

LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY

---

# FY2015 Moving To Work (MTW)

## Annual Report

Submitted – December 7, 2015



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Section I – Introduction .....	1
Goals & Objectives .....	2
Section II – Operating Information.....	6
Section III – Proposed MTW Activities .....	13
Section IV – A. Implemented MTW Activities.....	14
Activity #1 – Increase the Minimum Rent to \$150 Across all Housing Programs.....	14
Activity #3 – Triennial Recertifications of Connie Griffith Towers and Housing Choice Voucher Elderly/Disabled Households .....	22
Activity #5 – Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for Housing Choice Voucher .....	27
Activity #10 - Tenant-Based Special Partners Program.....	29
Activity #12 – Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners .....	32
Activity #13 - Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements .....	35
Activity #14 - Rent Reform: Elimination of Earned Income Disallowance .....	45
Activity #15 - LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD Fair Market Rent (FMR), or the Comparable Rent .....	48
Activity #16 – HCV Rent Reform Study.....	50
Section IV – B. Not Yet Implemented Activities.....	67
Section IV – C. Activities on Hold.....	69
Section V – Sources & Uses of Funds.....	70
Section VI – Administrative.....	71
Evaluation .....	72
Certification of Compliance with Regulations.....	95

## SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority (LHA) is to provide safe and desirable affordable housing to low and moderate-income individuals and families while partnering with community agencies to promote increased self-sufficiency and a higher quality of life for its residents. The agency provides housing assistance to nearly 4,000 low-income households in Lexington-Fayette County through the public housing and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs.

The LHA is governed by a Board of Commissioners, a group of dedicated citizens and local officials appointed in accordance with state housing law, who establish and monitor agency policies and are responsible for preserving and expanding the Authority's resources and ensuring the Authority's ongoing success.

In November 2010, LHA submitted a formal application to the federal U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) seeking admittance to the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program. HUD announced LHA's selection for program admittance in March 2011, and the Authority formally entered the MTW program on November 10, 2011 with the execution of an MTW Agreement between HUD and LHA.

HUD approved the Authority's FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan on September 2, 2014. The status updates and activity outcomes of the approved MTW initiatives for FY2015 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015) are included in this report. The table below is a chronological view of documents submitted for the LHA's participation in the MTW demonstration.

Action Taken	Date Submitted	HUD Approval Granted
LHA applies for MTW	11/20/2010	3/31/2011
MTW Agreement Signed	11/10/2011	
FY 2012-2013 MTW Annual Plan		12/29/2011
Resolutions signed approving 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Amendments to MTW agreement	4/12/2012	-
FY2014 MTW Annual Plan	4/16/2013	10/07/2013
FY 2012-2013 Annual Report	9/30/2013	9/26/2014
FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan	6/12/2014	9/02/2014
FY2014 MTW Annual Report	11/21/2014	Pending
FY2016 MTW Annual Plan	10/06/2015	10/15/2015

## Goals & Objectives

The short-term and long-term goals presented in this section were developed to address the three main goals of the MTW Demonstration Program.

*REDUCE COSTS*  
*INCREASE SELF-SUFFICIENCY*  
*INCREASE HOUSING CHOICES*

### Short-Term Goals & Objectives

#### Addressing Human and Social Service Needs

The LHA, like other housing agencies across the country, is faced with the task of doing more with less with an ever-growing list of important client needs that go beyond providing housing. Throughout FY2015, concerns for the wellbeing of elderly residents at the Housing Authority's 183-unit Connie Griffith Manor and 134 –unit Ballard Towers were at the forefront. The Housing Authority was challenged with finding the dollars to address the human/social service needs of this vulnerable population. LHA staff is frequently called upon to deal with resident issues that involve complicated subjects like mental health, substance abuse and illegal activity at Ballard-Griffith Towers that is home to the 62 and over population.

The 317 residents living at Ballard-Griffith Towers are currently served by a staff of: housing manager, two housing specialists and a service coordinator. Those four positions cannot adequately address the demands of this vulnerable population that is faced with issues such as: the need for transportation; help with housekeeping; and assistance in filling out paper work such as money orders or checks to pay bills.

Although BG Towers may have the most immediate need for case management services, all of the LHA's public housing sites have a need for these types of services for residents. During FY2015, the service coordinators at the high rises established a number of resident activities for the tenants of BG Towers such as weekly exercise classes and building events that included a fall festival. The LHAA continues to seek innovative ways to address the many needs of this aging population.

#### HUD PD&R HCV Rent Reform Study

Providing additional affordable housing stock – while critical – isn't the only way to help low-income families increase their housing choices. The LHA's participation in a rent reform study commissioned by HUD's Policy Development & Research (PD&R) Office and MDRC (HUD-contracted research firm) for Housing Choice Voucher participants is a method not only to increase housing choice but, just as importantly, to encourage and increase family self-sufficiency. The LHA is one of five MTW agencies taking part in the study that includes–

Columbus, GA; Louisville, KY; San Antonio, TX; and Washington, DC. The controlled study will test:

- A change in the percent of income that voucher holders pay for their share, from 30 % of adjusted income to a maximum of 28% of gross income (eliminating deductions and allowances),
- A minimum total tenant payment (TTP) and/or minimum tenant rent paid directly to the landlord, ranging from \$50 to \$150 per month
- A triennial rather than an annual income recertification period,
- A simplified policy for utilities, and
- Hardship policies to protect tenants with exceptional circumstance from harm.

LHA staff spent much of FY2015 enrolling HCV participants to either the control group or the treatment group. Outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report for the HUD standard metrics defined for the Study.

### Centre Meadows RAD Transaction Closed/Construction Underway

Pimlico Apartments was a 206-unit public housing general housing site owned by the LHA, operating in the red, and literally falling apart due to aging systems and structural deterioration. The LHA applied for HUDs <sup>1</sup>Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) in 2012 to secure financing to rehab the site. The agency received notice of their acceptance into the RAD Program on December 18, 2013. On March 4, 2014 the financial transaction closed and construction on the site began. Through the conversion process, the Housing Authority chose to rename the site Centre Meadows and the site upon occupancy will be funded through Section 8 Project-Based Voucher (PBV) assistance. All of the Centre Meadows 206 units remained vacant during the entirety of FY2015 for construction. LHA staff will begin re-occupying the site in late November 2015. PHAs with units that undergo mod/rehab under RAD authority are required to convert the property to long-term Section 8 rental assistance contracts.

<sup>1</sup>RAD provides the opportunity to test the conversion of public housing and other HUD-assisted properties to long-term, project-based Section 8 rental assistance to achieve certain goals, including the preservation and

improvement of these properties through enabling access by public housing authorities and owners to private debt and equity to address immediate and long-term capital needs.

### HCV Streamlined Unit Inspection

FY2015 marked the second year of the LHA's HCV 5-Star Rating system that streamlines the Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection process and incentivizes property owners to maintain decent, safe, and sanitary housing, while providing a key additional benefit to potential tenants. The rating system allows 5-Star landlords a 42-month inspection schedule (rather than the biennial schedule required by HUD) with one-star landlords being inspected annually. Details of the LHA's streamlined inspection program and *5-Star Rating System* are described in detail in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

### New Software Program Promises Efficiency & Increased Productivity

Emphasys Elite software went live for LHA staff during FY2015 (July 1, 2014). The HCV waiting list was opened twice during FY 2014 and on-line applications using the new software program were available both times. The LHA will continue to use the new software program to streamline processes to benefit our clients.

### Equestrian View Homeownership

The last five houses of the 101 single-family homes in the Equestrian View subdivision were sold during FY2015. The subdivision is the final phase of development in the Housing Authority's HOPE VI redevelopment in the former Bluegrass-Aspendale neighborhood. The average cost of a home in Equestrian View is approximately \$110,000-\$120,000. Equestrian View homebuyers were offered the incentives of:

- Down Payment Assistance of \$14,999 - \$30,000 for qualified households
- LHA Purchase Incentive Funds of up to \$3,000 per household to be used for appliances (refrigerator, washer, dryer, etc.), fencing, landscaping, closing costs or down payment assistance
- Builder Discounts Up to \$5,000
- Bank Loan Program Incentives

## Long Term Goals & Objectives

### Improving Communication Internally and Externally (No MTW Flexibilities Required)

Regular and clear communication is a key component to furthering the demonstration's main goals of reducing costs, increasing self-sufficiency and increasing housing options in the Lexington community. LHA staff is committed to encouraging communication with residents, colleagues and the community as a whole by conducting quarterly stakeholders meetings, resident meetings and special meetings to address current housing issues. In addition, staff is involved with groups outside the agency that affect the community that include: the William Wells Brown Advisory Panel, Bluegrass Alliance (a partnership of economic development

professionals), the local YMCA Board, and the Central Kentucky Homeless Housing Commission, among others.

Internally, LHA's leadership has reintroduced the Employee Forum that consists of representatives from each area of the agency's operation to include: at least one non-supervisory employee from each management office, the central office, a HCV inspector and a member of the maintenance department. The Forum meets quarterly with the executive director to discuss employee issues and offer suggestions on improving job performance and ways to improve services to our clients.

### Resident Incentive Program (Single-Fund Flexibility Only)

One of the most promising and exciting initiatives included in LHA's long term goals for the MTW program is the Self-Sufficiency Through Resident Involvement Vision & Education (STRIVE) Program. STRIVE was debuted to LHA residents living at the 6th Street HOPE VI sites during FY2015. The initiative rewards positive behavior among LHA households.

STRIVE was introduced to households with children enrolled and attending the 2014 session of summer school at William Wells Brown Elementary. Eleven (11) children enrolled in summer school from eight (8) LHA households participated in the first STRIVE initiative. Each participating household received a \$10 Walmart gift card to encourage participation. Children earned points for:

- Perfect Attendance (No absences or tardiness)
- Improved math and reading skills
- Improved Conduct

At the end of the summer school program the participating children were recognized at a special ceremony and presented with the gifts the child selected with points earned during the course of summer school session. As the program grows opportunities will be expanded to residents of other sites and the HCV program.

The main focus of the program is to reward the tenant family for positive behavior that include the goals listed below:

- Being Responsible Tenants
- Being Good Neighbors
- Gaining Tools to become Homeowners
- Involvement in the community
- Positive Influence on Children
- Active Participant in the education their children
- Encourage their children to excel in education
- Continuing their Education
- Secure and Maintain Steady Employment

Form 50900: Elements for the Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report

Attachment B

(II) General Housing Authority Operating Information

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
Centre Meadows	206	206	All 206 units at the Pimlico public housing development were converted to project-based vouchers under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. The site has been vacant for construction since FY2014. The Housing Authority does not expect to begin leasing these units until fall 2015/FY2016.
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A
N/A	0	0	N/A

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 *
206	206	206	0
		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
		206	0

\* From the Plan

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

N/A
N/A
N/A

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		
<p>KY004 PHA-Wide Software upgrade \$389,672                      KY004 PHA-Wide Capital Fund Fee \$274,920                      KY004 PHA-Wide Architect Fees \$89,351                      KY004000001-Bainbrdge-PineVly-Const: SF Roof Replacements, Office Repair \$28,863                      KY004000002 Connie Griffith: Security upgrades, Exterior Water Infiltration Repair, Flooring &amp; Door hardware replacement &amp; upgrade, Cooling Tower Replacement \$565,017                      KY004000003-Unnamed: Roof Replacement; Sidewalk Repair/replacement \$129,934</p>		
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	181	Ballard - a 134 unit elderly high rise; LHOc II - 13 single-family units and Faith Community Housing 34 single family rental units
Market Rate	5	Jefferson Street 5 units are market-rate.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	337	These vouchers are committed to Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) - 282 vouchers, Shelter Plus Care - 30 vouchers and Mainstream - 25 vouchers.
<b>Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed</b>	<b>523</b>	
<p>* <b>Select Housing Program from:</b> Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.</p>		
If Other, please describe:		Description of "other" Housing Program

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 **	0	0	
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	358	612	
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0	
<b>Total Projected and Actual Households Served</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>612</b>	
* 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 ***	0	0	
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	4296	7344	
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0	
<b>Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased</b>	<b>4296</b>	<b>7344</b>	
agreed upon with each a			
The Authority currently provides a monthly rental subsidy to seven (7) special partners who have agreed to house and provide wraparound social services to a minimum of 358 families with special needs. The special parnter agency handles the administrative duties for leasing the unit which lessens the LHA's administrative duties and allows for direct access to the client from the housing provider. A monthly rental subsidy was agreed upon with each of the agencies.			
*** 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	0	0	

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income								
<p>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:</p>								
Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	0	0	0	0	612	0	0	0
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	0	0	0	0	612	0	0	0
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	0	0	0	0	100%	0	0	0

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:							
<b>Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served</b>							
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	421	818	0	1239	34%		
2 Person	310	529	0	839	23%		
3 Person	298	505	0	803	22%		
4 Person	135	313	0	448	12%		
5 Person	49	168	0	217	6%		
6+ Person	24	72	0	96	3%		
Totals	1237	2405	0	3642	100%		
Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized	N/A						
<b>Mix of Family Sizes Served</b>							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	34%	23%	22%	12%	6%	3%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	1052	666	701	441	225	128	3213
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	33%	21%	22%	14%	7%	4%	101%
Percentage Change	1%	2%	0%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-1%
Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages	N/A						
* "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	
Project-Base Vouchers	206 units at the Pimlico public housing development were converted to project-based vouchers under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. The site has been vacant for construction since FY2014. The Housing Authority will not begin leasing these units until late 2015. The LHA received funding for the approved RAD Centre Meadows project through HCV as scheduled effective 1/01/2015. While the units are under construction and not yet occupied, there is no expense for unit utilization during this period. The LHA opened the waiting list for Centre Meadows in August 2015 to be prepared with applicants who may be eligible to occupy half the units when they are ready in November of 2015.	
Public Housing	Public Housing occupancy was down during FY2015 due to the waiting list being depleted of eligible applicants for self-sufficiency sites that have a work requirement. The LHA will continue to periodically open the waiting list to seek eligible housing applicants. The LHA will also consider using MTW authority to make changes to the work requirement.	
Local, Non-Traditional Units	The LHA meets periodically with these special partners to encourage utilization of these vouchers. At present, the LHA has no leasing issues with these vouchers.	
Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End		
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Increase Minimum Rent/ Activity 1	471	Self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 per year.
HCV Tenant Based Special Partner Programs/Activity 10	10	Self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 per year.
Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners/Activity 12	42	Self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 per year.
Alternate Policy on the Inclusion/Exclusion of Income to Calculate Rent/Activity 13	314	Self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 per year.
Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	314	* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.
<b>ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY</b>	<b>523</b>	

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 Public Housing Units	Community-Wide	2219	The public housing waiting list was partially open for 2 and 3 bedroom self-sufficiency public housing sites and elderly applicants of Griffith Towers	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide	497	HCV waiting list was partially open in 2015 for general applicants.	Yes
Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units	Program Specific	0	The waiting list remained open for VASH, Shelter Plus Care and Mainstream.	Yes
Tenant Based Local, Non-Traditional Housing Assistance Program	Program Specific	92	The 7 special partner programs manage their own waiting list that remained open during FY2015. These partners provide housing to families while they participate in special programming.	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.				
Federal MTW Public Housing Units: Elderly population served at the Connie Griffith Manor site ONLY and 2 and 3 bedroom waiting list for self-sufficiency units is currently open.				
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program: Tenant-based HCV special partner programs (Domestic Violence Bluegrass Mental Health and Volunteers of America)				
Housing Program and Description of the populations for which the wait list is open				
If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:				
1) Canaan House - Individuals who have been diagnosed with a mental illness; 2) Urban League of Lexington-Fayette County - Elderly Individuals; 3) New Beginnings - Individuals who have been diagnosed with a mental illness; 4) OASIS Rental Assistance Housing Program - Families in need of financial literacy, credit management, and homeownership resources.				
5) One Parent Scholar House - Single parents who are full-time students in a post-secondary educational institution.				
6) HOPE Center - Persons who have a substance abuse problem and are in need of voluntary or court-mandated treatment; 7)Serenity House Place - Parents with children: who have recently been released from jail, are homeless and who are substance abuse treatment program graduates.				

