Louisville Metro Housing Authority

Moving to Work Annual Report

Fiscal Year 2015

July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015

Submitted to HUD on September 30, 2015

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The Louisville Metro Housing Authority, formerly known as the Housing Authority of Louisville, is a nonprofit agency responsible for the development and management of federally assisted housing in the Louisville Metro area. In 2003, Louisville Metro Mayor Jerry Abramson and the Louisville Metro Council approved the merger of the Housing Authority of Louisville and Housing Authority of Jefferson County, thereby creating the Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA). A nine-member Board of Commissioners, appointed by the Metro Mayor, serves as the policy making body of the agency. LMHA has over 4,000 public housing units, and administers rental assistance to nearly 9,000 families through its Section 8 / Housing Choice Voucher Program.

Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration Program Overview

LMHA, then the Housing Authority of Louisville, became one of a small group of public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration Program in 1999. The MTW Program, authorized by Congress and signed into Law as part of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996, offers public housing agencies (PHAs) the opportunity to design and test innovative, locally-designed housing and self-sufficiency strategies for low-income families. The program allows exemptions from existing low-income public housing (Section 9) and Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) rules, and it permits LMHA to combine public housing operating and capital funds, along with Housing Choice Voucher rental assistance funds, into a single agency-wide funding source.

Under the MTW Program, LMHA creates and adopts an MTW Annual Plan that describes new and ongoing activities that utilize authority granted to LMHA under its MTW Agreement with HUD. This Plan focuses primarily on the Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher (HCV), and Capital Fund programs, as these are the LMHA programs that fall under MTW. The Annual Plan also focuses on newly proposed MTW activities and MTW activities that are ongoing. In addition, it contains information about some of LMHA's non-MTW initiatives, such as public housing site improvements, resident self-sufficiency programs, and new or upcoming grant opportunities. The MTW Annual Report - prepared at the end of each Fiscal Year (FY) - is an update on the status and outcomes of those activities included in the MTW Annual Plan.

MTW Objectives

MTW is a demonstration program that allows PHAs to design and test ways to achieve three statutory goals. Each one of LMHA's MTW activities must achieve at least one of these statutory objectives:

- Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures;
- Give incentives to residents, especially families with children, to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient; and
- Increase housing choices for low-income families.

At the inception of LMHA's status as an MTW agency, LMHA carefully evaluated its own goals and objectives against those of the demonstration. The outcome was six long-term goals for LMHA's participation in the MTW program.

Locally Defined LMHA MTW Goals

These goals, as outlined in the FY 1999 MTW Annual Plan, are locally-driven refinements of HUD's objectives:

- Increase the share of residents moving toward self-sufficiency;
- Achieve a greater income mix at LMHA properties;
- Expand the spatial dispersal of assisted housing;
- Improve the quality of the assisted housing stock;
- Reduce and/or reallocate administrative, operational and/or maintenance costs; and
- Enhance the Housing Authority's capacity to plan and deliver effective programs.

Since that time LMHA has recognized a growing number of populations with specific needs that often go unmet by existing housing and support service infrastructure. The agency has revised and updated its goals to reflect changes in the local community and the evolution of the HUD MTW demonstration into a performance-driven program. In addition to the goals above, LMHA has set the goal to:

- Develop programs and housing stock targeted to populations with special needs, especially those families not adequately served elsewhere in the community.

MTW Activity Overview

An MTW activity is defined as any activity LMHA engages in that requires MTW flexibility to waive statutory or regulatory requirements.

