Comprehensive renovation	\$798,491	\$500,000	-	-	\$1,298,491	35.95%
Madrona Place	Comprehensive renovation	978,287	-	-	-	978,287	27.09%
Lexington Court	Finalization of renovations, siding replacement	321,071	-	1,914	0.21%	322,985	8.94%
Schrunk Tower	Trash compactor, window replacement	-	-	260,425	28.61%	260,425	7.21%
Holgate House	Needs assessment, masonry repairs, emergency generator, boiler replacement	-	-	145,969	16.04%	145,969	4.04%
Eastwood Court	Finalization of renovations, mailbox kiosk	69,487	-	22,541	2.48%	92,028	2.55%
Tamarack Apt	Roof and ventilation repairs	-	-	83,166	9.14%	83,166	2.30%
Gallagher Plaza	Boiler replacement, lighting upgrades	-	-	77,440	8.51%	77,440	2.14%
Carlton Court	Finalization of renovations	34,162	-	31,873	3.50%	66,034	1.83%
Hollywood East	Trash compactor, window replacement, boiler replacement, pilot repair	-	-	46,689	5.13%	46,689	1.29%
Northwest Tower	Needs assessment, heater zone valves	-	-	15,449	1.70%	15,449	0.43%
Medallion Apt	Lighting upgrades	-	-	15,291	1.68%	15,291	0.42%
Dekum Court	Electrical upgrades, siding repair	-	-	11,306	1.24%	11,306	0.31%
Williams Plaza	Lighting upgrades	-	-	10,221	1.12%	10,221	0.28%
Ruth Haefner Plaza	Environmental review	-	-	6,208	0.68%	6,208	0.17%
Dahlke Manor	Backflow replacement	-	-	6,035	0.66%	6,035	0.17%
Peaceful Villa	Kitchen upgrades	-	-	5,309	0.58%	5,309	0.15%
Sellwood Center	Trash compactor	-	-	482	0.05%	482	0.01%
Townhouse Terrace	Finalization of renovations	-	-	225	0.02%	225	0.01%
Various properties	Public housing portfolio garbage truck	-	-	86,793	9.54%	89,793	2.40%
Various properties	Public housing portfolio abatement	-	-	57,960	6.37%	57,960	1.60%
Various properties	Public housing portfolio lead paint testing	-	-	23,575	2.59%	23,575	0.65%
Various properties	Public housing portfolio bed bug eradication	-	-	1,246	0.14%	1,246	0.03%
Total Capital Expenditures		\$2,201,497	\$500,000	\$910,117	100%	\$3,611,614	100%

MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) units authorized:

MTW HCV at beginning FY2012	7,690	
DHAP vouchers transitioned to MTW	+5	
Aldercrest Opt Out vouchers transitioned to MTW (10/1/11)	+9	
Hillsdale Terrace HOPE VI Relocation Vouchers (8/1/11)	+25	
Hillsdale Terrace HOPE VI Relocation Vouchers (10/1/11)	<u>+35</u>	
MTW HCV at end of FY2012	7,764	
Cumulative Change	+74	(+1%)

Non-MTW Housing Choice Vouchers units authorized:

SRO/MODS at beginning of FY2012	512	
SRO/MODS added or removed	<u>0</u>	
SRO/MODS at end of FY2012	512	
Cumulative Change	0	(0%)
Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing at beginning of FY2012	195	
Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing added 8/1/11	<u>50</u>	
Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing at end of FY2012	245	
Cumulative Change	+50	(+26%)
Family Unification Program vouchers at beginning of FY2012	0	
Family Unification Program vouchers added 7/1/11	<u>+100</u>	
Family Unification Program vouchers at end of FY2012	100	
Cumulative Change	+100	(+100%)
Opt-Out vouchers at beginning of FY2012	9	
Aldercrest Opt-Out transitioned to MTW (10/1/11)	-9	
Pine Apartments Opt-Out vouchers added 8/1/11	<u>+5</u>	
Opt-Out at end of FY2012	5	
Cumulative Change	-4	(-44%)

Discuss changes over 10%: In August 2011, Home Forward received a new award of Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers, increasing our total VASH pool by 26%. A new award of Family Unification Program vouchers increased our total pool by 100%, since we had no Family Unification Program vouchers prior to that award. The change in Opt-Out vouchers is due to the Aldercrest Opt-Out vouchers transitioning to MTW vouchers on 10/1/11, and therefore being included in the MTW Housing Choice Voucher count above. We also received another round of Opt-Out vouchers for Pine Apartments.

Housing Choice Vouchers – total units project-based in FY2012: No new project-based units were committed during the fiscal year.

Units previously committed, newly leased in FY2012

Project	Initial Leasing Date	Units	Target Population	Service Provider
Madrona	04/01/2011	15	Homeless	Central City Concern and partners
Villa de Suenos	05/01/2011	10	Homeless families	Hacienda CDC
Rockwood	09/01/2011	15	Homeless	Human Solutions
Briarwood	01/01/2012	10	Homeless families	Human Solutions and Bridges to Housing
Bud Clark Commons	07/01/2011	100	Homeless, disabled, medically fragile	Home Forward and partners

This page intentionally left blank.

Leasing Information

Total number of MTW public housing units leased in FY2012: 2,550 units

Home Forward continues to have an occupancy rate of 98% in its public housing units.

Total number of Non-MTW public housing units leased in FY2012:

Home Forward does not have any non-MTW public housing units.

Description of issues: There were no issues maintaining occupancy in FY2012.

Total number of MTW HCV units leased in FY2012:

7,739 units authorized (average of the total number of units authorized throughout FY2012)

7,430 units leased

96% utilization

Total number of non-MTW HCV units leased in FY2012:

Voucher	Units Authorized (total at year end)	Units Leased (average)	Utilization (average)
SRO/MODS	512	480	93.7%
Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing	245	162	66%
Aldcrest Opt-Out Vouchers	9	1	11.1%
Pine Opt-Out Vouchers	5	2	40%
Family Unification Program Vouchers	100	11	14.9%

Description of issues: There were no issues in MTW voucher utilization in FY2012.

Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) voucher utilization appears low because Home Forward received a new award of VASH vouchers in August 2011 as a result of our strong utilization in prior years. Over 83% of our original VASH vouchers were utilized this year, and Home Forward leases up VASH applicants quickly when referrals are received from the Veterans Administration. As in prior years, the initial lease up of newly awarded vouchers is delayed in part due to a lag time between the award of VASH vouchers, and when the Veterans Administration hires staff to identify and coordinate with VASH participants.

The Aldercrest Opt-Out vouchers were not in high demand with the eligible families. Despite multiple attempts to reach out to the Aldercrest residents, only one family responded and chose to utilize the available voucher. The Pine Opt-Out vouchers are being utilized, but were only awarded in August 2011 and the response rate has been slow. We expect those vouchers to be at least 80% utilized in early FY2013.

The Family Unification Program vouchers were extremely slow to begin leasing. There was significant training needed at the local child welfare agency concerning the voucher and eligibility, and both Home Forward and Child Welfare worked to implement appropriate systems to identify, refer and support applicants. Although the average number of Family Unification Program vouchers is only 15% from the time of the award, vouchers were 74% utilized as of March 31, 2012, and we expect they will be fully utilized in early FY2013. The support system in place for families and youth utilizing these vouchers is outstanding. The Multnomah County Anti-Poverty system has agreed to case manage the bulk of the families and the Homeless Youth System has agreed to work with any youth who do not want to reopen their child welfare case. This support system ensures wrap-around services for the families and youth.

Number of Project-Based Vouchers committed/in use: 1,314 vouchers in use, 61 additional vouchers committed

Description of projects where new vouchers are placed: Although there were no new project-based commitments in FY2012, we had three buildings with commitments from FY2011 that have not yet leased.

Project	Date Committed	PBVs Committed	Project Description
Los Jardines	May 2010	10	Targeted to homeless families with services provided by Hacienda CDC and Bridges to Housing program
Block 49	November 2010	42	Targeted to veterans with services provided by the Veterans Administration and REACH CDC
Holgate House	May 2010	9	Targeted to homeless families with services provided by the Native American Youth and Family Center

Waiting List Information

Public Housing households on the waiting lists at the end of FY2012

	Bedroom Size				Total Households	Percent Households
	Studio/ 1 BR	2BR	3BR	4+BR		
Elderly/Disabled Units	1,417	17	N/A	N/A	1,434	29.24%
Family Units	976	1,468	891	135	3,470	70.76%
Total	2,393	1,485	891	135	4,904	100%

Description of waiting lists and any changes made: There were no changes made to our waiting list process in FY2012. Two waiting list openings occurred in November 2011. The first, at Madrona Place Apartments, opened for one-, two- and three-bedroom units, resulting in over 700 households added to the waiting list. The second opening was for several elderly/disabled properties. We opened the list for studio units at Hollywood East, and the lists for one-bedroom units at Gallagher Plaza, Holgate House, Medallion Apartments, Northwest Tower, Schrunck Riverview Tower and Williams Plaza. This opening resulted in around 900 households added to the waiting list.

Additional decreases to the waiting list totals are due to a purge Home Forward conducted in October 2011.

Section 8 / Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) households on the waiting lists at the end of FY2012

At the end of FY2012, there were **994** households on the HCV waiting list:

Family Type (members)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+	Total
No. on waiting list	427	225	167	89	51	13	22	994

Description of waiting lists and any changes made: The Housing Choice Voucher waiting list is a centralized list maintained by Home Forward, which is currently closed except for Family Unification Program and terminally ill applicants. In FY2012, Home Forward pulled a total of 145 Family Unification Program or terminally ill applicants from the waiting list. Additional decreases to the waiting list totals are due to a purge Home Forward conducted in July 2011.

The only change made to waiting list procedure in FY2012 was to allow Family Unification Program applicants to be added to the waiting list, once they had been certified by the local child welfare agency. Prior to accepting these new applicants, Home Forward notified all other applicants on the waiting list about the available Family Unification Program vouchers, to offer them first opportunity to access the vouchers if eligible.

Description of other waiting lists: Project-based waiting lists are site-based and maintained by management at each of the properties where project-based vouchers are placed. Nearly half of the project-based vouchers are in buildings with waiting list preferences for senior or disabled households. Many of the buildings that do not offer a senior or disabled household preference offer a preference for homeless households. Home Forward audits waiting list maintenance at each site to ensure that lists are kept in accordance with project-based voucher regulations.

Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information (Optional)

Description of non-MTW activities implemented by the Agency

Revitalization of Distressed Public Housing Properties

Hillsdale Terrace Apartments (Stephens Creek Crossing): In 2011, Home Forward received notification from HUD awarding a HOPE VI grant to redevelop Hillsdale Terrace. Home Forward's Board of Commissioners approved the new name, Stephens Creek Crossing in November, and relocation of former residents was completed in January 2012. After a series of Resident and Community Advisory Committee meetings, the Revitalization Plan was submitted and was approved by HUD in March 2012. We received HUD approval to begin demolition in March 2012, and construction will proceed through 2013, with occupancy slated for February 2014.

High-rise properties: In FY2012, Home Forward pursued a Section 18 Disposition for 1,232 units of public housing in ten high-rise properties, in an effort to undertake a mixed-finance strategy to address significant capital needs. Staff submitted applications in March 2011 and continue to work with HUD Section 18 Disposition staff to obtain necessary approvals. Based on Notice 2012-7 (HA), Home Forward understands our application will be reviewed in accordance with the rules related to the Section 18 disposition process prior to the February 2012 notice. Upon approval, Home Forward will submit an application for Section 8 Tenant Protection vouchers. After approvals are completed, financing and construction planning activities are anticipated in FY2013 for initial projects, and capital work on the remaining properties will be pursued in subsequent years.