## SECTION III REQUIRED ELEMENTS FOR PROPOSED ACTIVITIES

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

## SECTION IV

## A. IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES

**ACTIVITY #1 - INCREASE MINIMUM RENT TO \$150 ACROSS ALL HOUSING PROGRAMS**

<b>Plan Year Proposed</b>	<b>Plan Year Implemented</b>
FY 2012 – FY 2013 for Pimlico Apartments	FY 2012
Activity Expanded FY2014 to all Public Housing Units and HCV Units	FY 2014
<b>Activity Description</b>	
<p>All non-elderly/non-disabled public housing and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) tenants pay \$150 in minimum rent. The LHA increased the minimum rent to \$150 across all housing programs (Section 8 &amp; 9) excluding elderly and/or disabled households and households participating in HCV special partner programs in April 2014. The initiative promotes self-sufficiency by encouraging heads-of-household to work, while raising much-needed revenue.</p> <p>In 2013 the activity was suspended at Pimlico as the site was vacated for major renovation through the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD). When Centre Meadows (formerly Pimlico) reopens as a Project-Based Voucher site, all tenants at this site will be subject to the \$150 minimum rent.</p>	
<b>Status</b>	
<p>This activity is on schedule and benchmarks and outcomes are reported in the following pages.</p> <p>Even though households reporting earned income increased, the number of households reporting no income were higher during FY2015 than baseline and benchmark metrics.</p> <p>LHA staff maintains that increasing the minimum rent has produced positive results for the agency with increased revenue and motivated work-able tenants to seek and secure employment.</p>	

Activity 1: Rent Reform - Increase Minimum Rent for Work-able Households				
CE #5: INCREASE IN AGENCY RENTAL REVENUE				
Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from non-disabled/non-elderly households				
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>PUBLIC HOUSING</b>	<b>\$2,576,196 (\$1,612,512)</b> Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue* from <b>759</b> non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2013	<b>\$2,888,208 (\$2,017,152)</b> Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from <b>699</b> non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2015	<b>\$3,490,820 (\$2,109,288)</b> Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from <b>768</b> non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2015	<b>YES</b>
<b>HCV</b>	<b>\$6,423,672 (\$3,457,392)</b> Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue* from <b>1,540</b> non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2013	<b>\$6,661,080 (\$3,928,428)</b> Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from <b>1,458</b> non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2015	<b>\$7,007,724 (\$4,587,564)</b> Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from <b>1,325</b> non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2015	<b>YES</b>
<b>AGENCY-WIDE</b>	<b>\$8,999,868 (\$5,069,904)</b> <b>2,299</b> Public Housing & HCV Households	<b>\$9,549,288 (\$5,945,580)</b> <b>2,157</b> Public Housing & HCV Households	<b>\$10,498,544 (\$6,696,852)</b> <b>2,093</b> Public Housing & HCV Households	<b>YES</b>
Data Source: Emphasys				
*Gross rental revenue is the tenant's rent portion including utilities; the net rental revenue does not include utilities.				

Activity 1: Rent Reform - Increase Minimum Rent for Work-able Households				
SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>PUBLIC HOUSING</b>	<b>\$11,487</b> Average gross annual earned income from <b>759</b> non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2013	<b>\$12,857</b> Expected average gross annual earned income from <b>699</b> non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2015	<b>\$17,209</b> Actual average gross annual earned income from <b>324 of 768</b> non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2015	<b>YES</b>
<b>HCV PROGRAM</b>	<b>\$8,316</b> Average gross annual earned income from <b>1,540</b> non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of June 30, 2013	<b>\$8,535</b> Expected average gross annual earned income from <b>1,458</b> non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of June 30, 2015	<b>\$14,597</b> Actual average gross annual earned income from <b>520 of 1,325</b> non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of June 30, 2015.	<b>YES</b>
<b>AGENCY-WIDE</b>	<b>\$9,902</b> Average gross annual earned income from <b>2,299</b> public housing & HCV households as of June 30, 2013	<b>\$10,696</b> Expected average gross annual earned income from <b>2,157</b> public housing & HCV households as of June 30, 2015	<b>\$15,903</b> Actual average gross annual earned income from <b>844 of 2,304</b> public housing & HCV households as of June 30, 2015.	<b>YES</b>
Data Source: Emphasys				

Activity 1: Rent Reform - Increase Minimum Rent for Work-able Households				
SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Category 5: Unemployed Heads of Household (Reporting No Earned Income)				
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>PUBLIC HOUSING</b>	<b>255 (34%)</b> Non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2013	<b>206 (29%)</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>444 (59%)</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households from <b>a total of 768 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>NO</b>
<b>HCV</b>	<b>734 (48%)</b> Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2013	<b>669 (46%)</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>805 (61%)</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households from <b>a total of 1,325 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>NO</b>
<b>AGENCY-WIDE</b>	<b>989 (43%)</b> Public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2013	<b>875 (41%)</b> Expected public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>1,249 (60%)</b> Actual public housing & HCV households from <b>a total of 2,093 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-head has no earned income as of June, 2015.	<b>NO</b>
Data Source: Emphasys				

Activity 1: Rent Reform - Increase Minimum Rent for Work-able Households				
SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Category 6: Other (Heads of Household Reporting Earned Income)				
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PUBLIC HOUSING	<b>504 (66%)</b> Non-elderly households where head/co-head report earned income as of June 30, 2013	<b>493 (71%)</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head report earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>324 (42%)</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households of from a <b>total of 768 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> to report earned income as of June 30, 2015	NO
HCV	<b>806 (52%)</b> Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2013	<b>789 (54%)</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>520 (39%)</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head from a <b>total of 1,325 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> reports earned income as of June 30, 2015.	NO
AGENCY-WIDE	<b>1,310 (57%)</b> Public housing & HCV households where head/co-head reports earned income as of June 30, 2013	<b>1,282 (59%)</b> Expected public housing & HCV households where head/co-head reports earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>844 (40%)</b> Actual public housing & HCV households from a <b>total of 2,093 non-disabled/non-elderly public housing and HCV households</b> where head/co-reports earned income as of June 30, 2015.	NO
Data Source: Emphasys				

Activity 1: Rent Reform - Increase Minimum Rent for Work-able Households				
SS #4: Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>PUBLIC HOUSING</b>	<b>42</b> Non-elderly households where head/co-head receive TANF as of June 30, 2013	<b>32</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	<b>266*</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households from a total of <b>768 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-head report receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	<b>NO</b>
<b>HCV</b>	<b>86</b> Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head receives TANF as of June 30, 2013	<b>91</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	<b>58</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households from a total of <b>1,325 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-head reports earned income as of June 30, 2015.	<b>YES</b>
<b>AGENCY-WIDE</b>	<b>128</b> Public housing & HCV households where head/co-head receives TANF as of June 30, 2013	<b>123</b> Expected public housing & HCV households where head/co-head receives TANF as of June 30, 2015	<b>324</b> Actual public housing & HCV households from a total of <b>2,093 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-receives TANF as of June 30, 2015.	<b>NO</b>
<p>Data Source: Emphasys</p> <p>*LHA believes the disproportionate difference in the public housing households receiving TANF benefits could be due to a change in software programs. A difference in how the data was extracted could explain the major difference from the baseline numbers to the actual numbers. LHA will compare FY2016 numbers to FY2015 to determine if the data is plausible.</p>				

Activity 1: Rent Reform - Increase Minimum Rent for Work-able Households				
SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 <sup>1</sup> per year.				
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.				
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>PUBLIC HOUSING</b>	<b>50</b> Non-elderly households where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	<b>56</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	<b>220*</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households from <b>a total of 768 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	<b>YES</b>
<b>HCV</b>	<b>399</b> Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	<b>408</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	<b>237</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households from <b>a total of 1,325 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015.	<b>NO</b>
<b>AGENCY-WIDE</b>	<b>449</b> Public housing & HCV households where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	<b>464</b> Expected public housing & HCV households where head/co-head is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	<b>457</b> Actual public housing & HCV households from <b>a total of 2,093 non-disabled/non-elderly households</b> where head/co-is meeting the definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015.	<b>NO</b>
Data Source: Emphasys				
<p>\$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year</p> <p>*LHA believes the disproportionate difference in the public housing households transitioning to self-sufficiency could be due to a change in software programs. A difference in how the data was extracted could explain the major difference from the baseline numbers to the actual numbers. LHA will compare FY2016 numbers to FY2015 to determine if the data is plausible.</p>				

Activity #1 – Disparate Impact Analysis

Activity 1: Public Housing															
Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data															
Public Housing Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Annual Eaned Income			Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			Average Gross Rent Payment			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual
<b>All Households</b>	860	704	768	\$10,512	\$13,263	\$14,367	\$11,197	\$14,478	\$19,388	\$281	\$352	\$487	\$21	\$71	\$206
<b>Center</b>															
Female	774	636	700	\$10,610	\$13,392	\$14,388	\$11,245	\$14,588	\$15,617	\$284	\$354	\$399	\$20	\$70	\$115
Male	86	68	68	\$9,623	\$12,049	\$14,156	\$10,764	\$13,447	\$15,680	\$260	\$335	\$267	\$26	\$75	\$7
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>															
Black	671	577	642	\$10,959	\$13,635	\$14,485	\$11,656	\$14,789	\$16,179	\$290	\$358	\$412	\$21	\$68	\$122
White	179	126	118	\$9,267	\$11,668	\$13,910	\$10,022	\$13,199	\$13,460	\$257	\$324	\$347	\$17	\$67	\$90
American Indian / Native Alaskan	4	3	1	\$9,407	\$15,847	\$13,595	\$3,333	\$10,271	\$8,731	\$116	\$262	\$218	\$34	\$146	\$102
Asian / Pacific Islander	5	5	5	\$13,170	\$12,172	\$16,777	\$7,990	\$10,810	\$8,820	\$208	\$284	\$222	\$27	\$76	\$14
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	4	4	2	\$8,120	\$10,683	\$6,500	\$6,890	\$12,044	\$10,346	\$210	\$305	\$272	\$4	\$95	\$62
Other**	3	-	0	\$0	-	-	\$568	-	-	\$83	-	-	\$67	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>															
Non-Hispanic	843	688	752	\$10,514	\$13,254	\$14,135	\$11,245	\$14,510	\$12,669	\$282	\$352	\$417	\$35	\$70	\$199
Hispanic	17	16	16	\$10,411	\$13,627	\$17,075	\$8,798	\$13,099	\$15,222	\$251	\$337	\$359	\$21	\$86	\$108
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>															
18-31	421	284	310	\$9,284	\$12,198	\$13,181	\$9,320	\$12,473	\$12,571	\$249	\$318	\$322	\$21	\$69	\$73
32-46	292	289	327	\$11,734	\$13,598	\$15,247	\$13,162	\$15,548	\$16,844	\$317	\$379	\$428	\$17	\$62	\$111
47-61	147	131	131	\$11,600	\$14,830	\$14,981	\$12,667	\$16,465	\$20,511	\$305	\$368	\$196	\$27	\$63	\$156
<b>Excluded Households</b>															
Elderly/Disabled Households	363	358	502	\$971	\$1,341	\$10,446	\$11,051	\$11,555	\$10,368	\$260	\$267	\$259	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

\*\*"Other" category not available in LHA's computer systems as of May 27, 2014

Activity 1: HCV															
Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data															
HCV Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Annual Family Income			Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			Average TTP			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2015 Actual	
<b>All Households</b>	1,454	1,430	1,325	\$8,632	\$8,626	\$8,335	\$10,301	\$10,325	\$9,887	\$271	\$357	\$289	\$35	\$86	\$18
<b>Gender</b>															
Female	1,404	1,378	1,177	\$8,697	\$8,669	\$8,701	\$10,547	\$10,403	\$10,231	\$273	\$360	\$299	\$34	\$87	\$26
Male	50	52	148	\$7,995	\$7,497	\$5,424	\$8,958	\$8,254	\$7,146	\$237	\$271	\$207	\$47	\$34	-\$30
<b>Race (Multiple selectors permitted)</b>															
Black	1,183	1,160	962	\$8,942	\$8,811	\$8,975	\$10,787	\$10,444	\$10,205	\$279	\$360	\$297	\$34	\$81	\$18
White	277	275	338	\$7,561	\$7,938	\$5,816	\$9,341	\$9,805	\$8,595	\$242	\$341	\$256	\$38	\$99	\$14
American Indian / Native Alaskan	5	4	2	\$6,298	\$4,940	\$5,029	\$7,354	\$7,557	\$12,892	\$189	\$221	\$323	\$34	\$32	\$189
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	2	3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,264	\$7,104	\$0	\$436	\$178	\$0	\$436	\$178
Other**	1	-	-	\$22,260	-	-	\$0	-	-	\$50	-	-	\$100	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>															
Non-Hispanic	1,438	1,410	1,262	\$8,654	\$8,605	\$5,753	\$10,475	\$10,294	\$8,648	\$271	\$356	\$240	\$35	\$85	-\$31.00
Hispanic	16	20	63	\$10,432	\$10,156	\$7,345	\$12,086	\$12,466	\$9,082	\$306	\$394	\$257	\$21	\$88	-\$49.00
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>															
18-31	497	386	329	\$8,258	\$7,821	\$8,593	\$9,035	\$8,513	\$8,558	\$237	\$297	\$261	\$42	\$60	\$24
32-46	759	824	711	\$9,231	\$9,351	\$9,150	\$11,774	\$11,499	\$11,120	\$302	\$392	\$318	\$29	\$90	\$16
47-61	198	220	285	\$7,579	\$7,324	\$6,003	\$9,238	\$9,104	\$8,344	\$242	\$328	\$246	\$38	\$86	\$4
<b>Excluded Households</b>															
Elderly/Disabled	1,196	717	983	\$1,810	\$1,203	\$732	\$8,879	\$10,225	\$9,549	\$227	\$320	\$241	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*The UHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Erphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, UHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

\*\*"Other" category not available in UHA's computer systems as of May 27, 2014

**ACTIVITY #3 - TRIENNIAL RECERTIFICATION OF CONNIE GRIFFITH TOWERS AND HCV ELDERLY/DISABLED HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>Plan Year Proposed</b>	<b>Plan Year Implemented</b>
FY2012-FY2013 Plan For Connie Griffith Manor households	FY2012
FY2014 Plan Expanded to include HCV elderly and disabled households on a fixed income	FY2014
<b>Activity Description</b>	
<p>This activity is ongoing. Through this activity the LHA is recertifying households at Connie Griffith and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes once every three years instead of annually. Between triennial recertifications, whenever the federal government adjusts benefits paid through fixed-income programs like Social Security and SSI, the LHA reserves the right to adjust resident household incomes and rent payments accordingly.</p> <p>The success of that initiative prompted staff to request authority to expand the activity to HCV elderly and disabled families on a fixed income. As the vast majority of elderly and disabled households in the HCV programs rely on fixed-income sources, there is little variation in household income on an annual basis. In reference to this activity, households on a fixed income are defined as any household with any amount of income from a fixed income source like Social Security, SSDI, or pension income.</p> <p>Households who experience a significant loss of income, an increase in allowable medical expenses, or a change in family composition may request an interim recertification at any time. Households whose income increases \$200 or more per month must request an interim recertification. Additionally, the LHA created a "local version" of HUD-Form 9886 that would be signed by the tenant at the triennial recertification.</p>	
<b>Status</b>	
<p>This activity is on schedule and benchmarks for the HUD Standard Metrics are reported in the following pages. Metrics that were anticipated to decrease staff time and number of recertifications were achieved for the public housing program but not achieved for the HCV program. The number of annual recertifications were decreased from the baseline data but not to the benchmark projections for the HCV program.</p>	

Type of Activity: Rent Reform – Activity #3/Alternative Recertification Schedule for Elderly/Disabled Households				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CONNIE GRIFFITH	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$8,091</b></p> 181 recertifications at Connie Griffith at an average cost of \$44.70 each during FY 2011	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$2,754</b></p> Expected <b>57</b> recertifications at Connie Griffith at an average cost of \$48.31 each during FY 2015	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$2,657</b></p> <b>55</b> actual recertifications at Connie Griffith multiplied by average cost of each during FY 2015.	<b>YES</b>
HCV PROGRAM	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$30,800</b></p> 700 recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source at an average cost of \$44.00 each during FY 2013	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$10,435</b></p> Expected <b>216</b> recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source at an average cost of \$48.31 each during FY 2015	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$16,329</b></p> <b>338</b> actual recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source multiplied by average cost of \$48.31 each during FY 2015.	<b>No</b>
AGENCY-WIDE	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$38,891</b></p> 881 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average cost of <b>\$44.14</b> each before implementation of the activity	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$13,189</b></p> Expected <b>273</b> public housing and HCV recertifications at an average cost of <b>\$48.31</b> each during FY2015	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$18,986</b></p> <b>393</b> actual public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by average cost of each during FY 2015.	<b>No</b>
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records				

Type of Activity: Rent Reform – Activity #3/Alternative Recertification Schedule for Elderly/Disabled Households				
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>CONNIE GRIFFITH</b>	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>362 hours</b>  181 recertifications at Connie Griffith at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY 2011	<b>114 hours</b>  Expected <b>57</b> recertifications at Connie Griffith at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY 2015.	<b>110 hours</b>  <b>55</b> actual recertifications at Connie Griffith multiplied by average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY 2015.	<b>YES</b>
<b>HCV PROGRAM</b>	<b>1,400 hours</b>	<b>432 hours</b>	<b>676 hours</b>	<b>No</b>
	700 recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY 2013	Expected <b>216</b> recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY 2015	<b>338</b> actual recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source multiplied by average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY 2015.	
<b>AGENCY-WIDE</b>	<b>1,762</b>	<b>546 hours</b>	<b>786 hours</b>	<b>No</b>
	881 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each before implementation of the activity	Expected <b>273</b> public housing and HCV recertifications at an average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY2015	<b>393</b> of public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by average staff time of <b>2 hours</b> each during FY 2015.	
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records				

<b>CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
<b>Baseline</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>CONNIE GRIFFITH</b>	Rental revenue prior to implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of triennial recertifications at Connie Griffith households and HCV elderly/disabled households (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>\$40,416</b>	<b>\$41,220</b>	<b>\$27,427</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>HCV ELDERLY/DISABLED</b>	<b>*\$195,345</b>	<b>*\$199,250</b>	<b>*\$246,286</b>	<b>No</b>
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records *HAP to Owner – for the HCV Program HAP to owner should decrease if this metric is successful.				