During FY 2015, LMHA proposed; HUD approved; and LMHA implemented three new MTW activities:

- Activity #42-2015: MTW Special Referral Program – Seven Counties Services, Inc.
- Activity #43-2015: HCV Program – HUD/MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration
- Activity #44-2015: MTW Special Referral Programs (which combines reporting for all MTW Special Referral Program activities under a single, umbrella activity)

During FY 2015, LMHA re-proposed an MTW activity that was originally proposed in FY 2011. HUD did not approve the activity in FY 2011 because the Housing Authority did not yet have Broader Use of Funds authority. HUD approved the activity upon re-proposal in FY 2015, and it has since been implemented:

- Activity #29-2015: Public Housing – Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville

A complete list of LMHA's MTW activities (along with their current status) follows:

Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
44	2015	MTW Special Referral Programs	Implemented
43	2015	HCV Program - HUD/MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration	Implemented
42	2015	MTW Special Referral Program - Seven Counties Services, Inc.	Implemented
41	2014	Public Housing - Special Occupancy Requirements for Floors 1-9 of Building C at Dosker Manor	Proposed, Not Approved
40	2014	HCV Program - Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP	Not Yet Implemented
39	2014	HCV Program - Rent Increase Limit	Implemented
38	2013	MTW Special Referral Program – Parkland Scholar House	Implemented
37	2013, 2014	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Frazier Spinal Cord Rehab Institute	Not Approved in 2013, Approved in 2014, Implemented
36	2013	MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Bashford Manor/Newburg	Implemented
35	2012	MTW Special Referral Programs – Allocation of MTW Housing Choice Vouchers	Implemented
34	2012	MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Youngland Avenue	Implemented
33	2012	Public Housing - Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income	Closed Out
32	2012	HCV Program & Public Housing - Elimination of the Earned Income Disregard	Implemented
31	2012	MTW Special Referral Program - Stoddard Johnston Scholar House	Implemented
30	2012	MTW Special Referral Program – 100,000 Homes Initiative	Implemented
29	2011, 2015	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville	Not Approved in 2011, Approved in 2015, Implemented
28	2011	Public Housing - Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance, & Modernization	Not Yet Implemented
27	2011	HCV Program & Public Housing - Amend Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility	Implemented
26	2011	Public Housing - Acquisition of Mixed-Income Sites	Implemented
25	2010	Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities	On Hold
24	2010	Public Housing - Increased Flat Rents for New Scattered Sites	Closed Out
23	2010	Public Housing - Lease-up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor	Implemented
22	2010	Public Housing - CFL Trade-in Pilot Program for Avenue Plaza Residents	Single Budget Authority Only, Closed Out
21	2010	Public Housing - Occupancy Criteria Changes for New Scattered Sites - Mandatory Case Management	Closed Out
20	2010	MTW Special Referral Program - Downtown Family Scholar House	Implemented

Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix Cont.

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
19	2010	HCV Homeownership Program - Weatherization and Energy Efficiency Pilot	Single Budget Authority Only, Closed Out
18	2009	Public Housing - Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal	Implemented
17	2009	HCV Program & Public Housing - Multicultural Family Assistance Program	Single Budget Authority Only, Implemented
16	2009	Public Housing - Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies	Closed Out
15	2009	MTW Special Referral Program - Louisville Scholar House	Implemented
14	2009	Center for Women and Families at the Villager - Determinations for Program Eligibility	Non-MTW
13	2009	HCV Homeownership Program – Exception Payment Standards	Implemented
12	2009	HCV Program - Maintenance Specialist	Single Budget Authority Only, Not Yet Implemented
11	2009	HCV Homeownership Program - Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications	Implemented
10	2008	Locally Defined Definition of Elderly	Implemented
9	2007	Public Housing - Term Limits and Employment/Educational Work Requirements for New Scattered Sites (Revised FY 2014)	Implemented
8	2008	HCV Program & Public Housing - Standard Medical Deduction	Implemented
7	2008	MTW Special Referral Program - Day Spring (Renewed 2012)	Implemented
6	2008	HCV Program - Earned Income Disregard for Elderly Families	Implemented
5	2007	HCV Program - Spatial Deconstruction of HCV Assisted Units	Closed Out
4	2007	HCV Program & Public Housing - Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families (Amended 2012, 2014)	Implemented
3	2006	HCV Homeownership Program - Amount and Distribution of Homeownership Assistance	Implemented
2	1999	MTW Inspections Protocol	Implemented
1	2005	MTW Special Referral Program - Center for Women and Families	Implemented