Acquisition of Jeanne Anne Apartments

Home Forward acquired the Jeanne Anne Apartments, now renamed the Madrona Place Apartments, in July 2010 and began extensive renovations on both interior and exterior improvements. Upon completion, residents living at the property were given priority for the public housing subsidy. Of the existing residents who had been paying market rates and were rent burdened, 35 households applied for public housing subsidy and were determined eligible. Ten additional households were selected from an on-site waiting list. In December 2011, Home Forward's Board of Commissioners authorized a mixed-finance structure that includes a permanent loan. Proceeds from the loan paid for financing costs and replenished Public Housing Preservation Initiative funds used to acquire the property. In March 2012, Madrona Place Apartments became the first property to implement Home Forward's Local Blended Subsidy.

Long-Term MTW Plan (Optional)

As described in our FY2012 MTW Plan, Home Forward continues to focus on the implementation of our four strategic directions created in 2010:

Direction 1 – Prioritization of Housing Resources

Direction 2 – Housing-Services Continuum

Direction 3 – Partnership within the Home Forward Community

Direction 4 – Role in the Regional Housing Market

These strategic directions have guided Home Forward in how we think about the work we do, both for activities that require MTW authority and for strategies that do not utilize our flexibility. Staff have identified numerous initiatives that build on these directions and invoke critical thinking about how we can best serve our community now and moving into the future. These initiatives include focusing on supports for work-focused families, creating aging-in-place strategies for seniors and people with disabilities, and changing the way we communicate with our residents and participants. Initiatives also look into the agency, exploring different ways we can do our work through partnership alignment, funding strategies and organizational development.

Home Forward uses MTW authority whenever possible to advance these directions. Our rent reform activity provides an opportunity to provide a stable and predictable rent calculation for seniors and people with disabilities, while also encouraging work-focused households to increase their income over time. Simplifying the calculation also creates efficiencies for staff and changes the relationship we have with our residents and participants. We will also continue to implement our Local Blended Subsidy activity, which combines subsidies in an effort to address the limitations that arise from public housing operating subsidy insufficiencies. These two initiatives, along with the rest of our MTW activities, continue to provide Home Forward the opportunity to be innovative and progressive in meeting our goals and objectives.

We look forward to continuing to use our MTW authority to tailor our programs and funding strategies to best serve our community.

Ongoing MTW Activities

FY2012-P1: RENT REFORM

(Identified in Plan Year FY2012; Implemented FY2012)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

In FY2012, Home Forward proposed a large-scale reform of rent calculation methods, applicable to all MTW public housing and Section 8 households, as well as VASH voucher holders. The simplified method distinguishes between the populations of seniors/people with disabilities, and “work-focused” households.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
SENIORS AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES				
Annual staff time saved	# hours of staff time to complete reviews	Approx. 5,663 seniors and people with disabilities on biennial review cycles require approx. 2,832 hours per year	When all households have transitioned to triennial review cycle, it is projected to save 944 staff hours per year	See Section C below for more information
Annual staff salary saved	\$\$ of staff salary spent on reviews	Before implementation, an average of approx. \$74,358 was spent annually on staff salary for reviews	When all households have transitioned to triennial review cycle, it is projected to save \$24,800 per year	See Section C below for more information
Maintain stability for this economically vulnerable population	Shelter burden (rent ¹ + utility allowance divided by gross income)	Before implementation, shelter burden is 27%	After implementation, shelter burden will remain below 28%	See Section C below for more information
WORK-FOCUSED HOUSEHOLDS				
Annual staff time saved	# hours of staff time to complete reviews	Approx. 4,232 work-focused households: 783 are on annual review cycles and 3,449 are on biennial review cycles, requiring approx. 2,508 hours per year	When all households have transitioned to biennial review cycle, it is projected to save 392 staff hours per year	See Section C below for more information

Annual staff salary saved	\$\$ of staff salary spent on reviews	Before implementation, an average of approx. \$65,851 was spent annually on staff salary for reviews	When all households have transitioned to biennial review cycle, it is projected to save \$10,300 per year	See Section C below for more information
Increased employment and earning over time	Average annual earned income	Before implementation, average is \$6,792 per year	Two years after implementation, increase by 15% (to \$7,811)	See Section C below for more information
Increased contribution to rent	Total tenant payment (rent ¹ + utility allowance)	Before implementation: Section 8 average - \$267 Public housing average - \$249	Two years after implementation, increase by 15%: Section 8 to \$307, Public housing to \$286	See Section C below for more information

¹For purposes of these metrics, Section 8 rents are calculated with gross rent capped at payment standard.

Result of hardship requests: One household automatically qualified for hardship through our phase-in process, and the household's rent increase was capped at \$10 per month.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

After we received approval to implement rent reform through our FY2012 MTW Plan, much of the year was spent preparing our database system, updating administrative plans and training staff to apply the revised calculations and policies. In addition, Home Forward took care to prepare households for the upcoming changes to their rent calculations. Letters were sent to all residents and participants in November 2011 and again in February 2012 notifying them of the timeline and the changes they could expect to their rent. In order to make all of these preparations as thorough as possible, rent reform calculations were put into effect for public housing and Section 8 households on April 1, 2012. Therefore, metrics are not available for FY2012 and will be tracked and reported in FY2013.

There is an exception to the April 1, 2012 change date. In January 2012, 130 units at the Bud Clark Commons were converted to the rent reform calculation. Of these 130 households, ten saw a rent increase, with one increase capped at \$10 through an automatic qualification for hardship. The remaining 121 households saw no change, or a rent decrease ranging between \$2 and \$14 a month.

Also in FY2012, we activated public housing subsidy under the rent reform calculation for 45 family units at Madrona Place Apartments. Because these households were previously paying market rent, there is no information available to compare the effects between the traditional public housing rent calculation and rent reform.