Disparate Impact Analysis

Ethnic Housing Population		Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data												Average / Increased Rent Burden					
		Families at Risk				Average Gross Income per Month				Average Gross Rent Payment									
		FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2015	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2015	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2015						
<b>All Families</b>		81	178	81	131	\$124	\$128	\$141	\$117	\$945	\$883	\$965	\$699	\$223	\$224	\$208	\$236	\$13	
<b>Gender</b>																			
Female		58	95	98	65	\$118	\$74	\$133	\$84	\$832	\$554	\$594	\$522	\$215	\$220	\$209	\$233	(\$10)	
Male		88	88	88	66	\$130	\$176	\$147	\$150	\$994	\$908	\$1,011	\$804	\$231	\$227	\$226	\$246	\$84	
<b>Race (Multi-racial is permitted)</b>																			
Black		120	115	118	81	\$136	\$149	\$160	\$85	\$943	\$877	\$953	\$707	\$221	\$219	\$212	\$233	\$12	
White		9	62	63	49	\$104	\$92	\$106	\$73	\$954	\$895	\$959	\$700	\$229	\$233	\$228	\$246	\$16	
American Indian / Native / Alaskan		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander		2	1	2	1	\$0	\$0	\$314	\$0	\$226	\$276	\$1,184	\$0	\$185	\$184	\$232	\$0	(\$189)	
Other		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>																			
Non-Hispanic		179	177	180	128	\$126	\$129	\$142	\$100	\$945	\$884	\$957	\$688	\$223	\$224	\$208	\$236	\$13	
Hispanic		2	1	1	3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$222	\$257	\$230	\$1,184	\$236	\$221	\$215	\$217	(\$33)	

FY2014 data was not available to do software conversion

**ACTIVITY 5) STREAMLINED HQS INSPECTION POLICY FOR HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER**

<b>Plan Year Proposed</b>	<b>Plan Year Implemented</b>												
FY2012 – FY2013	FY2012 – FY2013												
Significantly Modified FY2014	FY2015												
<b>Activity Description</b>													
<p>This activity is ongoing. Until June 25, 2014, HUD regulations mandated that housing authorities inspect every HCV unit at least annually to ensure they meet Housing Quality Standards (HQS). Section 220 of the 2014 Appropriations Act now allows housing authorities to comply with the requirement to inspect assisted housing units in the HCV program by inspecting such units not less than biennially, rather than annually. While LHA intends to uphold HUD’s high standards of decent, safe, and sanitary housing maintained in good repair for all HCV households, the Authority believes it can achieve this outcome more cost-effectively through a new Star Rating System for HCV property owners.</p> <p>Intervals between HQS inspections of HCV units will be determined by the landlord’s star rating as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="516 808 1104 1239"> <thead> <tr> <th>Star Rating</th> <th>Inspection Interval</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>★</td> <td>12-month interval between HQS inspections</td> </tr> <tr> <td>★★</td> <td>24-month interval between HQS inspections</td> </tr> <tr> <td>★★★</td> <td>30-month interval between HQS inspections</td> </tr> <tr> <td>★★★★</td> <td>36-month interval between HQS inspections</td> </tr> <tr> <td>★★★★★</td> <td>42-month interval between HQS inspections</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Three, four and five star landlords certify annually that all units meet HQS with use of a Deficiency-Free Tenant Inspection Checklist (TIC). TIC deficiencies generate a complaint inspection on a unit.</i></p> <p>When a new landlord initially joins the LHA’s HCV Program, their 5-Star rating will default to 2-Stars. For the first 3 years, their star rating will be calculated using their average HQS inspection fail rate over the duration of their participation in the Program. Thereafter, only the last 3 years of HQS inspection data will be used to calculate their star rating.</p> <p>The LHA began scheduling annual inspections based on the landlord’s star-rating during FY2015. HCV staff is contemplating modifying this activity in the FY2017 Plan to remove charges for poorly performing landlords. HCV staff thinks the increased inspections for poorly performing landlords is adequate penalty for troubled landlords.</p>		Star Rating	Inspection Interval	★	12-month interval between HQS inspections	★★	24-month interval between HQS inspections	★★★	30-month interval between HQS inspections	★★★★	36-month interval between HQS inspections	★★★★★	42-month interval between HQS inspections
Star Rating	Inspection Interval												
★	12-month interval between HQS inspections												
★★	24-month interval between HQS inspections												
★★★	30-month interval between HQS inspections												
★★★★	36-month interval between HQS inspections												
★★★★★	42-month interval between HQS inspections												
<b>Status</b>													
<p>This activity was implemented in FY2015 and inspections were being conducted based on the landlord rating during FY2015. Baselines and benchmarks for this metric were established in FY2015 as data was not readily available due to software issues. All metrics tables for this activity have been revised with new baselines and benchmarks. Outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 Annual Report.</p>													

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	<b>\$35,688</b> 2,974 Initial and Annual Inspections \$24.00 per hour times 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	<b>\$16,440</b> 1,370 Initial and Annual Inspections @ \$24.00 per hour times 30 minutes to complete an inspection.	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Emphasys. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.				

<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	<b>1,474 hours</b> 2,947 Inspections@ 30 minutes each	<b>685 hours</b> 1,370 Inspections @ 30 minutes each	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Emphasys. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.				

**ACTIVITY 10) TENANT-BASED SPECIAL PARTNERS PROGRAMS**

<b>Plan Year Proposed</b>	<b>Plan Year Implemented</b>
FY2012 – FY2013	FY2012 – FY2013
<b>Activity Description</b>	
<p>LHA partners with three social service agencies in the Lexington area to provide stable, tenant-based voucher housing to low-income families while they receive services provided by the partner agency. (LHA partners with an additional eight social service agencies that provide designated, fixed housing to low-income families; these partners are addressed in Activity 12.) These “special partner programs” serve some of Lexington’s most vulnerable low-income populations, those who need wraparound services in order to stabilize their family situation and begin working to increase self-sufficiency. Targeted populations include the mentally ill, the homeless, those recovering from alcohol or drug addiction, and parents who have recently been released from jail.</p> <p>Through the approval of its FY 2012 – FY 2013 MTW Annual Plan, the LHA received permission to require that participants relinquish their tenant-based voucher at the time they graduate from or otherwise leave the program offered by the special partner, so another family may benefit from the housing and programming offered by the special partner.</p> <p>The approval of this activity has permitted the LHA to provide an admissions preference to families eligible for and willing to participate in these special partner programs as a condition of continued assistance.</p> <p>Three agencies are affected by the flexibilities provided thorough this activity:  <b>Bluegrass Domestic Violence (BGDV)</b> – serves victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking  <b>Bluegrass Regional Mental Health – Mental Retardation (BGMHMR)</b> – serves persons with severe mental illness or substance abuse diagnoses who have completed treatment and are involved in recovery services  <b>Volunteers of America (VOA)</b> – serves homeless individuals and families</p>	
<b>Status</b>	
<p>This activity is on schedule and the baselines and benchmarks for this metric were established in FY2015 as data was not readily available when HUD Standard Metrics were established in FY2014. All metrics tables for this activity have been revised with new baselines and benchmarks. The LHA a will report outcomes for this activity in the FY2016 Annual Report.</p>	

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs			
CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged			
Unit of Measurement – Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
\$274,905 VOA - \$120,538 BGDV - \$119,075 BGMHMR - \$35,292	\$274,905	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting and PHA financial records. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs			
SS #1: Increase in Household Income			
Unit of Measurement – Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
\$7,070 (Average) VOA - \$4,781 BGDV –\$7,782 BGMHMR - \$8,649	\$15,080	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs			
SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status			
Unit of Measurement –Employment Status: Category 5 Unemployed (reporting no earned income)			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
36 VOA – 10 BGDV – 10 BGMHMR –0	29	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs			
SS4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)			
Unit of Measurement – Number of households affected by Activity #10 receiving TANF assistance (decrease).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
19 VOA – 11 BGDV -8 BGMHMR – 0	17	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner Reporting The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

<b>Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs</b>			
<b>SS8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</b>			
Unit of Measurement – Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).			
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least <sup>1</sup> \$15,080 per year.			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
10 VOA- 8 BGDV – 2 BGMHMR – 0	20	TBD	TBD
<sup>1</sup> \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year			
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

<b>Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs</b>			
<b>HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</b>			
Unit of Measurement – Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
60 months	6 months	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner reporting The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

<b>Activity 10 – HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs</b>			
<b>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>			
Unit of Measurement – Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
38	72	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

**ACTIVITY 12) LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL USE OF MTW FUNDS FOR SPECIAL PARTNERS**

<b>Plan Year Proposed</b>	<b>Plan Year Implemented</b>		
FY2014	FY2014		
<b>Activity Description</b>			
<p>The Authority currently provides monthly rental subsidy of \$124,360 to seven (7) special partners who have agreed to house and provide wraparound social services to a minimum of 358 families with special needs. The monthly rental subsidy was agreed upon with each agency and the LHA in December of 2013 prior to implementation in January 2014.</p> <p>During FY2015, these seven LHA special partner agencies served a total of 612 families with funding for 358 families, an increase of 254 (58%) in households served. These agencies serve individuals with mental illness and/or substance abuse issues; individuals recently released from prison or jail; families in need of financial literacy, credit management, and homeownership resources; single parents enrolled full-time in higher education; and homeless individuals and families.</p> <p>With Housing Authority approval, these special partner organizations are permitted to require that participants reside in designated service-enriched housing units in order to receive rental subsidy; and they are permitted to house program participants in HUD-defined special housing types. Within these special housing type units, partner organizations will also be permitted to request Housing Authority approval to house up to two unrelated adults in a zero- or one-bedroom unit.</p> <p>These seven agencies reported the increase in families served as follows:</p>			
<b>Special Partner Program</b>	<b>Description of Households Served</b>	<b># of Vouchers Provided</b>	<b>Actual Families Served in FY2015</b>
Canaan House	Individuals who have been diagnosed with a mental illness	17	17
HOPE Center	Persons who have a substance abuse problem and are in need of voluntary or court-mandated treatment	144	229
New Beginnings Bluegrass, Inc.	Individuals who have been diagnosed with a mental illness	24	27
OASIS Rental Assistance Housing Program	Families in need of financial literacy, credit management, and homeownership resources	30	52
One Parent Scholar House	Single parents who are full-time students in a post-secondary educational institution	80	145
Serenity Place (Chrysalis House)	Parents with children: 1) who have recently been released from jail or are homeless and 2) who are substance abuse treatment program graduates	40	113
Urban League of Lexington-Fayette County	Elderly individuals	23	29
		<b>358</b>	<b>612</b>
<b>Status</b>			
<p>This activity is on schedule and the baselines and benchmarks for this metric were established in FY2015 as data was not readily available when HUD Standard Metrics were established in FY2014. All metrics tables for this activity have been revised with new baselines and benchmarks. The LHA will report outcomes for this activity in the FY2016 Report.</p>			

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners			
SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households			
Unit of Measure – Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
\$344	\$344	TBD	TBD
Data Source: WinTen2; Emphasys; PHA financial records The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners			
*SS7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue			
Unit of Measure – PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
\$45,752	\$57,190	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners			
SS8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency			
Unit of Measure – Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).			
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least <sup>1</sup> \$15,080 per year.			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
42	53	TBD	TBD
<sup>1</sup> \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year			
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners			
HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility			
Unit of Measurement – Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.			
Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
45	90	TBD	TBD
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

<b>Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners</b>			
<b>HC #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</b>			
Unit of Measurement – Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

<b>Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners</b>			
<b>HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>			
Unit of Measurement – Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>491</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.			

### ACTIVITY 13) LOCAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY ADMISSIONS AND OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS ACTIVITY

Plan Year Proposed	Plan Year Implemented
FY2014	FY2014
<b>Activity Description</b>	
<p>This activity is ongoing. LHA created this activity with the aim of eliminating loopholes that a small but significant number of residents use to avoid work requirements at its public housing self-sufficiency units. Through this activity, the LHA has the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Impose a minimum earned income calculation for families residing at self-sufficiency units regardless of employment status – Minimum earned income for households members subject to the LHA’s self-sufficiency work requirement will be calculated based on the following: Self-Sufficiency I units - 52 weeks x 37.5 hours x federal minimum wage; and, Self-Sufficiency II units - 52 weeks x 20 hours x federal minimum wage. The amount of assumed annual income will be modified when the federal minimum wage is updated. This requirement is a condition of admissions and continued occupancy for all families who accept self-sufficiency units. Families whose head/co-head is a full-time student, are exempted.</li> <li>b) Modify the Definition of Work Activity used to determine whether or not a family is compliant with the self-sufficiency requirements. In order to ensure that the employment activities sought by residents will enable them to earn at least the minimum imputed earned income, the LHA received permission to create a local definition of "work activity," which limits compliant work activities to paid activities that are most likely to ensure families' incomes at least equal the minimum imputed earned income amount. Instead of using the requirements found at 42 USC 607(d), the LHA now defines “work activity” as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unsubsidized employment;</li> <li>2. Subsidized public sector employment;</li> <li>3. Subsidized private sector employment;</li> <li>4. Paid on-the-job training</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>In addition, the LHA received approval to require Self-Sufficiency Level II Admissions and Continued Occupancy Rules at Centre Meadows (formerly Pimlico Apartments) post-revitalization. Centre Meadows is a 206-unit site converted from public housing to project-based voucher through the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program. Approximately half of the renovated units will be ready for occupancy in October 2015 with the remaining units anticipated completion is scheduled for Spring 2016. Returning families are exempt from these requirements for one year following re-occupancy. LHA will add the Centre Meadows units to the metrics tables once the site is re-occupied in FY2016.</p>	
<b>Status</b>	
<p>This activity is on schedule. Baselines and benchmarks for Self-Sufficiency I and II sites were established in FY2015 for metrics SS #3, SS#6, and SS #7, as data was not readily available when HUD Standard Metrics were established in FY2014. Baselines and benchmarks will be established for the Centre Meadows (self-sufficiency II units) once the site is reoccupied in FY2016. Metrics for Centre Meadows will be reported in the FY2016 Report.</p>	

## Self-Sufficiency Unit Count

LHA Self-Sufficiency Site	# of Units	Housing Type
Allante Brooke	32	SS I
Atiya Place	18	SS I
Camelot	36	SS I
Georgetown Addition	6	SS I
Catera Trace	23	SSI
Heartsbrook	34	SS I
Olde Towne	8	SS I
Rosemary	26	SS I
Trent	9	SS I
Wilson 1 (Phase I)	12	SS I
Wilson 2 (Phase II)	17	SS I
Scattered Houses Team I	11	SS I
Scattered Houses Team II	9	SSI
Scattered Houses Team III	15	SSI
<b>Total Self-Sufficiency I Units</b>	<b>256</b>	
12 <sup>th</sup> Street	40	SS II
Bainbridge Court.	48	SS II
Bridlewood Place.	88	SS II
Constitution Square	17	SS II
Grand Oaks	88	SS II
Pine Valley	32	SS II
Russell Cave	26	SS II
The Shropshire	32	SS II
The Shropshire East	24	SS II
Twin Oaks Park	60	SS II
Falcon Crest	72	Tax Credit/SSII
Georgetown	17	Tax Credit/SSII
Sugar Mill	46	Tax Credit/SSII
<b>Total Self-Sufficiency II Units</b>	<b>590</b>	
<b>Total Self-Sufficiency I and II Units</b>	<b>846</b>	

### ***SSI & SSI Metrics***

Households Subject to Rent Reform Activity	<b>230</b>	<b>398</b>
TOTAL		<b>628</b>

**HUD STANDARD METRICS**

<b>Activity #13 - LOCAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY ADMISSIONS AND OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS</b>				
<b>ACTIVITY</b>				
<b>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</b>				
Unit of Measurement - Average gross earned annual income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).				
<b>Self Sufficiency I/II</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
	<b>\$12,800</b> Average gross earned annual income from <b>648</b> SSI and SSII households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity as of June 30, 2013.	<b>\$13,704</b> Expected average gross earned annual income of <b>639</b> households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity as of June 30 2015.	<b>\$19,544</b> Actual average earned gross annual income of <b>490 of 628</b> SSI and SSII households affected by this policy prior to as of June 30 2015.	<b>Yes</b>
Data Source: Emphasys Gross earned income of the head, co-head or spouse only is reported here.				

<b>Activity #13 - LOCAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY ADMISSIONS AND OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS</b>				
<b>ACTIVITY</b>				
<b>SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>				
Unit of Measurement – Other/Reporting Earned Income				
<b>Self-Sufficiency I &amp; Self-Sufficiency II</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
	<b>303 of 628</b> Non-elderly/Non-disabled SSI and II households where head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>628</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head report earned income as of June 30, 2016	<b>TBD</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households where the head/co-head/spouse report earned income non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2016	<b>TBD</b>
Data Source: Emphasys The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report. Earned income of the head, co-head or spouse only is reported here.				

Activity #13 - LOCAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY ADMISSIONS AND OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS ACTIVITY				
SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement – Other/Reporting No Earned Income				
Baseline		Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Self-Sufficiency I & Self-Sufficiency II	<b>95 of 628</b> Non-elderly/Non-disabled SSI and II households where head/co-head/spouse report earned income as of June 30, 2015	<b>0</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head report earned income as of June 30, 2016	<b>TBD</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households where the head/co-head/spouse report earned income non-elderly/non-disabled households as of June 30, 2016	<b>TBD</b>
Data Source: Emphasys The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.				