Short and Long Term MTW Plan

The mission of the Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA) is to provide quality, affordable housing for those in need, to assist residents in their efforts to achieve financial independence, and to work with the community to strengthen neighborhoods. During FY 2015, LMHA focused on the **short term** goal of effectively implementing its FY 2015 Annual Plan. Key outcomes and accomplishments include:

- Continued to expand service-enriched housing choices for vulnerable populations whose needs are not adequately met elsewhere in the community by implementing a new MTW Special Referral Program with Seven Counties Services, Inc. to provide up to 50 Housing Choice Vouchers to households that include a person with a severe mental illness, whose needs are not met by traditional outpatient services.

- Began enrolling participants in a HUD-directed, HCV Program rent reform demonstration program designed to test and evaluate an alternative rent policy, in conjunction with several MTW public housing agencies, including the LMHA. The Housing Authority has modified its policies and rent calculation methodology for a group of program participants (the Alternate Rent Group), and will compare the results to a group of program participants who are assisted under the rent policies used for all other LMHA-assisted households (the Control Group).

- Implemented a new activity to sublease up to three public housing units to provide temporary housing for low-income YouthBuild Louisville participants who are experiencing homelessness.

In the **long term**, LMHA will continue to focus on the goals below. Progress made toward these objectives during FY 2015 follows:

Reposition and Redevelop the Conventional Public Housing Stock

The physical stock of the remaining original family developments owned and managed by LMHA needs to be completely redeveloped. These sites – large, dense, urban, and often isolated – need major renovation or replacement. LMHA's goal is to transform these communities in the coming years, replacing the current public housing developments with mixed income communities, while at the same time providing replacement units so that the overall number of families served will not decrease. In the elderly developments, modernization efforts will proceed with an eye toward appropriate and expanded service provision. Key FY 2015 initiatives included:

- **Russell Choice Neighborhood Initiative (Vision Russell)**
  Choice Neighborhoods is a HUD-funded grant program begun in 2010 that replaces the HOPE VI Program. There are two types of Choice Neighborhoods grants: Planning and Implementation. LMHA was awarded a $425,000 planning grant in January 2015. By January 2017, Louisville will complete a Transformation Plan for the Russell Neighborhood (including the Beecher Terrace public housing development). LMHA has hired EJP Consulting Group to serve as the Planning Coordinator for the planning process. Ultimately, the goals of the Transformation Plan will be to: transform Russell into a neighborhood of opportunity and choice; revitalize Beecher Terrace as part of an overall plan for improving the Russell Neighborhood; and attract investments to Russell to improve quality of life for residents.

  Choice Neighborhoods Planning grant funds CANNOT be used for demolition, relocation, or replacement housing. The Transformation Plan will examine options for redevelopment of the Beecher Terrace site. Any future redevelopment would require one-for-one replacement of any units that would be demolished. Also, displaced residents would be allowed to return either on-site or to off-site replacement housing as long as they were lease-compliant at the time of departure from the original site and remained lease-compliant during the relocation period (No work / income requirements are permitted.). In addition, Louisville would offer an admissions preference for returning residents for both on- and off-site replacement units.

- **Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization**
  LMHA received a $22 million HOPE VI grant to revitalize the Sheppard Square public housing development in FY 2010. The decades old development, which was built in 1942, suffered from inherent design deficiencies, as well as numerous operations failures. On-site, the new Sheppard Square will consist of public housing, low-income housing tax credit, and market rate units in a variety of housing types including single-family homes, semi-detached and row townhouses, and multi-family apartment buildings. Off-site, the public housing replacement units will include service-enriched units and single-family homes and apartments in mixed-income communities. All new construction will meet Energy Star standards and the Enterprise Communities Green Community criteria. As with Liberty Green and all subsequent revitalization plans that require demolition of existing public housing units, LMHA has committed to one-for-one replacement of the 326 public housing units formerly on the Sheppard Square site.