No changes have been made to benchmarks or metrics, data collection methodology, or authorizations.

FY2012-P2: LOCAL BLENDED SUBSIDY

(Identified in Plan Years FY2012; Implemented FY2012)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward has created a Local Blended Subsidy program, which blends MTW Section 8 funds and public housing funds to subsidize units reserved for families earning 80 percent or below of area median income.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Convert units to Local Blended Subsidy (LBS)	LBS units brought online	0 LBS units before implementation	295 LBS units by FY2012 See Section D below for more information	45 LBS units were online in FY2012 See Section C below for more information
Funds for additional households	Freed funds due to adding banked public housing subsidy to the LBS blend	0 freed funds before implementation	\$151,000 in freed funds after all units have been converted	N/A (all units have not yet been implemented)

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

Home Forward initially planned to implement 295 units to Local Blended Subsidy in FY2012. However, due to the timing of the availability of banked public housing units, Home Forward reprioritized the phasing. In late FY2012, 45 units at Madrona Place Apartments were implemented to LBS. Home Forward plans to implement the remaining 250 units to LBS after we've received approval for the disposition of the ten high-rise properties (as described in Section III, Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information).

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Home Forward is lowering the benchmark for Local Blended Subsidy units brought online from 296 to 295. The original intention was to convert 46 units at Madrona Place Apartments. However, during redevelopment of the property, one unit was designated for use as a community room and office space.

No changes have been made to data collection methodology or authorizations.

FY2012-P3: LOCAL PROJECT-BASED VOUCHER PROGRAM

(Identified in Plan Years FY2012; Implemented FY2012)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward has created a project-based voucher program tailored to meet the needs of the local community.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increased housing choice	# of PBV units	In FY2011, Home Forward administered 1,100 PBV units	At least 1,100 units	In FY2012, Home Forward administered an average of 1,314 PBV units
Increased housing choice for at-risk households	# of zero-income households served	In FY2011, zero-income households accounted for 11.6% of project-based voucher households, as compared with 4.9% of tenant based vouchers	Zero-income households will account for at least 5% of project-based voucher households, and will continue to account for a larger percentage of project-based voucher households than tenant based households	In FY2012, zero-income households accounted for 15.2% of project-based voucher households, as compared to only 4.3% of tenant based households
Annual staff time saved by maintaining site-based PBV waitlists	# of hours of staff time associated with maintaining waitlists for PBVs	Est. of approx. 917 hours of staff time annually to maintain waiting lists at Home Forward	917 hours saved	917 hours saved; this equates to approximately \$24,090 in savings due to increased efficiencies
Equitable access for households on the tenant-based voucher waiting list	# of PBV households who would request transfer and receive preference without activity	Est. of 70% of PBV households would request transfer or 572 households in FY2011	0 PBV households will get a preference on the tenant based waiting list	0 PBV households received a preference on the tenant based waiting list, despite an estimate of 882 who would likely request the preference. Home Forward pulled only 145 people from the tenant based waiting list this year.

Benchmarks were achieved. No changes have been made to benchmarks or metrics, data collection methodology, or authorizations.

FY2012-P4: EXCEPTION PAYMENT STANDARDS FOR SERVICE-ENRICHED BUILDINGS

(Identified in Plan Years FY2012; Implemented FY2012)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward uses an alternate rent setting policy for service-enriched buildings entering into new project-based voucher contracts. The policy allows the Rent Assistance Director, with Board approval, to set payment standards that are greater than 110% of Fair Market Rents for these buildings.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increased housing choice for participants with significant barriers	Households in units with exception payment standards who retain housing for 12 months or longer	In FY2011, 81% of comparable households retained housing for at least 12 months See Section D below for more information.	In FY2012, at least 70% of households In FY2013, at least 75% of households In FY2014, at least 81% of households	No buildings were granted exception payment standards in FY2012. See Section C below for more information.

Result of hardship requests: None requested.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

Home Forward had intended to grant exception payment standards at two possible buildings in FY2012. However, as a result of an increase in Fair Market Rents, there was no need to set payment standards above 110% of Fair Market Rent. Therefore, there are no households to compare to the baseline this year.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Home Forward previously used a baseline of 57% of households who retained housing for at least 12 months. This was based on project-based voucher households, who were not receiving services. The new baseline of 81% is based on Home Forward's Shelter Plus Care program. This is a better comparison, as Shelter Plus Care is a housing subsidy that requires service providers to provide ongoing services.

No changes have been made to data collection methodology or authorizations.

FY2012-P5: ALTERNATE INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTNER-BASED PROGRAMS

(Identified in Plan Years FY2012; Implemented FY2012)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward allows alternate inspection requirements for units assisted with rent assistance that Home Forward had contracted to community partners.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Annual cost savings related to inspections for qualifying units	Inspection cost for qualifying units	Before implementation, annual inspection costs of \$35,500 for qualifying units See Section D below for more information.	Annual savings of at least \$35,000 related to inspections for qualifying units See Section D below for more information	Home Forward saved \$16,128 related to inspections for qualifying units in the second half of FY2012. See Section C below for more information.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

This activity was not implemented until October 2011, resulting in savings over a six month period instead of the full year. Annualized, the savings for FY2012 would be estimated at over \$32,000.

Although this savings is significant, it falls short of initial estimates. Previous projections assumed a significantly higher number of households served than those that have been enrolled to date. Contracted community partners are using a new case management model that requires more time with each client, and as a result, caseloads are kept lower. Initial evaluations of the new case management model have been positive and show many families moving to employment; however, as it relates to this activity, fewer households served by contracted community partners has resulted in fewer needs for inspections.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Home Forward is revising the baseline and benchmark, previously estimated at \$51,000 in annual savings, to \$35,000 per year. FY2012 was the first year of this particular program of contracting rent assistance to community partners, and Home Forward had created a baseline by projecting the number of inspections that would be needed. As mentioned above, caseloads are lower than anticipated. Instead, Home Forward is now calculating the baseline and benchmark based on the actual number of inspections conducted in the first six months of the fiscal year (before the activity was approved) compared to savings in the second half of the year after the activity was implemented.