Activity 13: Rent Reform – Alternate Policy on the Inclusion / Exclusion of Income to Calculate Rent				
SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement – Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).				
Baseline		Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Self-Sufficiency I/II	<b>26</b> Non-elderly/Non-Disabled SSI and SSII households where head/co-head receive TANF as of June 30, 2013	<b>30</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	<b>*187 of 628</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head receive TANF as of June 30, 2015	<b>No</b>
Data Source: Emphasys *LHA believes the disproportionate difference in SSI and SSII households receiving TANF benefits could be due to a change in software programs. A difference in how the data was extracted could explain the major difference from the baseline numbers to the actual numbers. LHA will compare FY2016 numbers to FY2015 to determine if the data is plausible.				

<b>Activity 13: Rent Reform – Alternate Policy on the Inclusion / Exclusion of Income to Calculate Rent</b>				
<b>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</b>				
Unit of Measurement - Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).				
<b>Baseline</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>SSI/SSII Households</b>	<b>\$2,921</b> Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 annual subsidy per SSI/SSII household affected by this policy as of June 30, 2015	<b>\$2191</b> Expected average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 annual subsidy per SSI/SSII household affected by this policy as of June 30, 2016	<b>TBD</b> Actual average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 annual subsidy per SSI/SSII household affected by this policy as of June 30, 2016	<b>TBD</b>
Data Source: Emphasys The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.				

<b>Activity 13: Rent Reform – Alternate Policy on the Inclusion / Exclusion of Income to Calculate Rent</b>				
<b>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
Unit of Measurement - PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).				
<b>Baseline</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>Self-Sufficiency I/II Households</b>	<b>\$134,619</b> PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2015.	<b>\$193,851</b> Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2016.	<b>TBD</b> Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of Activity #13 as of June 30, 2016.	<b>TBD</b>
Data Source: Emphasys The baseline and benchmark for this metric was identified in FY2015 and outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 MTW Annual Report.				

<b>Activity 13: Rent Reform – Alternate Policy on the Inclusion / Exclusion of Income to Calculate Rent</b>				
<b>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>				
Unit of Measurement - Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.				
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 <sup>1</sup> per year and has paid their rent on-time for the past 12 months				
<b>Self-Sufficiency I/II Households</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
	<b>48</b> Non-disabled/non-elderly households meeting definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	<b>58</b> Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	<b>*314 of 628</b> Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2015	<b>Yes</b>
Data Source: WinTen2; Emphasys				
<sup>1</sup> \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year				
*LHA believes the disproportionate difference in SSI and SSII households transitioning to self-sufficiency could be due to a change in software programs. A difference in how the data was extracted could explain the major difference from the baseline numbers to the actual numbers. LHA will compare FY2016 numbers to FY2015 to determine if the data is plausible.				

**Impact: Encouraging non-disabled/non-elderly adult household members to work**

Metric	Self-Sufficiency Group	*FY 2013 Baseline	**FY 2014 Benchmark	***FY 2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	Data Source
Imputed minimum annual earned income	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$14,138****	U.S. Dept. of Labor, Federal Minimum Wage
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	\$7,540	\$7,540	\$7,540	
	Pimlico	N/A	Exempt	Site vacant	Site vacant	
Avg (Median) gross annual earned income reported by families	Self-Sufficiency I	\$16,555 (\$16,653)	\$18,457 (\$16,653)	\$18,140 (\$17,503)	\$19,270 (\$18,741)	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$11,012 (\$10,460)	\$13,497 (\$10,460)	\$12,486 (\$11,700)	\$12,926 (\$12,896)	
	Pimlico	\$3,395 (\$0)	Exempt	Site vacant	Site vacant	
# (%) of families reporting no annual earned income	Self-Sufficiency I	44 (21%)	0 (0%)	46 (22%)	43 (19%)	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	Self-Sufficiency II	118 (28%)	0 (0%)	93 (23%)	95 (24%)	
	Pimlico	98 (67%)	0 (0%)	Site vacant	Site vacant	
# (%) of families reporting annual earned income less than minimum imputed earned income	Self-Sufficiency I	61 (29%)	0 (0%)	54 (26%)	36 (16%)	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	Self-Sufficiency II	159 (38%)	0 (0%)	130 (33%)	22 (6%)	
	Pimlico	114 (78%)	0 (0%)	Site vacant	Site vacant	
Avg (Median) total adjusted annual income reported by families	Self-Sufficiency I	\$16,431 (\$14,652)	\$18,333 (\$16,246)	\$18,882 (\$16,774)	\$19,512 (\$17,508)	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$12,101 (\$11,184)	\$14,587 (\$13,148)	\$13,953 (\$11,708)	\$13,381 (\$12,114)	
	Pimlico	\$4,340 (\$2,400)	Exempt	Site vacant	Site vacant	
Avg (Median) monthly gross rent payment of families	Self-Sufficiency I	\$380 (\$387)	\$427 (\$407)	\$426 (\$419)	\$493 (\$438)	WinTen2/ Emphasys
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$297 (\$281)	\$358 (\$330)	\$345 (\$293)	\$342 (\$305)	
	Pimlico	\$179 (\$150)	Exempt	Site vacant	Site vacant	
# (%) of families requesting hardship exemption	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	21 (10%)	0	0	Property Manager Log
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	42 (10%)	0	0	
	Pimlico	N/A	Exempt	Site vacant	Site vacant	
# (%) of families granted hardship exemption	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	11 (5%)	0	0	WinTen2 / Property Manager Log
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	21 (5%)	0	0	
	Pimlico	N/A	Exempt	Site vacant	Site vacant	

\* All FY 2013 baseline data is based on a 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the Annual Plan was posted for public comment)

\*\* FY 2014 benchmarks account for the impact of LHA's planned minimum rent increase to \$150 for all non-disabled / non-elderly public housing families

\*\*\*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

\*\*\*\*FY2014 was a phase-in period for current tenants living at Self-Sufficiency I units to reduce the financial burden. During the first year all self-sufficiency households were subject to the minimum earned income based on 20 hours per week, beginning July 1, 2014 (FY2015) Self-Sufficiency I households are now subject to a minimum earned income based on 37.5 hours per week as there is a work requirement of 37.5 hours per week for these households.

**Impact: Assesses the costs/benefits of this activity for LHA**

Metric	Study Group	FY2013 Baseline*	FY2014 Benchmark**	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual
Total gross monthly (net monthly) rent revenue	Self-Sufficiency I	\$79,737 (\$51,987)	\$102,088 (\$74,338)	\$89,817 (\$62,821)	\$102,136 (\$57,454)
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$125,879 (\$79,608)	\$151,638 (\$105,367)	\$137,490 (\$99,380)	\$136,117 (\$93,227)
	Pimlico (Centre Meadows)	\$26,109 (\$10,914)	Exempt	Site Vacant	Site Vacant
Dollar value of staff time spent processing hardship requests	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	\$493	0	0
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	\$986	0	0
All FY 2013 baseline data is based on a 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the FY2014 Annual Plan was posted for public comment).					
FY 2014 benchmarks account for the impact of LHA's planned minimum rent increase to \$150 for all non-disabled/non-elderly public housing families.					
Data Source: Tenmast and Emphasys					

Activity 13: Self Sufficiency I									
Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data									
Public Housing Population	Heads of Household		Average Total Annual Adjusted Income		Average Gross Annual Earned Income		Average Gross Rent Payment		Average Increased Rent Burden
	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2015
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	210	230	\$16,431	\$19,512	\$16,555	\$19,270	\$380	\$462	\$82
<b>Gender</b>									
Female	201	222	\$16,399	\$19,512	\$16,525	\$19,270	\$378	\$462	\$84
Male	9	8	\$17,154	\$17,513	\$17,228	\$16,659	\$426	\$467	\$41
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>									
Black	170	193	\$16,581	\$20,390	\$16,281	\$19,365	\$387	\$477	\$90
White	39	34	\$17,164	\$15,215	\$18,048	\$19,494	\$365	\$475	\$110
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	0	\$5,184	\$36,874	\$29,827		\$130	\$550	\$420
Asian / Pacific Islander	2	0	\$10,090	\$19,512	\$20,313	\$19,259	\$278	\$493	\$215
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	1	\$0	\$15,771	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$394	\$394
Other**	0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Non-Hispanic	204	220	\$16,511	\$19,761	\$16,508	\$19,310	\$381	\$500	\$119
Hispanic	6	10	\$13,711	\$19,512	\$18,145	\$19,259	\$351	\$493	\$142
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>									
18-31	88	82	\$13,189	\$16,002	\$13,760	\$15,519	\$312	\$401	\$89
32-46	88	106	\$17,554	\$22,040	\$17,177	\$21,210	\$405	\$555	\$150
47-61	34	42	\$21,916	\$24,141	\$22,179	\$21,697	\$489	\$607	\$118
<b>Excluded Hous holds</b>									
Elderly/Disabled Households	35	36	\$15,369	\$15,174	\$4,429	\$3,892	\$343	\$358	N/A

\*FY2014 data was not available due to software conversion issues.

Activity 13: Self Sufficiency II									
Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data									
Self-Sufficiency II Population	Heads of Household		Average Total Annual Adjusted Income		Average Gross Annual Earned Income		Average Gross Rent Payment		Average Increased Rent Burden
	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2015
<b>All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households</b>	419	398	\$16,431	\$13,381	\$11,012	\$12,926	\$297	\$342	\$45
<b>Gender</b>									
Female	379	362	\$11,813	\$13,112	\$10,848	\$12,679	\$294	\$336	\$42
Male	40	36	\$15,238	\$16,092	\$13,450	\$15,412	\$340	\$402	\$62
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>									
Black	351	256	\$12,244	\$15,160	\$11,051	\$17,463	\$300	\$385	\$85
White	71	59	\$11,594	\$11,881	\$11,363	\$10,910	\$289	\$305	\$16
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	0	\$5,400	\$0	\$7,800	\$0	\$135	\$0	-\$135
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	1	\$5,400	\$16,344	\$7,800	\$17,304	\$135	\$409	\$274
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	3	1	\$9,186	\$4,920	\$10,826	\$13,000	\$230	\$150	-\$80
Other**	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Non-Hispanic	415	394	\$12,129	\$13,381	\$11,057	\$12,926	\$298	\$305	\$7
Hispanic	4	4	\$13,246		\$15,145	\$13,846	\$332	\$310	-\$22
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>									
18-31	223	176	\$10,494	\$11,935	\$10,459	\$12,541	\$268	\$306	\$38
32-46	137	173	\$13,416	\$14,256	\$11,295	\$13,491	\$321	\$363	\$42
47-61	59	49	\$15,397	\$15,489	\$13,044	\$12,318	\$360	\$397	\$37
<b>Excluded Households</b>									
Elderly/Disabled Households	153	154	\$10,372	\$10,355	\$597	\$513	\$260	\$259	N/A

\*FY2014 data was not available due to software conversion issues.

**ACTIVITY 14) RENT REFORM: ELIMINATION OF EARNED INCOME DISALLOWANCE**

Plan Year Proposed	Plan Year Implemented
FY2015	FY2015
<b>Activity Description</b>	
<p>LHA staff saw a need to eliminate the Earned Income Disallowance (EID) calculation for public housing and HCV households. The goal of this activity was to reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures. The burden of having to track cumulative months of employment for a 23 households – a very small segment of LHA households was an administrative burden. Families that met the following criteria were eligible for the EID:</p> <p><u>Public Housing Households</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The household income increases as a result of employment of a family member who was previously unemployed for one or more years.</li> <li>· Families whose income increases during the participation of a family member in any economic self-sufficiency or other job training program.</li> <li>· Families who are or were, within 6 months, assisted under a State TANF or Welfare-to-Work program.</li> </ul> <p><u>Housing Choice Voucher Households</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Families whose income increases as a result of employment of a disabled family member who was previously unemployed (defined as working less than 10 hours a week at the established minimum wage) for one or more years.</li> <li>· Families whose income increases during the participation of a disabled family member in any economic self-sufficiency or other job training program.</li> <li>· Persons with disabilities who are or were, within 6 months, assisted under a State TANF or Welfare-to-Work program for at least \$500.</li> </ul> <p>The EID calculation was only available to a very small population because of the very specific requirements for the disallowance. Monitoring the family members who receive the EID calculation from hire date through 48 cumulative months was difficult to track because households don't always report when employment status starts and stops. In addition, many who do receive the benefit quit their jobs at the end of the two year exclusion to avoid an increase in the household rent. For those reasons the LHA proposed to eliminate the EID calculation.</p>	
<b>Status</b>	
<p>This activity is on schedule and benchmarks were met for the HUD Standard Metrics and benchmarks. Twenty-three households met the criteria to receive the EID. Eliminating the EID meant a complete elimination of staff time to complete the rent calculations and tracking the resident's employment status. The elimination of the EID calculation did not result in the anticipated increase in rental revenue.</p>	

<b>Activity 14 - Rent Reform - Earned Income Disregard (EID) Elimination</b>				
<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Unit of Measurement - Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).				
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<b>\$452</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	23 households received EID at an average cost of \$19.64 per household annually as of June 30, 2013	Expected 0 households will receive EID at an average cost of \$19.64 per household annually as of June 30, 2015	Actual households receiving EID multiplied by average cost to calculate/track annually as of June 30, 2015	All households affected by this activity no longer receive the earned income disregard.
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records				

<b>Activity 14 - Rent Reform - Earned Income Disregard (EID) Elimination</b>			
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>			
Unit of Measurement – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>23 hours</b>	<b>0 hours</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Yes</b>
23 households receiving EID x 1 hour average staff time required to track/calculate EID annually as of June 30, 2013	Expected 0 households receiving EID x average staff time required to track/calculate EID annually as of June 30, 2015	Actual households receiving EID x average staff time required to track/calculate EID annually as of June 30, 2013	All households affected by this activity no longer receive the earned income disregard.
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records			

<b>Activity 14 - Rent Reform - Earned Income Disregard (EID) Elimination</b>			
<b>CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>			
Unit of Measurement – Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved</b>
<b>25%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Average error rate of tracking employment status of EID households prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Average error rate of tracking employment of EID households after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual cost of tracking employment of EID households after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	All households affected by this activity no longer receive the earned income disregard.
Data Source: WinTen2, staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records			

<b>Activity 14 - Rent Reform - Earned Income Disregard (EID) Elimination</b>			
<b>CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>			
Unit of Measurement - Rental revenue in dollars (increase).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>\$68,544 (\$35,964)</b>	<b>\$104,508 (\$96,474)</b>	<b>\$59,736 (\$26,112)</b>	<b>No</b>
Sum total gross (net) annual rental revenue from 23 households receiving EID as of June 30, 2013	Expected sum total gross (net) annual rental revenue from 23 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2015	Actual sum total gross (net) annual rental revenue from 23 rental households no longer receiving EID as of June 30, 2015	Explanation to be provided

**ACTIVITY 15) LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD FAIR MARKET RENT (FMR), OR THE COMPARABLE RENT**

Plan Year Proposed	Plan Year Implemented
FY2015	FY2015
<b>Activity Description</b>	
<p>LHA staff proposed to limit annual contract rent increases for participating landlords to the least of a 1) 2% increase in current contract rent, 2) HUD's FMR or 3) the comparable rent. HCV staff has noticed that landlords were willing to lower the rent to comply with the 40% cap of a participant's monthly adjusted income at initial move in but at subsequent renewals will request a rent increase at a percentage which places a financial hardship on the family. In some cases, families were faced with the dilemma of possible eviction from the unit or have to uproot the family to move to a less expensive unit.</p> <p>The goal of this activity was to reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures by reducing the time HCV staff spends processing moves, which includes an interim examination and inspection of a new unit. This activity would limit the number of families that need to move because their rent becomes unaffordable, thereby reducing the administrative cost burden associated with processing moves.</p>	
<b>Status</b>	
<p>This activity is on schedule and outcomes of the HUD Standard Metrics are reported in the following pages. Although HCV staff processed less moves during FY2015, the outcome did not meet the benchmark projections in time spent processing moves and the cost to process a move. At present, LHA is unable to track HC #4: Displacement Prevention. LHA staff continues to seek a way of tracking this metric.</p>	

<b>ACTIVITY 15) LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD FAIR MARKET RENT (FMR), OR THE COMPARABLE RENT</b>			
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings			
Unit of Measurement - Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>\$18,720</b>	<b>\$13,104</b>	<b>\$15,264</b>	<b>No</b>
260 families moved with continued assistance at an average of <b>\$72</b> to process each move during FY2014	Expected <b>182</b> families will move with continued assistance at an average cost of <b>\$72</b> to process each move during FY2015	<b>212</b> actual families moved with continued assistance multiplied by average cost to process each move during FY2015	
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys, staff interviews, staff logs, PHA financial records			

<b>ACTIVITY 15) LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD FAIR MARKET RENT (FMR), OR THE COMPARABLE RENT</b>			
CE #2: Staff Time Savings			
Unit of Measurement – Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>650 hours</b>	<b>455 hours</b>	<b>530 hours</b>	<b>No</b>
260 families moved with continued assistance multiplied by an average <b>2.5</b> hours of staff time required to process each move during FY2014	<b>182</b> Expected families will move with continued assistance multiplied by the average <b>2.5</b> hours of staff time required to process each move during FY2015	<b>212</b> actual families moved with continued assistance multiplied by average <b>2.5 hours</b> of staff time required to process each move during FY2015	
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys, staff interviews, staff logs, PHA financial records			

<b>ACTIVITY 15) LIMIT HCV LANDLORD RENT INCREASES TO THE LEAST OF 2%, HUD FAIR MARKET RENT (FMR), OR THE COMPARABLE RENT</b>			
HC #4: Displacement Prevention			
Unit of Measurement – Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.			
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
HCV households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number). <b>Currently Not Tracked</b>	Expected HCV households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual HCV households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Explanation to be provided

The LHA has no way of tracking this metric.

**ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY**

Plan Year Proposed	Plan Year Implemented
FY2015	FY2015
<b>Activity Description</b>	
<p>Lexington Housing Authority (LHA) WAS selected to participate in a study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to evaluate a HCV alternative rent reform policy (the "Study"). MDRC, a nonprofit research organization, is conducting the Study on behalf of HUD. The Study sets forth alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies that will be implemented at several public housing authorities across the country in order to fully test the policies nationally. The centerpiece of the new policy is the substitution of triennial recertification of households' incomes for annual recertification. During the three-year period until a household's next recertification date, any increase in earnings it achieves will not cause the amount of rent and utilities it pays to go up.</p> <p>LHA staff began seeing Study participants in mid-April 2015. LHA staff expects to complete enrollment of all Study participants by the December 2015.</p>	
<b>Status</b>	
<p>This activity is on schedule and outcomes of the HUD Standard Metrics have not been updated because during FY2015 the enrollment process was ongoing. The research team allowed participating housing authorities until December 2015 to complete enrollment of all Study participants. Year 1 outcomes will be reported in the FY2016 Annual Report.</p>	

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost per Annual Certification	<b>YEAR 1: \$18,879</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$18,879</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$18,879</b> <b>TOTAL: \$56,637</b>	<b>YEAR 3: \$18,879</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>SAVINGS: \$37,758</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 3: TBD</b> <b>TOTAL: TBD</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 3: TBD</b> <b>TOTAL: TBD</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Annual Certification - \$26.97</b></li> <li>• <b>700 - Study Group Participants</b></li> <li>• <b>Hard cost (mail and reproduction costs) - .72</b></li> <li>• <b>Staff Cost per hour - \$26.25</b></li> <li>• <b>1 hour - Average time spent per annual certification</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per annual recertification after implementation of activity - \$26.97</b></li> <li>• <b>700 - Study Group Participants</b></li> </ul>	Actual cost of Annual Certification	Explanation to be provided

LHA implemented a new information technology system to allow for greater flexibility to implement, track and report MTW Activities and provide other information data management benefits to the Agency. During this transition, LHA experienced many difficulties converting its data from the legacy system to the new system. While every responsible action is being taken to correct this situation, updating the baseline metrics to exclude the estimated 32 households eligible for the Study currently with a childcare deduction is very difficult and will require significant resources. Additionally, per the updated Impact Analysis performed by MDRC's team in Section IV below, this population had a minimal impact to the data analysis. LHA will provide updated data in the subsequent form 50900 MTW Report.

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost per Interim Certification	<b>YEAR 1: \$15,624.70</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$15,624.70</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$15,624.70</b> <b>TOTAL: \$46,874.10</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$11,488.75</b> <b>YEART 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>TOTAL: \$11,488.75</b>	TBD	TBD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Interim Certification = \$13.13</b></li> <li>• <b>1.7</b> average number of interims per household per year</li> <li>• <i>times 700</i> Study Group participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost per Interim Certification - \$13.13 is equal to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Average time to perform an interim - .50 hours</i></li> <li>• <i>times the average cost per staff hour - \$26.25 per hour</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Interim Certification - \$13.13</b></li> <li>• <b>1.25</b> average number of interims per household per year<b>700</b> Study Group participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost per Interim Certification - \$13.13 is equal to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to perform an interim - .50 hours</li> <li>• <i>times the average cost per staff hour - \$26.25 per hour</i></li> </ul>	Actual cost of Interim Certification	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost per Streamlined Interim Certification	<b>YEAR 1: \$6,433.70</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$6,433.70</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$6,433.70</b> <b>TOTAL: \$19,301.10</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$3,214.40</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$3,214.40</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$3,214.40</b> <b>SAVINGS: \$9,643.20</b>	TBD	TBD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Interim - \$13.13</b></li> <li>• average number of interims per household per year <b>.7/500 per year</b></li> <li>• <b>700</b> the number of Study Group participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost per Interim is equal to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to perform an interim - <b>.50 hours</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost per Streamlined Interim - \$6.56</b></li> <li>• average number of interims per household per year <b>.7/500 per year</b></li> <li>• <b>700</b> the number of Study Group participants</li> <li>• <b>Cost per Streamlined Interim is equal to: \$6.56</b></li> <li>• Average time to perform an interim - <b>.25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> </ul>	Actual cost of Streamlined Interim Certification	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost of Rent Calculation	<b>YEAR 1: \$13,781</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$13,781</b> <b>YEAR 3 \$13,781</b> <b>TOTAL: \$41,343</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$9,187.50</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 3: \$0</b> <b>TOTAL:\$9,187.50</b> <b>SAVINGS: \$32,155.50</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>YEAR 3:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>YEAR 3:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>
	Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current time to perform rent calculation <b>.75 hours</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the average cost per staff hour <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Groups <b>700 =</b>  <b>\$13,781.25</b></li> </ul> <b>Cost of Rent Calculation</b> is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources <b>.50</b></li> <li>• <i>plus</i> the "Cost to Determine Adjusted Income - <b>.25 hours</b></li> </ul>	Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current time to perform rent calculation <b>.50 hours</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the average cost per staff hour <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Groups <b>700 =</b>  <b>\$9,187.50</b></li> </ul> <b>Cost of Rent Calculation</b> is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources <b>.50</b></li> <li>• <i>plus</i> the "Cost to Determine Adjusted Income - <b>0 hours</b></li> <li>•</li> </ul>	Actual cost of Rent Calculation	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity.	Actual cost of the task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost to Determine Income from Assets	<b>YEAR 1: \$4.59</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$4.59</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$4.59</b> <b>TOTAL: \$13.77</b>	<b>YEAR 1: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>YEAR 2: \$0</b> <b>TOTAL: \$13.77</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>
	<b>Cost to determine income from assets equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to verify asset, calculate income, perform quality control - <b>.25 hours</b></li> <li>• times the cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• Times the percent of households with income from assets valued at <b>\$5,000 - 0.001%</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of study participants – <b>700</b></li> </ul>	<b>Cost to determine income from assets equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to verify asset, calculate income, perform quality control - <b>.25 hours</b></li> <li>• times the cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• Times the percent of households with income from assets valued at <b>\$25,000 - 0%</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of study participants – <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Actual cost to determine income from assets	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Cost to Determine Utility Allowance	YEAR 1: <b>\$4,593.75</b>	YEAR 1: <b>\$4,593.75</b>	YEAR 1: <b>TBD</b>	YEAR 1: <b>TBD</b>
	YEAR 2: <b>\$4,593.75</b>	YEAR 2: <b>\$0</b>	YEAR 2	YEAR 2
	YEAR 3: <b>\$4,593.75</b>	YEAR 3: <b>\$0</b>	YEAR 3	YEAR 3
	TOTAL: <b>\$13,781.25</b>	TOTAL: <b>\$4,593.75</b> SAVINGS: <b>\$9,187.50</b>	TOTAL	TOTAL
	<b>Cost per utility allowance equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time to Determine Utility Allowance - <b>.25</b></li> <li>• Times the average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of study participants <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>	<b>Cost per utility allowance equals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time to Determine Utility Allowance - <b>.25</b></li> <li>• Times the average cost per staff hour - <b>\$26.25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of study participants <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>		

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Time to Determine Utility Allowance	<b>YEAR 1: 175</b> <b>YEAR 2:175</b> <b>YEAR 3: 175</b> <b>TOTAL: 525</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 175</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>TOTAL: 175</b> <b>SAVINGS: 350</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>YEAR 3:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>YEAR 3:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>
	Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance - .25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>	Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance - .25</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance</b> is equal to: Time to verify voucher size, unit bedroom size, inspection determination of bedroom size and verify the correct utility allowance is applied - <b>.25</b>	Actual Time to Determine Utility Allowance	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Time To Complete Annual Certification	<b>YEAR 1: 700</b> <b>YEAR 2: 700</b> <b>YEAR 2: 700</b> <b>TOTAL: 2,100</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 700</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>SAVINGS: 1,400</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>
	<b>Time to Complete Annual Certification – 1 hour</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>times</i> the number of the Study Group – <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Complete Annual Certification</b> is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average time spent to schedule, interview and verify - <b>.75 hours</b></li> <li><i>plus</i> the average time spent to conduct quality control of the annual certification - <b>.25 hours</b></li> </ul>	<b>Time to Complete Annual Certification – 1 hour</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>times</i> the number of the Study Group – <b>700</b></li> </ul> <b>Time to Complete Annual Certification</b> is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average time spent to schedule, interview and verify - <b>.75 hours</b></li> <li><i>plus</i> the average time spent to conduct quality control of the annual certification - <b>.25 hours</b></li> </ul>	Actual time to complete Determine Tenant Rent	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Time To Determine Tenant Rent	YEAR 1: 525 YEAR 2: 525 YEAR 3: 525 TOTAL: 1,575	YEAR 1: 350 YEAR 2: 0 YEAR 3: 0 SAVINGS: 1,225	TBD	TBD
	The Baseline is equal to: • <b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent .75</b> <i>times</i> the number of Study Group – 700 = 525 hours  <b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent</b> is equal to: • Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources .50 hours • <i>plus</i> Time to Determine Adjusted Income .25 hours = .75 hours	Benchmark is equal to: • <b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent .50</b> <i>times</i> the number of Study Group – 700 = 350 hours  <b>New Time to Determine Tenant Rent</b> is equal to: • Average time for documenting, recording, calculating, verifying and quality control for all income sources .50 hours • <i>plus</i> Time to Determine Adjusted Income 0 hours = .50 hours	Actual time to complete Determine Tenant Rent	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).</b>	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Time to Determine Income from Assets</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 0.175 hours</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0.175</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0.175</b> <b>TOTAL: 0.5 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 0</b> <b>YEAR 2: 0</b> <b>YEAR 3: 0</b> <b>TOTAL: 0</b> <b>SAVINGS: 0.5 hours</b>	<b>YEAR 1: 0</b> <b>YEAR 2:</b> <b>YEAR 3:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>YEAR 1: TBD</b> <b>YEAR 1:</b> <b>YEAR 3:</b> <b>TOTAL:</b>
	Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time to Determine Income from Assets over \$5,000 - <b>.25 hours</b></li> <li>• times percent of households with income from assets over \$5,000 = <b>.001%</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time to Determine Income from Assets over \$25,000 - <b>.25 hours</b></li> <li>• times percent of households with income from assets over \$25,000 = <b>0%</b></li> <li>• <i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Actual Time to Determine Income from Assets	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Average Error Rate in</b>	<b>0 (UNAVAILABLE)</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Determining TTP	Baseline is equal to: Average error rate In Determining the TTP is (currently not tracked)	Benchmark is equal to: percent Average error rate In Determining the TTP	Actual average error rate in determining TTP	Explanation to be provided
Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance	<b>0 (UNAVAILABLE)</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
	Baseline is equal to: Not Currently Tracked	Benchmark is equal to: % Average error rate In Determining the Utility Allowance	Actual average error rate in determining Utility Allowance	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Average Earned Income of Non-Elderly Non-disabled Households</b>	<b>\$16,140</b>	<b>\$16,463</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
	Baseline is equal to: Average Earned Income of Non-elderly Non-disabled Households of Study Group	Benchmark is equal to: Annual increase of 2% in the Average Earned Income of Non-Elderly Non-disabled Households of Study Group	Average Earned Income of Non-Elderly Non-disabled Households of Study Group	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<b>SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other	Head(s) of households in categories identified below prior to implementation of the activity. This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity.	Actual head(s) of work-able households in categories identified below after implementation the activity.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full- Time	41%/287	43%/301	TBD	TBD
(2) Employed Part-Time	10%/70	12%/84	TBD	TBD
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	8%/56	10%/30	TBD	TBD
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	0%/0 (not tracked)	0%/0	TBD	TBD
(5) Unemployed	55%/385	53%/371	TBD	TBD
(6) Other	0%/0	0%/0	TBD	TBD
Employment Status for: (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other	Actual head(s) of work-able households in categories identified prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected head(s) of households in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity	Actual head(s) of work-able households in categories identified after implementation of the activity.	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<b><i>SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease)	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	<b>6% (42)</b>	<b>2% ( 14)</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease)	Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of Households Receiving TANF Benefits of total population</li> <li>times the number of Study Group - <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reduction of Households Receiving TANF Benefits</li> <li><i>times</i> the number of Study Group - <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Actual households receiving TANF benefits	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<b><i>SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-sufficiency</i></b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase)	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of Activity 16	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	<b>9% (63)</b>	<b>9% (63)</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Households Receiving Self-sufficiency Services	Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actual percentage of households receiving self-sufficiency Services currently <i>times</i> the number of Study Group- <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services <i>times</i> the number of Study Group - <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Actual households receiving self-sufficiency services	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease)	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation the activity (in dollars)	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	<b>\$6,549</b>	<b>\$6,371</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Average HCV Subsidy for Non-elderly Non-disabled Households	Baseline is equal to: Average HCV Subsidy for Non-Elderly Non-disabled Households prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Benchmark is equal to: the average HCV Subsidy for Non-elderly Non-disabled after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average HCV Subsidy for Non-elderly Non-disabled Households	Explanation to be provided

<i>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	<b>\$204,400</b>	<b>\$216,300</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Total HCV Tenant Share for Non-elderly Non-disabled Households	Baseline is equal to: (292*700=) Total HCV Tenant Share for Non-elderly Non-disabled Households	Benchmark is equal to: (309*700=) Total HCV Tenant Share for Non-elderly Non-disabled Households	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity	Explanation to be provided

<b>ACTIVITY 16) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER RENT REFORM STUDY</b>				
<i>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-sufficiency</i>				
Self-sufficiency: Self-sufficiency: to be gainfully employed and a graduate of an institution of higher education or obtain a GED and increase income to a level of zero assistance.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency (as defined above) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency (as defined above) after implementation of the activity	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	<b>2% (14)</b>	<b>2.3% (16)</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Non-elderly Non-disabled Households Transitioned/ Graduated to Self-sufficiency per Year.	Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-elderly Non-disabled Households Transitioned/ Graduated to Self-sufficiency per Year</li> <li><i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-elderly Non-disabled Households Transitioned/ Graduated to Self-sufficiency per year</li> <li><i>times</i> the number of Study Group <b>700</b>times the number of Study Group <b>700</b></li> </ul>	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity	Explanation to be provided

## SECTION IV

### B. ACTIVITIES NOT YET IMPLEMENTED

#### **Activity 7) Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval**

Activity Proposed and Approved - FY 2012-2013 Plan

Relief from HUD approvals prior to the acquisition of property will enhance LHA's ability to respond quickly to unique market conditions, making the Authority more competitive with other purchasers in the tight real estate markets typical of low poverty areas of the city. The LHA has not acquired any public housing properties since this activity was approved, so it was not necessary to implement this activity.

#### **Activity Update**

The LHA will develop a timeline for this activity should the Authority decide to acquire public housing units or land for the development of public housing.

#### **Activity 8) Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers**

Activity Proposed and Approved - FY 2012-2013 Plan

Activity Significantly Modified in FY2014

The aging Appian Hills general public housing site needs extensive capital improvements – including façade improvements, new windows, insulation in the exterior walls, and soundproofing between units. The LHA continues to seek adequate funding to revitalize the Appian Hills public housing development. This site may be rehabilitated in its entirety or in phases, as determined by the Authority. Once a plan for revitalization is agreed upon that includes the substitution of project-based vouchers for public housing subsidies, LHA will submit an appropriate application for disposition of the affected portion(s) of the site as well as a request for tenant protection vouchers for residents of affected units.

#### **Activity Update**

Should HUD issue a NOFA during FY 2016 that would aid in the redevelopment of Appian Hills, LHA may apply for these funds. The LHA does not know when funding resources will be available for implementation of this activity.

#### **Activity 9) Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street**

Activity Proposed and Approved – LHA's FY2012-FY2013

LHA plans to develop between five and eight projected-based 3-bedroom townhomes on a vacant lot owned by the agency on Edmond Street. The property is adjacent to an existing 3-unit public housing site and close to the Authority's Pine Valley Management Office. LHA is considering several options to finance the new construction at 800 Edmond Street. The Authority may allocate dollars from its program income fund, which in turn was funded through property sales and the collection of development fees associated with the implementation of its previous HOPE VI grants. Alternatively, LHA may seek outside funds from a non-federal source.

The flexibilities provided through this MTW activity will be used to project-base the units at Edmond Street without a competitive process and to exceed the per-building cap typically placed on project-based voucher developments. The activity has been put on hold so that available financial resources could be focused on the rehabilitation of Pimlico/Centre Meadows.