  As of June 30, 2015, demolition work had been completed at the site, and construction of the first rental phase (60 units) and one block of the second rental phase (46 units) had been completed.

- **Liberty Green (Clarksdale) HOPE VI Revitalization**
  In redeveloping the Clarksdale public housing development, LMHA has to date received a total of $40 million in Federal HUD HOPE VI Revitalization grant funds, obtained over $200 million in physical development leverage, and partnered with several for-profit and non-profit developers to create more than 1,900 public housing, low-income tax credit, market rate rental, and homeownership units. All the rental units included in the original Revitalization Plan are complete. Following the economic downturn, the site plan was revamped to respond to evolving market conditions, and the unit mix was shifted toward market rate rental. During FY 2015, a local developer continued construction of 173 market rate rental units in three buildings, a portion of which will be designated for students.

- **Redevelopment of the Friary**
  During FY 2015, LMHA continued holding units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA had used as public housing until a few years ago when the site was emptied because the structure is in need of comprehensive rehabilitation. As of May 30, 2015, LMHA had procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and LMHA will submit a disposition application to HUD for the Friary in FY 2016. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing.

Increase Housing Choice through Stronger Rental Communities and Options, and Expanded Homeownership Opportunities

Key FY 2015 initiatives included:

- **Green / Healthy Homes Initiatives**
  LMHA's strategy for improving the living environment of public housing families includes efforts to "be green" in regards to energy costs. Rising energy costs have made utility expenses a growing concern in overall housing affordability, and a significant portion of LMHA's operating budget. The Authority also incurs utility costs for units that are privately managed, such as Park DuValle and Liberty Green, and for those under lease in our HCV Program. Beyond the monetary impacts to

LMHA's budget, there are environmental and health benefits to be reaped from our greening efforts, including cleaner air and water.

During FY 2015, LMHA continued to explore ways to further enhance energy efficiency and site recycling initiatives. The recycling programs at Lourdes Hall and Avenue Plaza are fully operational; other sites are being considered. Also, Sheppard Square will have its own set of extensive green initiatives, including mandatory recycling and composting (which have already started); rain water retention, bio swales, and pervious pavers in the parking lots; photovoltaics; electric vehicle charging stations; a green roof; and four energy efficient / storm resistant houses. In addition to the Enterprise Green Community certification, LMHA is pursuing LEED Neighborhood certification for Sheppard Square, funded in part by a U.S. Green Building Council grant.

Another way LMHA is addressing the needs of low-income families is through its smoke-free initiative. While LMHA, the Louisville Metro Department of Health and Public Wellness, and their partners officially closed out the CDC-funded Community Transformation Grant (CTG) in September, 2014, LMHA will continue to work on its goal of making 16% of its housing stock smoke-free (approximately 550 units). To date, 106 completed units at Sheppard Square are smoke-free; all remaining 181 on-site Sheppard units will be smoke-free; and 27 units at other sites are smoke-free. LMHA has earmarked other sites to become smoke-free through attrition, including Will Seay Plaza, Lourdes Hall, St. Catherine Court, and St. Martins. Since September 2014, 102 residents at these sites and 256 residents at other sites have requested no-smoking unit designations. Over the course of the CTG grant period, LMHA also distributed grant funds to HCV Program landlords and management companies as financial incentives to create smoke-free units in the private market. LMHA has finalized another agreement with the Health Department that will provide up to $10,000 in additional incentives to other property owners and managers who are interested in making their properties smoke-free. The Health Department is also making some incentives available to LMHA residents who complete the Cooper Clayton smoking cessation classes.