No changes have been made to data collection methodology or authorizations.

FY2012-01: BIENNIAL INSPECTIONS

(Identified in Plan Years FY2008-FY2009; Implemented FY2008)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward conducts biennial inspections for qualifying Section 8 households.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Annual cost savings for Section 8 qualifying participants	Qualifying participants	1,043 qualifying participants, resulting in cost savings of approximately \$52,150	2-5% annual increase	1,958 qualifying households in FY2012 (8% increase), resulting in a cost savings of approximately \$146,850

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

Benchmarks were achieved.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Home Forward conducted an analysis that looked more closely at the actual costs incurred per inspection. As a result, the estimated cost per inspection increased from \$50 to \$75. Additionally, we expect costs to increase again next year.

No changes have been made to data collection methodology or authorizations.

FY2012-O2: LIMITS FOR ZERO-SUBSIDY PARTICIPANTS

(Identified in Plan Year FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward has implemented limits for families that have a pattern of lowering their income after subsidy ends.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Decrease in participants repeating pattern	Participants repeating pattern	10 zero-subsidy participants cycled back onto assistance in FY2009	10 participants or less	15 zero-subsidy participants cycled back onto assistance in FY2012. See Section C below.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

Although the number of participants who cycled back to subsidy is higher than the benchmark, the numbers are too small to be significant. Because of the economy, it is not unusual for households to gain income for a time and subsequently lose their jobs.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

This activity was discontinued on April 1, 2012 and will not be reported in future years.

No changes have been made to data collection methodology or authorizations.

FY2012-03: MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE RATE OF VOUCHER HOLDERS WHO SUCCESSFULLY LEASE-UP
 (Identified in Plan Year FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward has implemented a variety of measures to improve lease-up rates for Section 8 voucher holders in the community.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Improve voucher lease-up rate	Voucher lease-up rate	74% in FY2009	85%	For households pulled from the waitlist in FY2012 who had their voucher issued for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at least 60 days, the lease up rate is 90.6%. • at least 120 days, the rate is 94.1%.
Maintain landlords who accept Section 8	Number of landlords who accept Section 8	3,166 in FY2009	3,166	2,496 See Section D below for more information.
Decrease lease-up time	Average number of days for a voucher holder to lease up	51 days	Less than 50 days	36.5 days

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

Benchmarks were achieved.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Home Forward is discontinuing the metric “Maintain landlords who accept Section 8”. In FY2012, Home Forward had 2,496 landlords with current Section 8 tenants, again falling below the benchmark of 3,166. Since vouchers are fully utilized, it can be inferred from this data that there are landlords who are housing multiple voucher holders in large complexes or in multiple properties they own, reducing the number of landlords needed. This metric is not an accurate measure of how many landlords in the community would accept a voucher if presented the opportunity, and therefore will not be included in future reports.

Home Forward had planned to include a metric to track the number of landlords in the community indicating a willingness to accept a Section 8 voucher, based on the Metro Multi-family Housing Association biannual survey of landlords. However, we have been unable to make arrangements with Metro Multifamily to get that data.

No changes have been made to data collection methodology or authorizations.

FY2012-04: MODIFIED CONTRACT RENT DETERMINATIONS AND PAYMENT STANDARD ADJUSTMENTS FOR PROJECT-BASED VOUCHER UNITS

(Identified in Plan Year FY2011; Implemented FY2011)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward has implemented modified contract rent determinations and payment standard adjustments for project-based voucher units to ensure that these units are affordable for high-barrier applicants and to make adjustments more favorable for landlords.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase housing choice for very low income households	PBV units affordable to zero income households	In FY2010, 211 PBV units had rent above the maximum of the current payment standard less utility allowance, making them unaffordable to zero income households	0 PBV units with rent above the maximum, making all PBV units affordable to zero income households	In FY2012, 255 PBV units still have rents above the maximum and remain unaffordable to zero income households

Result of hardship requests: None requested.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

The number of project-based voucher units above the payment standard, and thus unaffordable to zero income households, increased in FY2012 to 255 units. However, 158 of those units have a gross rent (rent plus utility allowance) that is over the payment standard by less than \$25. For a number of those units, this year’s increase in utility allowances pushed the gross rents above the payment standard. Only 97 project-based voucher units have a gross rent that is more than \$25 over the payment standard.

None of the 255 units will be approved for further rent increases, per Home Forward’s policy, unless the payment standards increase sufficiently to make those units affordable to zero-income households.

No changes have been made to benchmarks or metrics, data collection methodology, or authorizations.

FY2012-05: ALTERNATE RENT CALCULATION FOR PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AT ROCKWOOD STATION, MARTHA WASHINGTON AND THE JEFFREY APARTMENTS

(Identified in Plan Year FY2011; Implemented FY2011)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward implemented alternate rent calculations for the public housing units that have been added to larger, non-subsidized communities at Rockwood Station, Martha Washington and the Jeffrey Apartments.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase public housing units	Public housing units at these three sites	0 units at the beginning of FY2011	Total of 70 units by the end of FY2011	At the end of FY2012, there were 65 total public housing units at these three sites See Section C below for more information
Reduce staff time spent on rent calculation training	Staff hours spent training property management on the rent calculation	104 annual staff hours for initial and ongoing training of the standard rent calculation	Reduction to 72 annual staff hours for training of the alternate rent calculation	72 hours spent on training; this equates to approximately \$1,333 in savings due to increased efficiencies
Reduce staff time spent on eligibility reviews	Staff hours spent on eligibility reviews	140 annual staff hours for eligibility reviews for the standard rent calculation	Reduction to 70 annual staff hours for eligibility reviews with the alternate rent calculation	61 hours spent on eligibility reviews; this equates to approximately \$2,000 in savings due to increased efficiencies

Result of hardship requests: No hardship requests

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

Although we had anticipated adding 70 units to these three properties by the end of FY2011, we are still waiting to add five units at The Jeffrey, which are currently occupied by individuals with a Section 8 voucher. Over the course of the next year, we will notify these households that their units will be converting to public housing. They will have the option of moving or giving up their Section 8 voucher. For those households that decide to stay, we've created a preference on the Section 8 waiting list, should they decide to move for up to 24 months later.