### **Activity Update**

The LHA still plans to implement this activity once financial resources become available.

### **Activity 11) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds: Emergency Reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers**

Activity Proposed in FY2012-2013 Plan

Approved with FY2012 – FY2013 Plan Approval

Revised with FY2014 Plan Approval

Through its FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, the LHA requested to retain the flexibility to use MTW funds should Ballard Tower (which is attached to an LHA-owned public housing site, Connie Griffith Manor; serves low-income, elderly households; and is managed, but at the time this activity was proposed was not owned, by the LHA) require significant emergency capital repairs. MTW funds would only be used if the tax credit investor can demonstrate to the Authority's satisfaction that it does not have the financial resources to complete the repairs itself. Despite the number/extent of unforeseen capital emergencies that might arise, the LHA will provide Ballard Place no more than \$300,000 in emergency funds in total.

When this activity was proposed the LHA did not have a confirmed funding source for sorely needed capital improvements at Ballard. After the activity was approved, the site's tax credit investors informed the LHA that they would indeed have sufficient funds to complete the needed work. Having spent a significant portion of their reserves to fund these improvements the Housing Authority was concerned about their ability to cover any additional emergency capital repairs, which prompted creation of this activity.

### **Activity Update**

This activity has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented if there is an emergency capital expense necessitating the use of these funds at Ballard Place.

## SECTION IV

### C. Activities on Hold

N/A

## SECTION V – SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

(V) Sources and Uses of Funds			
<b>Annual MTW Report</b>			
<b>V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds</b>			
<b>A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds</b>			
<b>Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year</b>			
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system</b></p>			
<b>Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility</b>			
<p style="text-align: center;">LHA used approximately \$744,000 of Section 8 funds that had been accumulated during the construction period to partially repay an investment of LHA unrestricted funds that was made in the form of a subordinated loan for development costs of the Centre Meadows (CM) Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) substantial rehabilitation. CM will be 100% assisted by S8 project-based vouchers (PBV). As such, an investment in the cost of rehabilitation of the units to which PBV will be attached in an expenditure for which MTW funds may be used.</p>			
<b>V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan</b>			
<b>B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan</b>			
Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>
Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>
In the body of the Report, PHAs should provide a narrative updating the progress of implementing and operating the Local Asset Management Plan during the fiscal year.			
<b>V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds</b>			
<b>C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds</b>			
In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.			
<b>Account</b>	<b>Planned Expenditure</b>	<b>Obligated Funds</b>	<b>Committed Funds</b>
Type	N/A	0	0
Type	N/A	0	0
Type	N/A	0	0
Type	N/A	0	0
Type	N/A	0	0
Type	N/A	0	0
Type	N/A	0	0
Type	N/A	0	0
<b>Total Obligated or Committed Funds:</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
In the body of the Report, PHAs shall provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds, including what funds have been obligated or committed to specific projects.			
<p style="text-align: center;"><i><b>Note</b> : 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.</i></p>			

## SECTION VI – ADMINISTRATIVE

- A. General description of any HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue;
- B. Results of latest PHA-directed evaluations of the demonstration, as applicable;

Since entering the Demonstration, the LHA has partnered with Kentucky State University to evaluate our rent reform MTW activities. During FY2015 KSU underwent a major overhaul of administrative staff that included a new president. Many of the core staff who were present when the LHA entered the agreement with KSU are no longer with the university. The LHA has elected to secure a new evaluator, but one who worked with KSU at the start of our partnership with KSU, Dr. Amanda Sokan. Dr. Sokan is an independent consultant, who is currently an assistant professor with the University of Kentucky in the Health Management and Policy Department. Dr. Sokan served as lead evaluator of the LHA's MTW program when the LHA entered the Demonstration in 2011. At that time she was employed by KSU but has since left the university. Dr. Sokan will lead oversight of the MTW program evaluation process, with an overall mandate to assess, monitor and report on the effects of the LHA's MTW initiatives.

The central goal of the rent reform evaluation is to measure the overall effectiveness of the rent reform in accomplishing HUD's stated goals of: increasing the number and quality of affordable housing choices throughout the Lexington-Fayette community, increasing the number of families moving toward self-sufficiency, strengthening the number of community partnerships benefitting residents with special needs, and reducing administrative costs while limiting administrative burdens placed on staff and residents. In addition, the evaluation will consider potential disparate impacts on protected classes of residents as determined by sex, race, ethnicity, age and disability.

## Lexington Housing Authority Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration Project Evaluation

Prepared by: Amanda E. Sokan, MHA PhD

This report provides a general review of LHA MTW Demonstration project for the following activities: #1, #3, #13, #14 and #16, in terms of the stated program goals, and includes an impact analysis on the extent to which these activities impact disparate populations of tenants.

### INTRODUCTION

The LHA participates in the HUD MTW demonstration with a view to the pursuit of the following goals:

1. Reduce costs (increase revenues)
2. Increase self-sufficiency of tenants
3. Increase housing choices for tenants

Through the MTW Demonstration program, LHA proposed and received approval to embark upon activities designed to achieve stated goals. Currently there are a total of seventeen activities, in different stages of application. This report reviews the following:

- a. Activity One – Increase minimum rent to \$150 across all housing programs
- b. Activity Three – Triennial recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV elderly/disabled households
- c. Activity Thirteen – Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements
- d. Activity Fourteen – Rent Reform: Elimination Of Earned Income Disallowance
- e. Activity Sixteen – Housing Choice Voucher Rent Reform Study

Each activity will be reviewed in terms of how well the stated goals above were achieved for the year in question. In compliance with HUD policy regarding rent reform initiatives, this report will also present the results of an impact analysis conducted to determine the effect of each activity and its driving policies on disparate tenant populations within LHA.

#### REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

- How well did activity meet stated MTW Demonstration Project goals?
- Did implementation create a disparate effect on tenant populations?

## ACTIVITY ONE

**Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 across all Housing Programs.** Excluding elderly and disabled households.

Date of implementation April 1, 2014

### Reduce costs (increase revenues)

To measure this goal the following metric was used – *increase in agency rental revenue* - from both public housing (PH) and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) units.

Agency-wide, the LHA set as its benchmark a goal of \$5,945,580 in net rental revenue for 2015, based on a total of 2,157 households. This comes to an average of or \$2,756 per household. Actual net rental revenue was \$6,696,852 or an average of \$3,200 per household.

For PH, baseline net rental revenue (minus utilities) was set at \$1,612,512 received from 759 qualifying households (non-elderly/non-disabled), using 2013 data. Broken down this resulted in an average of \$2,124.5 per household per annum. For the FY 2015, LHA proposed as benchmark and based on 699 qualifying households, annual net rental revenue of \$2,017,152 or an average of \$2,886 per household. As the actual rental revenue collected was \$2,109,288 or an average of \$2,746.5 per household, LHA met its revenue goal for PH, despite the non-availability of 206 units (Pimlico, now Centre Meadows) due to renovation. The same is true for HCV, where rental revenue collected was \$4,587,564 or an average of \$3,462 for 1,325 households, compared to the benchmark (based on 1,458 households) of \$3,928,428 or an average of \$2,694 per household.

Disaggregating agency wide data into PH and HCV, helps paint a clearer picture. For instance, the increase in revenue appears to be driven primarily by the HCV sector, which saw an increase in overall rents collected, despite a reduction in number of households. Some of this might be attributable to effects of Activity 13, and is discussed later in this report.

### Increase self-sufficiency of tenants

In addition to raising much needed revenue, this initiative is designed to promote self-sufficiency by encouraging heads-of-household to work, measured by increase in household income. LHA defines head of household to include tenants who are the head or co-head of household, and spouses. Relevant metrics included here include the following:

- a. Increase in average earned income of head of household
- b. Increase in positive outcomes in employment status
- c. Removal from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- d. Households transitioned to self-sufficiency

### *Increase in head of household's average earned income*

PH: Using baseline data established in 2013 from 759 households (average gross income = \$11,487), average household income benchmark for 2015 was set at \$12,857. 2015 data indicates a total of 768 households with potentially employable heads of households. Of that

number, 324 (42%) reported being employed, with an average income \$17,209, an increase of over \$4,000 on benchmark.

HCV: A similar pattern is present. Of the 1,325 households with potentially employable heads of household, 520 (39%), reported employment with an average annual income of \$14,597 compared to the benchmark of \$8,535.

The outcome is that agency-wide, 844 (37%) of 2,304 households with potentially employable heads of house earned average of incomes of approximately \$16,000 in 2015. As this represents an increase of almost \$5,000 compared to benchmark, and \$6000 compared to 2013, LHA appears to have met this goal.

### ***Increase in positive outcomes in employment status***

The question arises regarding the ratio of employed heads of households to unemployed, which is matter for concern as less than half did not report employment. In fact, although the benchmark of 875 indicated an expectation of a decrease in unemployment compared to 2013 baseline (989), actual number of unemployed heads of household grew to 1,249 in 2015. The implication is therefore that although LHA did achieve the goal of increasing average household income, it did not correlate to improved employment status for heads of households. This is arguably a more critical measure of success.

### ***Removal from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)***

This metric provides another measure for self-sufficiency by tracking numbers of heads of households who receive TANF, as a cessation of reliance on TANF can be seen as a move towards self-sufficiency.

According to data presented, overall LHA saw more than 150% agency-wide increase in the numbers of heads of households who received TANF in 2015, when compared to benchmark (123). This magnitude of this increase appears to be driven by PH figures, where actual numbers of heads of household reporting receipt of TANF was 266, compared to the benchmark (32), and 2013 baseline (42). In contrast, HCV numbers show a decrease to 58 in 2015, compared to benchmark (91), and 2013 baseline (86). Again, this HCV difference may be attributable to other MTW initiatives, which will be discussed later in the report. Despite the positive outcome for this metric for HCV, overall, LHA did not achieve its benchmark – primarily due to the negative outcome in PH.

Self-sufficiency = Household with annual earned income of at least \$15,080\*  
 \*\$7.25/hour (Federal minimum wage) x 40-hour week x 52 (work weeks per year)

***Households transitioned to self-sufficiency***

This final metric measures the number of households that transition to self-sufficiency, which for the purpose of the MTW Demonstration Project is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 per year. Agency-wide, the 2015 number (457) barely missed LHA's benchmark of 464 by 7 points (households). PH showed a more than four-fold increase in numbers of households with heads earning at least \$15,080 per year (Benchmark = 56; 2015 outcome = 220). Trends in the HCV sector appear to go in a different direction, with 2015 outcomes (237 households), significantly failing to meet the benchmark (408). These results flag attention, in particular because they do not accord with previous findings/results/trends. For instance, the gains in other metrics by HCV do not seem to have transferred, and a review is advisable to understand why. Further the large increase seen in PH sector here, does not mimic other results, and so should be viewed with caution. In fact LHA has cited a change of software program as likely source of the discrepancy. It will be important to monitor future data (2016), for comparison to 2013 baseline, benchmark and 2015, in order to establish plausibility.

**Increase housing choices for tenants**

Data unavailable at this time.

**Impact Analysis – Activity One**

A critical question for LHA, MTW and other stakeholders, is the impact of increasing minimum rent to \$150 across all housing programs on LHA tenants and families. To answer this question an impact analysis was conducted to measure impact in terms of the following:

- a. Effectiveness – how many families met the minimum payment required?
- b. Annual earned income – how many families reported increases?
- c. Effect on tenants – includes: how many requested hardship exemptions, left LHA housing, number of initiative related complaints, and residents' demographics and
- d. Administration – staff time handling complaints related to this initiative

***a) Effectiveness – how many families met the minimum payment required?***

On average, the monthly rent paid in 2015 was \$267 agency-wide, which though higher than the minimum, was lower than FY 2014 benchmark (\$305), rents paid in 2013 (\$275 - baseline), and 2014 (\$355).

This program has been effective in establishing and maintaining a monthly minimum rent of \$150 for residents. In baseline year 2013, residents who paid the minimum rent constituted 75% in PH, 60% in HCV, and 65% agency-wide. That percentage rose to 99% (PH), 92% (HCV), and 94% (agency wide) in 2014, just short of the 100% benchmark for all areas. However, 100% of all residents (PH, HCV) agency-wide met the \$150 minimum monthly rent payment.

This initiative was also effective in increasing revenues as the data documents progressive increase in net monthly revenue collected by LHA agency-wide, from \$291,829 (2013, baseline), and \$458,214 in 2014, which exceeded the benchmark of \$360,125, to \$558,071 in 2015.

***b) Annual earned income – how many families reported increases?***

Average gross annual earned income reported by families generally indicate a somewhat gradual but increasing trend overall. However as the data at this time did not discriminate between sources of earned income (i.e. how much was earned by head of household, versus other members of the household), it is not possible to make an inference regarding impact of the initiative as a motivator on heads of household to increase potential earnings. It is recommended that this be rectified for the future.

***c) Effect on tenants – includes: how many requested hardship exemptions, left LHA housing, number of initiative related complaints, and residents' demographics***

An important consideration is the effect of the minimum monthly rent initiative on LHA residents. It is noteworthy that in FY 2015, there were no requests for hardship exemptions agency-wide (PH and HCV), and no exemptions were granted. This is in contrast to FY 2014, when two requests were made in PH, and to the 2014 benchmarks for PH (11), HCV (29), and similarly regarding benchmarks for hardship exemptions granted for PH (7), HCV (18).

Data also indicates low levels of initiative-related complaints by residents to staff. For instance, in FY 2015 there were four complaints from PH residents and two from HCV residents, compared to 5 (PH) and 6 (HCV) in the preceding year (2014). These numbers show a distinct improvement when compared to benchmark (PH = 20; and HCV = 55). It will be important to understand the impetus behind this change, especially so that it can be replicated and evaluated.

The foregoing should perhaps be considered in light of the data regarding the number of residents who left LHA housing in the same period. For instance, in 2015, when there were zero requests for hardship exemptions, and 6 initiative-related complaints to LHA staff, agency-wide, data shows that 611 residents (PH = 168, HCV = 443), left LHA housing. With the exception of PH, where the 2015 number is lower than the preceding year (2014 = 245), there appears to be an increasing trend in the numbers of residents who left LHA housing since 2013. Unfortunately, because the available data does not provide reasons for residents' exodus, we are not able at this time to tell whether or not the initiative was a contributory factor. It is recommended that this gap in data collection be amended in future years.

***d) Administration – staff time handling complaints related to this initiative***

The effect of the initiative on staff productivity is useful because it relates to the goal of cost reduction, and revenue increase. It can also help shed light on the how well the initiative is working, and /or accepted by residents. It is informative to see that agency-wide, only one hour was reported as time spent handling initiative-related complaints in 2015, in itself a reduction from actual outcomes in 2014 (2.75 hours). Both years show less staff time spent on complaints than anticipated in the FY 2014 benchmark of 25 hours agency – wide. This is a positive outcome both for staff morale and overall productivity.

### Disparate Impact Analysis - Demographics

The purpose of the disparate impact analysis is to ensure that this rent reform initiative does not unintentionally result in/create through its implementation a disparate impact on the rent burden faced by protected classes of households by race, color, national origin, disability, age, or gender. The tables below provide snapshots of income (earned/adjusted), and rents paid by households by race/ethnicity, age and gender across three years (2013 – 2015), and the increased rent burden incurred.

#### A) Public Housing

**TABLE 1: PUBLIC HOUSING - AVERAGE INCOME (EARNED/ADJUSTED)**

Public Housing Population	Heads of Household (FY)			Average Gross Annual Earned Income (FY)			Average Total Annual Adjusted Income (FY)		
	2013	2014*	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
<b>All Households</b>	860	704	768	\$10,512	\$13,263	\$14,367	\$11,197	\$14,478	\$19,388
<b>Gender</b>									
Female	774	636	700	\$10,610	\$13,392	\$14,388	\$11,245	\$14,588	\$15,617
Male	86	68	68	\$9,623	\$12,049	\$14,156	\$10,764	\$13,447	\$15,680
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>									
Black	677	577	642	\$10,959	\$13,635	\$14,485	\$11,656	\$14,789	\$16,179
White	179	126	118	\$9,267	\$11,668	\$13,910	\$10,022	\$13,199	\$13,460
American Indian / Native Alaskan	4	3	1	\$9,407	\$15,847	\$13,595	\$3,333	\$10,271	\$8,731
Asian / Pacific Islander	5	5	5	\$13,170	\$12,172	\$16,777	\$7,930	\$10,810	\$8,820
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	4	4	2	\$8,120	\$10,683	\$6,500	\$6,890	\$12,044	\$10,346
Other**	3	-	0	\$0	-	-	\$568	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Non-Hispanic	843	688	752	\$10,514	\$13,254	\$14,135	\$11,245	\$14,510	\$12,669
Hispanic	17	16	16	\$10,411	\$13,627	\$17,075	\$8,798	\$13,099	\$15,222
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>									
18-31	421	284	310	\$9,284	\$12,198	\$13,181	\$9,320	\$12,473	\$12,571
32-46	292	289	327	\$11,734	\$13,598	\$15,247	\$13,162	\$15,548	\$16,844
47-61	147	131	131	\$11,600	\$14,830	\$14,981	\$12,667	\$16,465	\$20,511
<b>Excluded Households</b>									
Elderly/Disabled Households	363	358	502	\$971	\$1,341	\$10,446	\$11,051	\$11,555	\$10,368

Table 1 shows the demographic breakdown of households, and income earned between 2013 and 2015. Two types of income are reported – gross average annual earned income and average total annual adjusted income.