Also, through a 2014 Carol Mount Peterson Grant, the LMHA will expand the St. Peter Claver Community Garden (located behind the Sheppard Square Management Office), and also create a "fitness garden" on the property for the use and enjoyment of Sheppard Square residents and the surrounding Smoketown community. These improvements will allow residents and neighbors alike to cultivate two of the components of healthy living: physical activity and access to fresh fruits and vegetables. The project will include the addition of 10 raised beds for a total of 33 garden plots; and it will contain 10 fitness stations positioned along a walking path that connects to a newly designated "Mayor's Mile" within the footprint of Sheppard Square. The fitness garden will also have a large, multi-purpose lawn area for activities such as yoga, tai-chi, and other group fitness classes, and up cycled playground equipment for children.

- **Community and Resident Safety**
  Promoting the safety and security of public housing residents is of the utmost concern to the LMHA. During FY 2015, LMHA received $250,000 through HUD's Capital Fund Emergency Safety and Security Program to fund safety improvements at Dosker Manor Building A. The grant funds will allow the agency to purchase and install locks and lighting; replace the entry system; and relocate the security station in this high-rise tower, which serves elderly and/or disabled households.

II. General Housing Authority Operating 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**
N/A	0	0	N/A
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
0	0

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 *
0	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
0	0

Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year
Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization: In 2010, LMHA was awarded a HOPE VI grant for the revitalization of Sheppard Square, a 326-unit family development. The revitalization effort, which includes a mix of market rate, tax-credit and public housing rental units, as well as homeownership opportunities, is occurring in a series of phases. By FYE 2015, construction of the first rental phase (60 units) and one block of the second rental phase (46 units) had been completed. As with all redevelopment efforts subsequent to the Park DuValle HOPE VI Revitalization, LMHA is committed to one-for-one replacement of the 326 public housing units razed at Sheppard. In FY 2012, LMHA received approval from HUD to acquire existing, off-site scattered-site units to replace a portion of the units that were demolished at Sheppard Square. By FYE 2014, 21 off-site public housing replacement units had been acquired. No off-site public housing replacement units were acquired during FY 2015. LMHA plans to acquire approximately 25 off-site replacement units during FY 2016.
Stoddard Johnston: Stoddard Johnston is a Mixed-Finance initiative between Family Scholar House and the Louisville Metro Housing Authority. LMHA intends to acquire 4 units of public housing at the site. This project did not close during FY 2015; LMHA expects it will close during FY 2016.
Wilart Arms (KY 1-22): Wilart Arms Apartments (formerly known as Hallmark Plaza Apartments) is a Mixed-Finance initiative between the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC), LMHA, the Housing Partnership, Inc. (HPI), and HUD'S Federal Housing Administration Office of Multifamily Housing. The property is a 66-unit multi-family complex located off Dixie Highway in the Shively community. In 2007, the owners of Wilart Arms were delinquent on their loan. Also, the building had fallen into severe disrepair, and had been placed on HUD's troubled Multifamily Assets listing. In an effort to prevent the property from going into foreclosure and to preserve the housing complex, including project based Section 8, KHC reached out to Multifamily Housing for a possible solution. The solution was modeled on the work of other jurisdictions where such properties had been disposed of to the local Public Housing Agency. KHC's proposal – a cooperative effort among KHC, LMHA and HPI – was approved by Multifamily Housing and closed on April 29, 2010 with all participants except for LMHA. Under the approved proposal, HPI would renovate the site, reduce the density (originally 100 units), and own and manage the property. LMHA would acquire the use of 15 units through Mixed-Finance development. LMHA and Wilart Arms Apartments, LLLP (Owner) would enter into a Regulatory and Operating Agreement and a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants would be recorded in favor of HUD. With Board approval, LMHA agreed to fund a $1,016,678 Promissory Note, for which the owner is obligated to house public housing eligible residents in 15 units (2 one-bedroom units, 10 two-bedroom units and 3 three-bedroom units). Two of the units are also be accessible to persons with hearing and/or visual impairments. Of the remaining 51 units at Wilart Arms, 11 units are under the Tax Credit Assistance Program and 40 units are under the Project Based Section 8 Program. This project did not close in FY 2015; LMHA expects it will close during FY 2016.
KY 1-34 Scattered Sites: During FY 2015, LMHA continued holding units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA had used as public housing until a few years ago when the site was emptied because the structure is in need of comprehensive rehabilitation. As of May 30, 2015, LMHA had procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and LMHA is preparing a disposition application for submittal to the SAC in FYE 2016. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing.
Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year
The following projects were either completed or underway during fiscal year 2015: **Scattered Sites KY 1-056, KY 1-038, KY1-034, KY 1-024 and KY1-017** 601 W. Breckinridge roof replacement Restore Noltemeyer fire damaged unit 1529 W. St. Catherine Court interior renovation St. Martin's basement renovation 1518 and 1529 W. Magazine Street siding replacement 518 E. Breckinridge Street fire damage **KY1-014 Avenue Plaza/550 Apartments** Avenue Plaza elevator lobby HVAC upgrade **KY1-003 Parkway Place** Community center and daycare renovations **KY1-005 Iroquois Homes** Selective site demolition, including asbestos abatement at gymnasium, maintenance office, and community center **KY1-002 Beecher Terrace** Baxter Community Center renovation **Other** Green Physical Needs Assessment