This activity will be discontinued with the full change to the rent reform calculation on April 1, 2012 and will not be included in future reports.

No changes have been made to benchmarks or metrics, data collection methodology, or authorizations.

FY2012-06: BUD CLARK COMMONS DEVELOPMENT (FORMERLY KNOWN AS RESOURCE ACCESS CENTER)

(Identified in Plan Years FY2008-FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward has modified screening criteria and transfer processes for this development, which houses the City of Portland and Multnomah County’s primary day access center for people experiencing homelessness, a 90-bed men’s shelter and 130 units of affordable housing for people with very low incomes.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase public housing units	Public housing units at Bud Clark Commons (BCC)	0 units attributable to the BCC before the activity began	30 additional PH units attributable to the BCC by end of FY2012	30 PH units were allocated and successfully leased up in FY2012.
Increase project-based voucher (PBV) units	PBV units at BCC	0 PBV units attributable to the BCC before the activity began	100 PBV units allocated at the BCC by FY2012	100 PBV units were allocated and successfully leased up in FY2012.

Benchmarks were achieved. No changes have been made to benchmarks or metrics, data collection methodology, or authorizations.

FY2012-07: OPPORTUNITY HOUSING INITIATIVE (OHI)
 (Identified in Plan Years FY2008-FY2010; Implemented FY2008-FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Home Forward operates OHI self-sufficiency programs site-based at Fairview Oaks, Humboldt Gardens and New Columbia, and through a collaborative program with the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS).

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Fairview - Benchmark Year 3				
Maintain enrollment	Households served	40	40	47 households served in FY2012 (includes households exiting and entering the program)
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 30 participants after 5 years	3 participants graduated in FY2012; 4 participants graduated in previous years
Increase participant income	Average participant earned income	\$11,414 average income at program entry	5% annual increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$11,985 by FY2010 • \$12,584 by FY2011 • \$13,213 by FY2012 • \$13,874 by FY2013 100% at graduation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$22,828 by FY2014 	FY2012 average earned income for all participants was \$13,103 FY2012 average earned income for only participants with earnings was \$19,917
Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving employment or promotion	0	75% / 30 participants by FY2014	31 participants employed in FY2012; of those, 9 were new jobs or promotions
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in escrow	\$0 at entry	\$5000 upon graduation (FY2014)	21 participants have begun earning escrow with an average accumulation of \$3,700

Humboldt Gardens – Benchmark Year 3				
Maintain enrollment	Households served	57 households	57 households	66 households in FY2012
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 43 participants after 5 years	2 participants have graduated
Increase participant income	Average participant earned income	\$6,756 average income at program entry	5% annual increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$7,094 by FY2010 • \$7,449 by FY2011 • \$7,821 by FY2012 • \$8,212 by FY2013 100% at graduation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$13,512 by FY2014 	FY2012 average earned income for all participants was \$8,324 FY2012 average earned income for only participants with earnings was \$17,686
Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving employment or promotion	0	75% / 43 participants in FY2014	37 participants employed in FY2012; of those, 12 were new jobs or promotions
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in escrow	\$0 at entry	\$5000 upon graduation (FY2014)	37 participants have begun earning escrow with an average accumulation of \$2,257
New Columbia – Benchmark Year 3				
Increase enrollment	Households served	0 households served before activity began	50 households enrolled in FY2011	96 households enrolled in FY2012; 71 of these households are with the Urban Institute program See Section C below for more information
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 38 participants after 5 years	Participants are on track to graduate after 5 years
Increase participant income	Average participant income	\$10,023 beginning average income for those enrolled in FY2010	5% annual increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10,524 by FY2010 • \$11,050 by FY2011 • \$11,603 by FY2012 • \$12,183 by FY2013 100% at graduation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$20,046 by FY2014 	FY2012 average earned income for all participants was \$10,389. FY2012 average earned income for only participants with earnings was \$19,046. See Section C below for more information

Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving employment or promotion	0	75% / 38 participants by 2014	48 participants employed in FY2012
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in escrow	\$0 at entry	\$5,000 upon graduation (FY2014)	16 participants have begun earning escrow, with an average accumulation of \$3,422
DHS Voucher Program (see Section C below)				
Maintain enrollment	Households served	18 households	18 households	16 households were enrolled at the beginning of FY2012. The program officially ended December 31, 2011 and 14 households remained enrolled at that time. These 14 households were given Section 8 vouchers to ensure ongoing housing stability and continue to participate in Home Forward's FSS program. Two households exited voluntarily this year. One graduated from the program with significant employment income. One moved to another jurisdiction due to domestic violence.
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 16 participants after 5 years	Due to funding restraints, this program was forced to end after only three years. One participant formally graduated and two additional families exited with increased earnings.

Increase participant income	Average participant earned income for those with earnings	\$8,613	5% annual increase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$9,044 by FY2010 • \$9,496 by FY2011 • \$9,971 by FY2012 • \$10,469 by FY2013 Double by graduation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$17,226 by FY2014 	\$17,043 in FY2012 (factoring in the 12 participants with earned income on the last day of the fiscal year, including the earned income at time of exit for those who have exited)
Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving new employment or promotion	0	75% / 16 participants by FY2014	To date, 14 of the original 21 (67%) gained new employment within 3 years. Four households subsequently lost employment.
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in participants' escrow	\$0	\$5000 upon graduation (FY2014)	11 participants have begun earning escrow, with an average accumulation of \$3,963

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective

At Fairview, all benchmarks are on track with the possible exception of “successful graduation”. More households have exited the program prior to the graduation than was originally anticipated. Because the program is property-based, exit reasons include moving out of public housing, transferring to different sites and non-compliance with the program. Home Forward will explore this metric and consider other possible measures of reporting on program success and completion.