Based on this table, the profile of the average PH head of household is: Female, Black/Non-Hispanic, and aged between 18 and 31.

**TABLE 2: INCREASED RENT BURDEN BY GENDER OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD**

Public Housing Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Rent Payment			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014*</i>	<i>FY2015</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014</i>	<i>FY2015</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>	<i>FY 2014 Actual</i>	<i>FY2015 Actual</i>
<b>All Households</b>	860	704	768	\$281	\$352	\$487	\$21	\$71	<b>\$206</b>
<b>Gender</b>									
Female	774	636	700	\$284	\$354	\$399	\$20	\$70	<b>\$115</b>
Male	86	68	68	\$260	\$335	\$267	\$26	\$75	<b>\$7</b>

The above table shows the average gross rent paid by head of households by gender, between 2013 and 2015, and the average increased rent burden for each year. From the table, we can see that prior to 2015 the difference in increased rent burden was marginal between female and male heads of households. However, in 2015, there is a great difference by gender, skewed to suggest that this initiative may have a disparate effect on households with female heads, than on those with male heads. Further data collection and analysis may be useful to help determine whether the effect seen is due to the larger numbers of female heads of households or other cause.

TABLE 3: INCREASED RENT BURDEN BY RACE AND ETHNICITY OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Public Housing Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Rent Payment			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY2015	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY2015	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual
<b>All Households</b>	860	704	768	\$281	\$352	\$487	\$21	\$71	<b>\$206</b>
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>									
Black	677	577	642	\$290	\$358	\$412	\$21	\$68	<b>\$122</b>
White	179	126	118	\$257	\$324	\$347	\$17	\$67	<b>\$90</b>
American Indian / Native Alaskan	4	3	1	\$116	\$262	\$218	\$34	\$146	<b>\$102</b>
Asian / Pacific Islander	5	5	5	\$208	\$284	\$222	\$27	\$76	<b>\$14</b>
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	4	4	2	\$210	\$305	\$272	\$4	\$95	<b>\$62</b>
Other**	3	-	0	\$83	-	-	\$67	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Non-Hispanic	843	688	752	\$282	\$352	\$417	\$35	\$70	<b>\$199</b>
Hispanic	17	16	16	\$251	\$337	\$359	\$21	\$86	<b>\$108</b>

Table 3 shows the average gross rent paid by head of households by race/ethnicity, between 2013 and 2015, and the average increased rent burden for each year. From the table, we can see that the FY 2015 rent burden far exceeds 2014 benchmarks for every race/ethnic group with the exception of Asian/Pacific Islander.

Compared to actual 2014 figures, the increased rent burden in 2015 again higher for every group with the exception of the Asian/Pacific Islander group where it drops from \$76 (2014 actual) to \$14 (2015).

Generally, all households experienced a significant increased rent burden in 2015. The racial groups with the greatest increase in 2015 are Blacks (\$122), and American Indians/Native Alaskan (\$102). Also the data indicates that the initiative is more likely to have a disparate effect on Non-Hispanics compared to Hispanic groups.

TABLE 4: INCREASED RENT BURDEN BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Public Housing Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Rent Payment			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014*</i>	<i>FY2015</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014</i>	<i>FY2015</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>	<i>FY 2014 Actual</i>	<i>FY2015 Actual</i>
<b>All Households</b>	860	704	768	\$281	\$352	\$487	\$21	\$71	<b>\$206</b>
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>									
18-31	421	284	310	\$249	\$318	\$322	\$21	\$69	<b>\$73</b>
32-46	292	289	327	\$317	\$379	\$428	\$17	\$62	<b>\$111</b>
47-61	147	131	131	\$305	\$368	\$196	\$27	\$63	<b>-\$109</b>

Table 4 shows the average gross rent paid by head of households by age, between 2013 and 2015, and the average increased rent burden for each year. As before, the increased rent burden in 2015 exceeds both actual rent burden in 2014, as well as the 2014 benchmark. Of the three age groups/range represented on the table, those aged 32- 46 bore the highest rent burden (\$111), followed by those aged 18 to 31 (\$73), with the lowest (no burden) for the 47-61 age group.

## B) HCV

Based on this table, the profile of the average HCV head of household is: Female, Black/Non-Hispanic, and aged between 32 and 46.

HCV Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Annual Eaned Income			Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			Average TTP			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual
														Actual	
<b>All Households</b>	1,454	1,430	1,325	\$8,632	\$8,626	\$8,335	\$10,501	\$10,325	\$9,887	\$271	\$357	\$289	\$35	\$86	\$18
<b>Gender</b>															
Female	1,404	1,378	1,177	\$8,697	\$8,669	\$8,701	\$10,547	\$10,403	\$10,231	\$273	\$360	\$299	\$34	\$87	\$26
Male	50	52	148	\$7,995	\$7,497	\$5,424	\$8,958	\$8,254	\$7,146	\$237	\$271	\$207	\$47	\$34	-\$30
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>															
Black	1,183	1,160	962	\$8,942	\$8,811	\$8,975	\$10,787	\$10,444	\$10,205	\$279	\$360	\$297	\$34	\$81	\$18
White	277	275	358	\$7,561	\$7,938	\$5,816	\$9,341	\$9,805	\$8,595	\$242	\$341	\$256	\$38	\$99	\$14
American Indian / Native Alaskan	5	4	2	\$6,298	\$4,940	\$5,029	\$7,354	\$7,557	\$12,892	\$189	\$221	\$323	\$34	\$32	\$189
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	2	3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,264	\$7,104	\$0	\$436	\$178	\$0	\$436	\$178
Other**	1	-		\$22,260	-		\$0	-		\$50	-	-	\$100	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>															
Non-Hispanic	1,438	1,410	1,262	\$8,654	\$8,605	\$5,753	\$10,475	\$10,294	\$8,648	\$271	\$356	\$240	\$35	\$85	-\$31.00
Hispanic	16	20	63	\$10,432	\$10,156	\$7,345	\$12,096	\$12,466	\$9,082	\$306	\$394	\$257	\$21	\$88	-\$49.00
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>															
18-31	497	386	329	\$8,258	\$7,821	\$8,593	\$9,035	\$8,513	\$8,558	\$237	\$297	\$261	\$42	\$60	\$24
32-46	759	824	711	\$9,231	\$9,351	\$9,150	\$11,774	\$11,499	\$11,120	\$302	\$392	\$318	\$29	\$90	\$16
47-61	198	220	285	\$7,579	\$7,324	\$6,003	\$9,238	\$9,104	\$8,344	\$242	\$328	\$246	\$38	\$86	\$4
<b>Excluded Households</b>															
Elderly/Disabled	1,196	717	983	\$1,810	\$1,203	\$732	\$8,879	\$10,225	\$9,549	\$227	\$320	\$241	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

\*\*"Other" category not available in LHA's computer systems as of May 27, 2014

TABLE 5: HCV - AVERAGE INCREASED RENT BURDEN BY GENDER

HCV Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Annual Eaned Income			Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			Average TTP			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual
														Actual	
All Households	1,454	1,430	1,325	\$8,632	\$8,626	\$8,335	\$10,501	\$10,325	\$9,887	\$271	\$357	\$289	\$35	\$86	\$18
<b>Gender</b>															
Female	1,404	1,378	1,177	\$8,697	\$8,669	\$8,701	\$10,547	\$10,403	\$10,231	\$273	\$360	\$299	\$34	\$87	\$26
Male	50	52	148	\$7,995	\$7,497	\$5,424	\$8,958	\$8,254	\$7,146	\$237	\$271	\$207	\$47	\$34	-\$30

Similar to PH, females bear a more disparate increased rent burden compared to males, and all households generally. However, it is noteworthy that the trend supports a decrease in overall rent burden for all groups, and especially for households with male heads in 2015.

TABLE 6: HCV - INCREASED RENT BURDEN BY RACE/ETHNICITY

HCV Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Annual Eaned Income			Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			Average TTP			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual
														Actual	
All Households	1,454	1,430	1,325	\$8,632	\$8,626	\$8,335	\$10,501	\$10,325	\$9,887	\$271	\$357	\$289	\$35	\$86	\$18
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>															
Black	1,183	1,160	962	\$8,942	\$8,811	\$8,975	\$10,787	\$10,444	\$10,205	\$279	\$360	\$297	\$34	\$81	\$18
White	277	275	358	\$7,561	\$7,938	\$5,816	\$9,341	\$9,805	\$8,595	\$242	\$341	\$256	\$38	\$99	\$14
American Indian / Native Alaskan	5	4	2	\$6,298	\$4,940	\$5,029	\$7,354	\$7,557	\$12,892	\$189	\$221	\$323	\$34	\$32	\$189
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	2	3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,264	\$7,104	\$0	\$436	\$178	\$0	\$436	\$178
Other**	1	-		\$22,260	-		\$0	-		\$50	-	-	\$100	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>															
Non-Hispanic	1,438	1,410	1,262	\$8,654	\$8,605	\$5,753	\$10,475	\$10,294	\$8,648	\$271	\$356	\$240	\$35	\$85	-\$31.00
Hispanic	16	20	63	\$10,432	\$10,156	\$7,345	\$12,096	\$12,466	\$9,082	\$306	\$394	\$257	\$21	\$88	-\$49.00

Table 6 shows the average rent increase burden incurred by head of households by race/ethnicity, between 2013 and 2015. The average increased rent burden for all households was \$18 in 2015. From the table, we can see that the FY 2015 rent burden was lower for all groups except American Indian/Native Alaskan (\$189). The group with the second highest rent burden is Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (\$178), though it should be noted that this figure is nonetheless, a significant decrease from the previous year (\$436). Also the groups

with the two highest increased rent burden are American Indian/Native American and even though they constitute a very negligible portion of the population.

**TABLE 7: HCV - INCREASED RENT BURDEN BY AGE**

HCV Population	Heads of Household			Average Gross Annual Eaned Income			Average Total Annual Adjusted Income			Average TTP			Average Increased Rent Burden		
	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014	FY2015 Actual
														Actual	
All Households	1,454	1,430	1,325	\$8,632	\$8,626	\$8,335	\$10,501	\$10,325	\$9,887	\$271	\$357	\$289	\$35	\$86	\$18
Age of Head of Household															
18-31	497	386	329	\$8,258	\$7,821	\$8,593	\$9,035	\$8,513	\$8,558	\$237	\$297	\$261	\$42	\$60	\$24
32-46	759	824	711	\$9,231	\$9,351	\$9,150	\$11,774	\$11,499	\$11,120	\$302	\$392	\$318	\$29	\$90	\$16
47-61	198	220	285	\$7,579	\$7,324	\$6,003	\$9,238	\$9,104	\$8,344	\$242	\$328	\$246	\$38	\$86	\$4

Table 7 shows the average gross annual earned income by head of households by age, between 2013 and 2015, and the average increased rent burden for each year. The increased rent burden is less for all age groups in 2015, compared to FY 2014 and benchmark.

Of the three age groups/range represented on the table, those aged 47 – 61 bore the lowest rent burden (\$4), followed by those aged 32 to 46 (\$16), with the youngest group having the highest (\$24).

### Conclusion and recommendations

Activity 1 has produced mixed results and outcomes for LHA, in 2015. In terms of reducing costs and increasing revenues, this initiative to increase minimum rent to \$150 across all housing programs has been successful, as evidenced by the 100% participation rate found. Other positive outcomes include the reduction in resident complaints and time spent by staff to address complaints; the reduction in number of hardship exemptions requested. Issues to monitor and watch out for include the need to track and collect data on households that leave LHA, and the reason for doing so – perhaps through exit surveys; increasing the number of potentially employable heads of household who in fact get employment, as part of the goal to move residents to self-sufficiency. In order to clearly track and evaluate this, data will need to be collected on the earned income by heads of household, separate from income earned by members of the household generally. In terms of the disparate impact this activity might have on protected groups (gender, race, ethnicity, age), gender and age have been flagged, as well as race (PH). It must be mentioned that suggested disparate impact on females might be attributable to the fact that they make up a significant percentage of heads of households. The

data also highlights the opportunity or need to target those heads of households in the 18 to 31 age range (as a prime group for strategies to encourage and improve employability), as LHA advances its goal to move residents to self-sufficiency. Some limitations in the data have been attributed to the mid-course change in software program used for data collection, maintenance and analysis, which may have affected the metrics/measures, as well as conclusions drawn from the data. For instance, in the body of its report the LHA stated its belief that *"the disproportionate difference in the public housing households receiving TANF benefits could be due to a change in software programs. A difference in how the data was extracted could explain the major difference from the baseline numbers to the actual numbers."* The proposed strategy of comparing FY2016 numbers to FY2015 in order to check and improve data reliability is laudable. Future analysis will benefit from the use of consistent, timely and verifiable data.

### ACTIVITY THREE

#### **Triennial recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV elderly/disabled households**

Expanded to include elderly and disabled households on a fixed income, due to success of initial implementation in Connie Griffith households in FY 2012 – 2013.

Date of implementation - FY 2014

#### Reduce costs (increase revenues)

A primary focus of this initiative is to reduce agency costs, increase revenues and boost staff productivity. To measure this overarching goal the following metrics were considered: *decrease of staff time for processing recertifications, number of recertifications and cost of task, and increase in agency rental revenue* - from both Connie Griffith (CG) and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program.

#### **Agency cost savings**

Cost of recertifications: Baseline data indicates that prior to the implementation of this initiative, the agency conducted 881 recertifications per year (CG =181, HCV = 700). At an average cost of \$44.41 each, these recertifications cost the agency \$38,891. Changing the schedule of recertifications to a triennial basis was expected to reduce the annual number of recertifications processed by agency staff, and thus achieving cost savings for the agency. The data post-implementation indicates the following:

CG: In 2015, the actual number of recertifications completed was 55 at a total cost of \$2, 657 compared to the benchmark (57; \$2,754). This represents a significant cost savings to the agency when compared to the baseline cost of \$8,091.

HCV: In 2015, a total of 338 recertifications were completed at a total cost of \$16,329 compared to the benchmark estimates (216; \$10,435). Although the agency did not meet its benchmark for this period, it must be noted that the resulting 2015 cost is almost 50% less than at baseline (\$30,800).

Consequently, although LHA only achieved its cost savings benchmark in CG, the data supports the continued success of this initiative in achieving savings for LHA. Together, the cost of recertifications for 2015 was \$18,986 (CG + HCV). At the end of FY 2015, this initiative resulted in an almost \$20,000 savings when compared to baseline (\$38,891).

### ***Staff time savings***

A similar pattern and positive effect is indicated. In CG, staff spent less time (110 hours) on recertification tasks in 2015 compared to the benchmark estimate of 114 hours, and baseline (362 hours). However in HCV program, the 676 hours logged by staff exceeded the benchmark estimate of 432 hours. Again, the favorable comparison to baseline (1,400 hours), must be noted. Overall LHA did not achieve its benchmark for this measure, yet the resultant savings in staff time (786 compared to 1,762 at baseline), and its potential contributions to cost reduction must be acknowledged.

### ***Increase in agency rental revenues***

Data provided indicates that the agency did not meet its stated benchmarks for this goal. To summarize, actual rental revenue went down in CG, and Housing Assistance Payments to Owner (HAP), increased for HCV elderly/disabled households. It is not clear how the implementation of this initiative can impact actual rental revenue, or how the recertification process influences as rental income. For instance, in HCV program, increase in revenues would necessitate a decrease in HAP payment, which in turn occurs when the resident/tenant is able to afford to pay more towards rent. Arguably for this population (elderly/disabled), who according to agency information mostly have fixed incomes (see description – Activity 3), this may not be feasible.

### ***Disparate Impact Analysis – Demographics***

The purpose of the disparate impact analysis is to ensure that this rent reform initiative does not unintentionally result in/create through its implementation a disparate impact on the rent burden faced by protected classes of households by race, color, national origin, disability, age, or gender. The tables below provide snapshots of gross monthly income (earned/other), and average gross rents (monthly) paid by households by race/ethnicity, and gender from FY2011 to FY2015, and any increased rent burden incurred.

**TABLE 8: ACTIVITY 3 - CONNIE GRIFFITHS HOUSEHOLDS**

Public Housing Population	Heads of Household				Average Gross Eaned Income per Month				Average Gross Income per Month				Average Gross Rent Payment				Average Increased Rent Burden
	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2015	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2015	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2015	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2015	
All Households	181	178	181	131	\$124	\$128	\$141	\$117	\$945	\$883	\$956	\$699	\$223	\$224	\$218	\$236	\$13
Gender																	
Female	93	95	98	65	\$118	\$74	\$133	\$84	\$892	\$854	\$891	\$592	\$215	\$220	\$209	\$205	(\$10)
Male	88	83	83	66	\$130	\$176	\$147	\$150	\$994	\$908	\$1,011	\$804	\$231	\$227	\$226	\$265	\$34
Race (Multiple selections permitted)																	
Black	120	115	118	81	\$136	\$149	\$160	\$86	\$943	\$877	\$953	\$707	\$221	\$219	\$212	\$233	\$12
White	59	62	63	49	\$104	\$92	\$106	\$173	\$954	\$895	\$959	\$700	\$229	\$233	\$228	\$245	\$16
American Indian / Native Alaskan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	2	1	2	1	\$0	\$0	\$314	\$0	\$736	\$776	\$1,184	\$0	\$185	\$194	\$232	\$0	(\$185)
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnicity																	
Non-Hispanic	179	177	180	128	\$126	\$129	\$142	\$120	\$945	\$884	\$957	\$688	\$223	\$224	\$218	\$236	\$13
Hispanic	2	1	1	3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$922	\$737	\$750	\$1,184	\$256	\$221	\$215	\$217	(\$39)

FY2014 data was not available due to software conversion.