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	**21**	In 2013, LMHA acquired full ownership of all rental units constructed through Phase I of the Park DuValle HOPE VI Revitalization, including 59 public housing units, 21 tax credit units, and 20 market rate units.
Market Rate	**20**	Same as above
Other	**83**	The Louisville Metro Housing Authority Development Corp. (formerly Louisville Housing Services) developed affordable condominium homeownership, providing construction, financing, and property management expertise. LMHADC (using LMHA staff) continues to manage the condominium regime for each of the following sites: HPP I (36 units); HPP II (15 units); HPP III (20 units); and Parkland Place (12 units).
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	124	

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

If Other, please describe:	Most of the funding for the developments was in debt with local banks. The developments were also partially funded by City HOME Fund loans at a reduced 3% rate, over 20 years ago.

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 **	2	3
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	2	3

* 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 ***	24	36
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	24	36

During FY 2015, LMHA implemented a new Local Non-Traditional activity in partnership with YouthBuild Louisville to house up to three low-income program participants who are experiencing homelessness. The impact of this new activity was not factored into the "Planned" unit months occupied / leased estimate.

*** 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

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

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015*	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	0	0	0	1.21	1.74	X	X	X
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	0	X	X	1.21	1.74	X	X	X
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	0	X	X	100	100	X	X	X

* As Frazier Rehab subleases 2 public housing units whether or not they are occupied, when looked at by unit month, the number of households served (0.74) is less than the number of units leased (2), as shown in the previous tables. Because YouthBuild Louisville only subleases units when they are occupied, the number of households served (1) is equal to the number of units leased (1).

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

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

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	2496	54	0	2550	54.89
2 Person	555	33	0	588	12.66
3 Person	689	32	0	721	15.52
4 Person	436	22	0	458	9.86
5 Person	158	20	0	178	3.83
6+ Person	137	14	0	151	3.25
Totals	4471	175	0	4646	100

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized	"Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW" and "Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW" come from the Housing Authority of Louisville's MTW application, which was prepared in 1997. The application reported household size data in the following categories: 1-2 people, 3-4 people, and 5+ people. For purposes of this report, the historic data was prorated, in order to conform with the categories above, based on the characteristics of the 2014 population of households served. In 2003, the Housing Authority of Louisville (HAL) merged with the Housing Authority of Jefferson County (HAJC) to form LMHA. Though the original agencies' Public Housing and Section 8 programs were merged that year, demographic information (by household size) is not available for the families who were then served by HAJC, and is not represented above.