In FY2012, Home Forward was the recipient of a grant from the Urban Institute, providing an enhanced OHI program at New Columbia and Humboldt Gardens. Grant funding allowed for Home Forward to increase the caseload at New Columbia. Because of the significant number of new enrollees in FY2012, the combined average income for all participants showed a decrease. However, a breakdown of the populations shows that participants are progressing in income: average income for newly enrolled households was \$9,183, but average income for previously enrolled households was \$13,425, an increase from FY2011.

The DHS pilot ended two years early, creating limitations to meeting many of the original benchmarks. However, 14 participants remain in the FSS program and continue to work on improving their employment and income. The average earned income for employed participants is within \$183 (1%) of the benchmark goal for earned income, despite the program ending two years early. Although these participants will no longer be reported on as part of the OHI program, they may still be on pace to meet many of the benchmarks.

No changes have been made to benchmarks or metrics, data collection methodology, or authorizations.

Sources and Uses of Funding

Due to the timing of Home Forward's fiscal year end audit, actual activity presented below is preliminary and unaudited.

Sources & Uses of MTW Funds

Sources of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan ¹
Rental Revenue	4,607,896	4,878,722	4,725,598
Section 8 Subsidy	61,266,071	61,063,005	62,916,889
Operating Subsidy	10,665,601	9,956,324	10,829,105
HUD Grants ²	1,138,264	1,118,224	1,361,926
Other Revenue	1,683,377	1,694,700	1,746,042
HUD Non-Operating Contributions	4,393,578	5,007,919	5,528,751
Total Sources	83,744,787	83,718,894	87,108,311

Uses of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan ¹
Housing Assistance Payments ³	55,077,018	54,823,035	55,119,411
Administration	9,886,359	10,058,751	9,290,112
Tenant Services	820,371	1,359,886	794,069
Maintenance	5,786,169	5,805,552	5,854,460
Utilities	2,398,735	2,295,889	2,073,122
General	485,386	414,510	421,913
PH Subsidy Transfer	1,878,426	1,552,405	1,584,294
Overhead Allocations	3,219,952	3,182,483	3,235,543
HUD Capital Expenditures	4,893,578	5,007,919	5,528,751
Total Uses	84,445,994	84,500,430	83,901,675

¹As submitted in MTW Plan (prepared December 2010); final budget adopted March 2011.

²HUD Grants reflects Capital Fund used for Operating expenses including modernization/rehab that is less than our capitalization threshold.

³The difference in sources versus uses results from Section 8 subsidy exceeding Housing Assistance Payment on a per-unit basis. The positive variance is placed in reserves.

Sources & Uses of State and Local Funds

Sources of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan ¹
State, Local & Other Grants			
City of Portland/Gresham	1,981,992	1,396,163	1,093,114
Multnomah County	1,319,517	678,787	651,839
State of Oregon	178,364	249,337	10,096
Non-Operating Capital Contributions			
City of Portland	15,162,515	18,700,000	5,073,956
Multnomah County	320,287	-	1,508,217
State of Oregon	139,702	-	1,036,563
Total Sources	19,102,377	21,024,287	9,373,785

Uses of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan ¹
Housing Assistance Payments (STRA) ²	2,404,441	1,609,721	1,090,573
Administration	383,002	201,659	143,403
Tenant Services	563,372	409,480	281,492
Maintenance	24,178	12,800	59,071
Utilities	2,414	-	29,012
General	1,113	-	2,439
Other Personnel Expense	-	-	74,893
PH Subsidy Transfer	-	-	-
Central Office Cost Allocations	101,353	87,250	74,166
Capital Expenditures	15,622,504	18,700,000	7,618,736
Total Uses	19,102,377	21,020,910	9,373,785

¹As submitted in MTW Plan (prepared December 2010); final budget adopted March 2011.

²Short Term Rent Assistance

Sources & Uses of COCC (If Applicable):

Not applicable. Home Forward uses a cost allocation system.

Allocation Method for Central Office Costs

Home Forward has elected to use an allocation method for central office costs. We have a variety of administrative departments and have developed a method to allocate these departments based on the key drivers of expense. This methodology meets the requirements of OMB A-87.

The allocation method is as follows:

1. Level 1:
 - a. The cost of the administrative office building is allocated to the departments based on space occupied
2. Level 2:
 - a. The executive department is allocated equally to each of the operating groups
 - b. Human Resources, Purchasing and IT are allocated to the operating groups based on FTEs within the operating groups
 - c. Accounting and Finance is allocated to the operating groups based on a combination of operating expenses and fixed assets
3. Level 3:
 - a. Public Housing Administration as well as the central office allocations to public housing are then allocated to the properties based on units
 - b. Rent Assistance Administration (Housing Choice Vouchers and other Rent Assistance Programs) as well as the central office allocations to Rent Assistance are then allocated to the departments within this operating group based on vouchers
 - c. Resident Services Administration as well as the central office allocations to Resident Services are then allocated to the departments within this operating group based on operating expenses

Allocated overhead is reported separately from direct operating costs in the operating group financial reports. The allocations result in a net zero Net Operating Income/Loss for the administrative departments.