Average profile across the time span presented above for CG - typical resident is female, black and non-Hispanic.

Table 8 shows the average gross rent paid by head of households by gender, between 2011 and 2015, and the average increased rent burden for 2015 (No data for other years). From the table, we can see that prior to 2015 women outnumbered men as heads of households, and generally men earn and have more income. Also, men have a higher rent burden than women, but this may be explained by the gender difference in income. Women incurred no increased rent burden in 2015.

Reviewing data presented by race and ethnicity, there does not appear to be any pattern to indicate disparate effect, as increased rent burden falls within a reasonable range for all race groups. A noteworthy exception being the single Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander resident who had no rent , and so no rent burden (-\$185), in 2015.

Overall - No disparate impact found at this time. Continued monitoring is recommended.

### Conclusion and recommendations

This is obviously a successful initiative, despite failure to meet benchmarks, and so should be continued. Some new metrics are also suggested for consideration by LHA.

It is suggested that LHA consider measuring staff and residents' satisfaction with the implementation and outcomes of this initiative. For instance, data can be collected on staff response to the change and feedback on process and impact can be used to review and inform quality improvement in the recertification process. Also, measuring residents' satisfaction with the process may provide useful information, and help track and monitor challenges or unexpected consequences.

Address delays and backlog in the recertification process should be a priority, in the coming fiscal year, in order to build on current cost savings. It is strongly recommended that the *"increase in agency rental revenue"* metric be discontinued, and the agency focus on cost saving strategies, which work well within the scope and intent of this initiative. For instance, such strategies could target reducing recertification backlog, conducting a process flow analysis of the recertification process for possibility of reducing task time below the current two-hour duration.

## ACTIVITY THIRTEEN

### Local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements activity

Excludes households whose head/co-head is elderly/disabled or a full-time student.

Date of implementation FY2014

This activity was created as a response to the identified need to eliminate loopholes that before now enabled residents of LHA Self-sufficiency units to avoid compliance with applicable "work requirements" protocols. To that end, LHA:

- a. Imposed a minimum earned income requirement for residents, regardless of employment status
- b. Modified the definition of "work activity" upon which compliance with self-sufficiency is based, and
- c. Obtained approval to implement Self-Sufficiency Level II Admissions and Continued Occupancy Rules at Centre Meadows (206- unit, formerly Pimlico apartments)

#### LHA definition of "work activity" includes:

- ✓ Unsubsidized employment;
- ✓ Subsidized public sector employment;
- ✓ Subsidized private sector employment;
- ✓ Paid on-the-job training

All baselines and metrics for this activity were established in FY 2015, so no historical data exists.

LHA has a total count of 846 Self-Sufficiency units (Self-Sufficiency I Units = 256; Self-Sufficiency II = 590). Of this number, 628 households are affected by this initiative and rent reform activity (230 - SSI & 398 - SSII).

Because 206 units known as Centre Meadows (formerly Pimlico Apartments) were vacant for renovation during this period, this site is not included in the subsequent analyses.

#### *Increase self-sufficiency of residents/tenants*

To measure this goal the following metrics were used – *increase in household income; increase positive outcomes in employment status; number of households requesting hardship exemption, decrease in number of households on TANF, and number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency.*

##### ***Increase in household income***

This measure, which is based on the earned income of the head of household (includes co-head, or spouse), considers the average gross earned income of households subject to the policy initiative in both Self-Sufficiency Units I and II (SS I/II). According to data presented, the average gross earned income from 648 SS I/II units in 2013, and prior to policy implementation was \$12,800 - this amount is set as baseline. The agency set as its benchmark for FY 2015, an expected average gross earned annual income of \$13,704 (639 households). Actual figures indicate that this was exceeded in 2015, with a reported increase in average earned gross income to \$19,544 for 490 of the 628 households subject to this policy initiative. This \$6,744 increase on baseline is a positive outcome for this metric.

##### ***Increase positive outcomes in employment status***

There is currently no data for this metric as baseline and benchmarks were established in FY 2015, as such outcomes will be evaluated in FY 2016.

##### ***Number of households requesting hardship exemption***

LHA has also provided data on the number of hardship requests made by affected households. As there is no historical data on this metric, and data show no requests in FY 2013 and FY 2015, it is recommended that this metric continued to be tracked and monitored, for review in FY 2016.

##### ***Decrease in number of households on Temporary assistance for Needy Families (TANF)***

LHA estimates for FY 2015 indicated an expected decrease in numbers of households receiving TANF. However, the available data indicates that actual numbers increased to 187 (out of 628 households), in contrast to benchmark (30) and 2013 baseline (26). Thus LHA failed to meet this benchmark. Because of the large discrepancy in the numbers, it is recommended that a comparison of FY 2015 and FY 2016 outcomes be conducted to verify the numbers, or for trend analysis. It should be noted that LHA attributes the disproportionate difference found to change in software programs used to collect and manage data reported. A trend/comparative analysis as discussed above will also be useful in helping to reconcile the data.

***Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency***

LHA reports that 314 of the 628 households subject to this policy initiative transitioned to self-sufficiency in FY 2015. As detailed elsewhere, in this report, self-sufficiency is defined as an earned income of at least \$15,080 per year. However, this activity uses an expanded definition, which includes an earned income of \$15,080 per year. According to baseline established in 2013, 48 households met this definition. Expected value of 58 households was set as the benchmark for 2015, with actual numbers indicating that a full 50% of affected households met this definition of self-sufficiency. Although this outcome would indicate a huge success for the agency on this metric, as with the preceding metric, LHA is concerned about the plausibility of these figures. Another notable concern is that it is not clear from the data whether the increased earned income is attributed to the head of household or other members as well. It is important that this be clarified, in order to better understand the drivers of outcomes realized, and to inform future strategies.

***Reduce costs (increase revenues)***

To measure this goal the following metrics were used – *reduce per unit subsidy costs for participating households, increase agency rental revenues*, as well as a cost-benefits assessment of this activity for LHA.

***Reduce per unit subsidy costs for participating households***

This review is placed on hold, as outcome data is yet to be determined for FY 2015. Recommend continue to track and monitor data for review in FY 2016.

***Increase agency rental revenues***

This review is placed on hold, as outcome data is yet to be determined for FY 2015. Recommend continue to track and monitor data for review in FY 2016.

***Cost-benefits assessment***

Two measures are considered – a) total rent revenue (gross/net), as well as dollar value of staff time spent processing hardship requests. Data provided indicates an increase in rent revenue in both FY2014 and FY2015, as compared to baseline, although in neither year did rent revenue achieve benchmark. Also, as noted earlier there were no hardship requests to process. It is recommended that this metric be put on hold and reviewed in FY 2016, when outcome data will be available for FY2015 to allow for a more robust analysis.

## Disparate Impact Analysis – Demographics

The purpose of the disparate impact analysis is to ensure that this rent reform initiative does not unintentionally result in/create through its implementation a disparate impact on the rent burden faced by protected classes of households by race, color, national origin, disability, age, or gender. The tables below provide snapshots of average annual income (earned/adjusted), and average gross rent (monthly) paid by households by race/ethnicity, and gender from FY2013 and FY2015, and any increased rent burden incurred.

### A) Self-Sufficiency I Units

TABLE 9: SELF-SUFFICIENCY I – DISPARATE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Self-Sufficiency I Population	Heads of Household		Average Total Annual Adjusted Income		Average Gross Annual Earned Income		Average Gross Rent Payment		Average Increased Rent Burden
	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2015
<b>All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households</b>	210	230	\$16,431	\$19,512	\$16,555	\$19,270	\$380	\$462	\$82
<b>Gender</b>									
Female	201	222	\$16,399	\$19,512	\$16,525	\$19,270	\$378	\$462	\$84
Male	9	8	\$17,154	\$17,513	\$17,228	\$16,659	\$426	\$467	\$41
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>									
Black	170	193	\$16,581	\$20,390	\$16,281	\$19,365	\$387	\$477	\$90
White	39	34	\$17,164	\$15,215	\$18,048	\$19,494	\$365	\$475	\$110
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	0	\$5,184	-	\$29,827	-	\$130	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	2	2	\$10,090	\$19,512	\$20,313	\$19,259	\$278	\$493	\$215
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	1	\$0	\$15,771	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$394	\$394
Other**	0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Non-Hispanic	204	220	\$16,511	\$19,761	\$16,508	\$19,310	\$381	\$500	\$119
Hispanic	6	10	\$13,711	\$19,512	\$18,145	\$19,259	\$351	\$493	\$142
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>									
18-31	88	82	\$13,189	\$16,002	\$13,760	\$15,519	\$312	\$401	\$89
32-46	88	106	\$17,554	\$22,040	\$17,177	\$21,210	\$405	\$555	\$150
47-61	34	42	\$21,916	\$24,141	\$22,179	\$21,697	\$489	\$607	\$118
<b>Excluded Households</b>									
Elderly/Disabled Households	35	36	\$15,369	\$15,174	\$4,429	\$3,892	\$343	\$358	N/A

\*FY2014 data was not available due to software conversion issues.

Profile: Female, Black, Non-Hispanic, age 18 to 46.

Gender – Residents (head of household), are predominantly female. Data indicates twice the rent burden experienced by male counterparts. This may reflect the magnitude of difference in gender distribution, rather than disparate effect or hardship.

Race/ethnicity – The highest increase in rent burden affected the Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander category (\$394), and appears to be due to the fact that this resident paid no rent previously, the sum equates to rent and merely reflects the payment of rent. Blacks are shown to have the lowest increased rent burden. The data also shows that the rent burden is higher in FY2015 for Hispanics (\$142) compared to non-Hispanics (\$119).

Age - Heads of households age 32 to 46 have a higher rent increase burden (\$150), compared to other groups. This is higher than the increased rent burden experienced by those aged 47 to 61(\$118), even though they report higher average gross annual earned income.

Overall, it does not appear that this policy initiative unduly creates a disparate effect on any of the protected classes.

**B) Self-Sufficiency II Units****TABLE 10: SELF-SUFFICIENCY II UNITS - DISPARATE ANALYSIS**

Self-Sufficiency II Population	Heads of Household		Average Total Annual Adjusted Income		Average Gross Annual Earned Income		Average Gross Rent Payment		Average Increased Rent Burden
	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2013	FY2015	FY2015
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	419	398	\$16,431	\$13,381	\$11,012	\$12,926	\$297	\$342	\$45
<b>Gender</b>									
Female	379	362	\$11,813	\$13,112	\$10,848	\$12,679	\$294	\$336	\$42
Male	40	36	\$15,238	\$16,092	\$13,450	\$15,412	\$340	\$402	\$62
<b>Race (Multiple selections permitted)</b>									
Black	351	256	\$12,244	\$15,160	\$11,051	\$17,463	\$300	\$385	\$85
White	71	59	\$11,594	\$11,881	\$11,363	\$10,910	\$289	\$305	\$16
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	0	\$5,400	\$0	\$7,800	\$0	\$135	\$0	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	1	\$5,400	\$16,344	\$7,800	\$17,304	\$135	\$409	\$274
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	3	1	\$9,186	\$4,920	\$10,826	\$13,000	\$230	\$150	-\$80
Other**	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Non-Hispanic	415	394	\$12,129	\$13,381	\$11,057	\$12,926	\$298	\$305	\$7
Hispanic	4	4	\$13,246		\$15,145	\$13,846	\$332	\$310	-\$22
<b>Age of Head of Household</b>									
18-31	223	176	\$10,494	\$11,935	\$10,459	\$12,541	\$268	\$306	\$38
32-46	137	173	\$13,416	\$14,256	\$11,295	\$13,491	\$321	\$363	\$42
47-61	59	49	\$15,397	\$15,489	\$13,044	\$12,318	\$360	\$397	\$37
<b>Excluded Households</b>									
Elderly/Disabled Households	153	154	\$10,372	\$10,355	\$597	\$513	\$260	\$259	N/A

**Profile** – Similar to SSI – predominantly female, Black, non-Hispanic, and aged between 18 and 31.

**Gender** – As before women exceed men as head of households. Men have a higher average increased rent burden, which may reflect higher rent paid, rather than gender bias.

**Race/ethnicity** - Similar patterns found. In FY 2015, the highest average increased rent burden of \$274 applied to the Asian/Pacific Islander. When compared to the average increased burden for Blacks (\$85), where data shows comparable income and rent levels, this might flag a possible case of disparate impact for review. There appears to be minimal differences based on ethnicity.

**Age** – Again, all average increased rent burden by age fall within a close range (\$38, \$42, and \$37), precluding any concerns for disparate impact in this category.

### Conclusion and recommendations

This is an important policy initiative with the potential to help LHA achieve its preferred goals for this population. However, at this time it is considered premature to draw any conclusions due to the paucity of data (both actual for FY 2015, and comparative data), as indicated by the metrics, which require data collection and have been tabled for review in FY 2016. Also, this will allow time for Centre Meadows site to be included in the analysis.

It is recommended that priority be given to data collection and reconciliation, tracking and monitoring during the coming year as implementation continues, to allow for proper evaluation in FY 2016.

## ACTIVITY FOURTEEN

### **Rent reform – Elimination of Earned Income Disallowance (EID).**

Date of implementation FY 2015

The stated goal of this policy initiative/activity is to reduce costs, and enhance better stewardship and effectiveness in federal expenditures, by streamlining processes and eliminating non-value creating administrative practices that impede staff productivity. Through this active, LHA seeks to eliminate an administrative practice, with minimal return on investment of staff time and agency resources.

This initiative applied to a small segment agency-wide, s only 23 households met eligibility criteria to receive the EID.

#### Reduce costs (increase revenues)

To measure this goal the following metric were used – *agency cost savings, staff time savings, decrease in error rate of task execution, increase in agency rental revenue* - from both public housing (PH) and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) households.

#### **Agency cost savings**

Implementation of this initiative allowed LHA eliminate task costs of \$452 (2013 baseline), as all affected households did not receive EID in 2015.

#### **Staff time savings and Decrease in error rate of task execution**

Previously, LHA staff spent one hour on average on EID related tasks. Implementation of this initiative allowed LHA eliminate the 23 hours of staff time, which would have been necessary to complete EID related tasks.

In addition, the estimated 25% error rate (baseline, 2013), encountered when tracking resident's employment status was eliminated. Both outcomes have the potential to enhance staff productivity by freeing them up to accomplish other tasks.

### ***Increase in agency rental revenue***

LHA data indicate an increase in agency rental revenue following implementation. FY 2015 outcome indicates that LHA received net rental revenue from the 23 households in the amount of \$26,112, which was less than benchmark (\$96,474), and the baseline (\$35,964).

### Disparate Impact Analysis – Demographics

No data at this time.

### Conclusion and recommendations

This appears to be a successful initiative, as evidenced by data which indicate cost savings to the agency from elimination of staff time spent in processing EID (rent calculations, tracking resident employment status etc.)

It is recommended that tracking of this initiative be continued.

## ACTIVITY SIXTEEN

### **Housing Choice Voucher rent Reform Study**

Excluding elderly and disabled households.

Date of implementation FY 2015

No report at this time, as this is first year of implementation. Activity Sixteen - Is not reported because this is implementation year. Year One outcomes will be reported and evaluated in FY 2016.

### Closing Comments

This report has provided a review of selected activities involving rent reform as part of the LHA MTW Demonstration project. It is clear that the LHA and its staff in the choice of and implementation of these initiatives have expended a lot of work and effort. Generally, these initiatives/activities appear to be moving/capable of moving the agency towards its stated goals for participation in the MTW program. Particular emphasis must be placed on the collection, tracking and monitoring of data upon which evaluation must rest. It is hoped that data collected by end of FY 2016 will help address some of the challenges identified in this report, in particular those that occurred as a result of the change in software program used for data management.

With regard to the impact of these rent reform initiatives on the protected groups, no red flags were found at this time. However, continuous and rigorous attention to execution of initiatives and data collection, will be important and necessary to ensure that disparate impacts are avoided, or identified and addressed.

## SECTION VI – ADMINISTRATIVE

- C. Certification that the PHA 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.

### CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS MOVING TO WORK ANNUAL REPORT

Acting on behalf of the Public Housing Agency (PHA) listed below, as its authorized PHA official, I approve the submission of the Annual Moving to Work Report for the PHA fiscal year July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

The Agency has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) ensure that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families, as defined in section 3(b)(2) of the 1937 Act; 2) assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families under MTW, as would have been served absent the demonstration, and 3) maintain a comparable mix of families by family size, as would have been served or assisted had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority  
PHA Name

KY004  
PHA Number/HA Code

I hereby certify that all the information stated herein, as well as any information provided in the Report, is true and accurate.

Austin J. Simms  
Name of Authorized Official

Executive Director  
Title

  
Signature

November 30, 2015  
Date