Mix of Family Sizes Served

	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	54.89	12.66	15.52	9.86	3.83	3.25	100.01
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	5470	2458	2354	1632	909	683	13506
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	40.50	18.20	17.43	12.08	6.73	5.06	100.0
Percentage Change	-26.22%	43.76%	12.31%	22.52%	75.72%	55.69%	100.00%

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages	Unlike with the MTW Baseline Project (HUD Notice PIH 2013-02), HUD has not fully articulated a methodology for monitoring and evaluating compliance with the MTW objective to serve substantially the same mix of families by family size. LMHA will investigate changes to demographics, housing stock, and policies that may explain the variations from the baseline percentages, as shown above, and will report justifications and explanations for family size variations of over 5% from the baseline percentages once HUD has published a methodology for monitoring and evaluating compliance with this objective.

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

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

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

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

Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End	
Housing Program	**Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions**
Public Housing (Scattered Sites)	LMHA has been experiencing vacancies in its Public Housing Scattered Sites, in particular in AMP KY001000034, which includes units at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA used as public housing until a few years ago when the site was emptied because the structure is in need of comprehensive rehabilitation. As of May 30, 2015, LMHA has procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and LMHA is preparing a disposition application for submittal to HUD in FY 2016. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing.
Public Housing (Mixed-Population Developments, including: Dosker Manor, St. Catherine Court, Will E. Seay Plaza, Avenue Plaza	LMHA had been experiencing lower than normal occupancy rates at many of its mixed population high-rises; therefore, LMHA used its MTW authority to locally reduce the age of elderly to 55. Subsequently, occupancy rates significantly improved at all sites, although occupancy rates at Dosker Manor did not reach levels deemed acceptable by LMHA. As a result, LMHA began offering lease-up incentives at this site. During FY 2015, the agency was awarded Emergency Safety and Security Grants annual funding, and security upgrades will be made at the Dosker Manor site during FY 2016. LMHA will continue to consider if an official elderly and/or disabled-only designation of one or more buildings at the site is appropriate.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program	LMHA has been experiencing lower than normal leasing rates in its HCV Program. Strategies to increasing leasing include: absorbing incoming ports; accepting new families off the waiting list; accepting homeless veteran and Special Referral Program referrals; and hiring new staff for vacant positions including Housing Specialists, Rental Assistance Monitors, and Housing Clerk Typists. In addition, Metro Government is currently in the process of hiring two additional housing inspectors, who will be dedicated to HCV units. This will reduce the average number of days it takes to complete initial inspections, allowing units to be added to the HCV Program more quickly.

Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End		
Activity Name/#	**Number of Households Transitioned ***	**Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency**
#9-2007 (Term Limits / Employment Requirements for Scattered Sites) & #21-2010 (Mandatory Case Management)	48	The ability to obtain and maintain suitable employment
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A
Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	0	* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	48	

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 Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide	17455	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community-Wide	3851	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site-Based	2331	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Program Specific	184	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units / Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Merged / Program Specific	881	Open	No
Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program	Program Specific	0	Open	No

More can be added if needed.

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

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

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

N/A
N/A
N/A

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

LMHA has two local, non-traditional MTW activities. One subleases two units at the Liberty Green Community Center to low-income, Frazier Rehab spinal cord injury out-patients. The other subleases up to three public housing units to YouthBuild Louisville for homeless program participants.
N/A
N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

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

In April 2015, LMHA's Board adopted the following changes to the admissions preferences used in the HCV Program, which have since been implemented:

1. Clarified that the preference for LMHA HCV Homeownership Program graduates who now need HCV assistance again, is only available to families who still own and reside in the formerly assisted unit.
2. Added a new preference for families that include a homeless veteran.
3. Added a new preference to provide tenant-based HCV assistance to VASH families that no longer require case management.