Uses of Single-Fund Flexibility

Single-fund flexibility allows for the combination of capital funds, operating subsidy and Housing Choice Voucher funds into a single fund used for MTW eligible activities. In FY2012, Home Forward used single-fund flexibility in the following ways:

1) Home Forward has used Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Funds in two previous public housing developments: once with the Martha Washington and a second time as a repayment source for a Capital Fund Financing Program loan associated with our New Columbia HOPE VI redevelopment project. Should our pending HUD Section 18 Disposition application for 1,232 units of public housing in ten high-rise properties be approved, we will utilize RHF funds in a mixed-finance strategy to address the significant capital needs within that portfolio.

2) Home Forward used single-fund flexibility for costs associated with implementing rent reform (FY2012-P1); local blended subsidy (FY2012-P2); and measures to improve the rates of voucher holders who successfully lease up (FY2012-P3)

Rent Reform: Home Forward used single-fund flexibility in our extensive planning for our comprehensive rent reform activity. Single-fund flexibility supported the preparations necessary for our software systems and staff, and will offset rent revenue losses in the first years due to phase-in and hardship policies.

Local blended subsidy: Local Blended Subsidy allows Home Forward to use public housing operating subsidy from previously banked units, blended with Section 8 subsidy to adequately support unit operations. Layering subsidy supports property operations and funds debt service payments and replacement reserves.

Measures to improve the rates of voucher holders who successfully lease up: To improve the rate of voucher holders who successfully lease up, Home Forward uses fungible Section 8 dollars for measures aimed at increasing participation in the program. These measures include a pilot landlord guarantee fund to reimburse for damages by Section 8 participants and payments to owners through the end of the month after move-out, when vacancies are unexpected and owners did not receive proper notice.

3) Home Forward created a funding source for significant initiatives to advance the statutory objectives of MTW and Home Forward's recently adopted Strategic Directions. In the time since these initiatives were first introduced, many have been refined and modified. Some strategies have been combined or eliminated, and original budget estimates shifted as a result. Modifications are noted in the table that follows.

MTW Initiative Funds	Initial FY2012 Allocation	Final FY2012 Budget	Actual FY2012 Expenditures
Local Blended Subsidy			
Administrative and legal expenses	\$250,000	\$136,500	\$57,548
Public Housing Preservation Initiative (“Capital Repairs”)			
Capital repairs	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Develop Plans for Aging in Place Strategies (“Aging at Home”)			
Contracted technical assistance	\$25,000	\$92,000	\$78,139
Short Term Rent Assistance			
Ongoing support and expansion of existing program	\$500,000	\$705,273	\$547,146
Agency Based Assistance			
Rent Assistance administered by partners with service enrichments – NOTE: Discontinued	\$605,000	\$118,342	\$89,566
Tiered Self-Sufficiency (“Families Forward – Economic Opportunity”)			
Work-focused supports to employment (includes childcare)	\$744,050	\$868,366	\$757,911
Expansion of Benefits Assistance			
**Combined with “Aging at Home” above	\$67,000	-	-
Moving Youth to Career			
Youth employment supports	\$240,000	\$321,250	\$142,680
Youth Endowment			
**Combined with “Moving Youth to Career” above	\$500,000	-	-
Develop Plans for Youth Supports			
**Combined with “Moving Youth to Career” above	\$25,000	-	-
Rent Reform			
Database (YARDI) upgrade; loss of revenue due to phase-ins and hardships	\$320,000	\$245,000	\$140,259
Community Engagement Initiative Fund			
Community building and partnership activities	\$250,000	\$150,000	\$53,310
Total Direct Costs of Initiatives	\$4,026,050	\$3,136,731	\$2,366,559
Annual MTW Evaluations	\$40,000	-	-
Staff and overhead costs @20% of direct costs	\$805,210	\$151,225	\$143,905
Total Anticipated Cost	\$4,871,260	\$3,287,956	\$2,510,464

Administrative

Correction of Observed Deficiencies

HUD conducted a site visit in October 2011. There were no major observed deficiencies.

Rent Assistance received an audit in the spring of 2011. There were no findings of any deficiencies.

All work orders and deficiencies cited during our REAC inspections in FY2012 have been remedied. Most deficiencies were for minor items, such as replacing a refrigerator gasket or touching up paint.

Agency-Directed Evaluations, as applicable

N/A

Performance and Evaluation Report for capital fund activities not included in the MTW block grant

N/A



MEMORANDUM

To:	Board of Commissioners	Date:	June 19,2012
From:	Betty Dominguez, Program Director, Policy and Planning	Subject:	Resolution 12-06-03 Authorization to Submit Moving to Work Twelfth-Year Annual Report

The Board of Commissioners is requested to authorize Home Forward to submit the Moving to Work (MTW) Thirteenth-Year Annual Report, with certifications, to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Issue

As a housing authority with the MTW designation, Home Forward is obligated to submit an annual report detailing its progress toward objectives proposed in its prior year's annual MTW plan. This year's report follows the format prescribed in Home Forward's 10-year agreement with HUD, which requires certifications to ensure the agency serves primarily the same population of people as it would absent the MTW flexibility. These are incorporated in the resolution.

This year's report corresponds to Home Forward's fiscal year 2012 (April 1, 2011-March 31, 2012).



RESOLUTION 12-06-03

RESOLUTION 12-06-03 AUTHORIZES HOME FORWARD STAFF TO SUBMIT THE MOVING TO WORK TWELFTH-YEAR ANNUAL REPORT, WITH CERTIFICATIONS, TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD).

WHEREAS, Home Forward is obligated by its MTW agreement with HUD to submit an annual report detailing its progress toward objectives proposed in its prior year's annual MTW plan; and

WHEREAS, as part of its MTW reporting obligation, Home Forward certifies that more than 75% of families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; that it continues to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served without MTW; and that it maintains a comparable mix of families as would have been served had the agency not participated in the MTW demonstration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Commissioners of Home Forward that staff is directed to submit this approved Moving to Work Thirteenth Year Annual Report to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

ADOPTED: JUNE 19, 2012

Attest:

Steven D. Rudman, Secretary

Home Forward:

Harriet Cormack, Chair