In April 2015, LMHA's Board adopted the following changes to the admissions preferences used in the Public Housing Program, which will be implemented effective January 1, 2016:

1. Clarified preferences for former Clarksdale and Sheppard Square residents to correctly reflect that this preference applies to all rental units built through the Revitalization efforts, not just to on-site units.
2. Added a new preference for families that include a homeless veteran.
3. Implemented a new, weighted preference system. Previously, all preferences were weighted equally. The new system will house families in the following order (listed from those housed first to those housed last):

a. Housed First: Former Clarksdale and former Sheppard Square residents.

b. Families that include a homeless veteran.

c. Families that qualify for any other preference: participants graduating from YouthBuild; working families applying for a 3-bedroom, scattered-site, single-family detached house; an involuntarily displaced family; a family residing in substandard housing; a family paying more than 50% of gross income for rent and/or utilities; a family displaced as a result of physical violence; or a homeless applicant who is not a homeless veteran.

d. Housed Last: Families that do not qualify for any waiting list preference.

III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested

All activities proposed in the FY 2015 Plan that were granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as “Approved Activities.”

IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted

This section of the Annual Report describes approved MTW activities. It includes a brief description, anticipated changes, and any new metrics and baselines for each activity. Activities are organized by status:

A. Implemented;
B. Not yet implemented;
C. On hold; and
D. Closed out.

A. Implemented MTW Activities

For each previously approved and implemented activity, LMHA has provided:

1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;
2) A description of the activity, information on its impact, and an update on its status;
3) A description of any benchmarks that were not achieved;
4) A description of any metrics that have been revised; and
5) A description of any changes to the data collection methodology.

Within this Report, implemented MTW activities have been grouped by topic area as follows:

- A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments
- A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)
- A.3 HUD/MDRC HCV Rent Reform Demonstration
- A.4 Occupancy Criteria for New Scattered Sites
- A.5 Public Housing Development
- A.6 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities
- A.7 Local Leased Housing Program
- A.8 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments

LMHA had experienced decreasing occupancy rates at several of its elderly/disabled sites for many years, with an average occupancy rate of 90.8% in FY 2008. Through a combination of MTW initiatives implemented beginning that year, LMHA has increased occupancy across these sites to an average of 95.0% at the end of FY 2015. Higher occupancy rates improve LMHA's operating revenues (which achieves greater cost effectiveness federal expenditures), and increase housing choices for 0- and 1-bedroom qualified applicants age 55 to 61.

ACTIVITY #10-2008: Local Definition of Elderly

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #10-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. *Description and Impact*
   This activity allows LMHA to use the following local definition of elderly: any family whose Head of Household, Cohead, or Spouse is age 55 or above. LMHA had been experiencing decreased occupancy rates at its elderly/disabled-only high-rises prior to adopting a local definition of elderly for these communities. The MTW age criterion is used to determine eligibility for residency at Dosker Manor, Avenue Plaza, Lourdes Hall, Will E. Seay Plaza (formerly Bishop Lane Plaza), and Saint Catherine Court.

   Opening up these sites to non-disabled families between ages 55 and 61 has raised occupancy rates and increased the pool of 1-bedroom and efficiency units available to these applicants. While these sites had an average occupancy rate of 90.8% when this activity was implemented in FY 2008, at the end of FY 2015, the average occupancy rate was 95.0%. Higher occupancy rates improve the agency's operating revenues and maximize the cost effectiveness of federal funding.

   This activity was implemented in FY 2008; it is on schedule.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Housing Choice #4: Displacement Prevention				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
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: Families whose HoH, Cohead or Spouse is age 55+ that would like to live at the sites covered by the activity.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2007: 0	0	0	Meets benchmark.
	Annual *number* of households at each site losing assistance/moving prior to implementation.	Expected *number* of households at each site losing assistance/moving 7/1/14 thru 6/30/15.	Actual *number* of households at each site losing assistance/moving 7/1/14 thru 6/30/15.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households able to move to a *better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). *Better unit is defined as a unit at one of the sites covered by the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2007: 0	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	41	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
	Prior to implementation, *number* of non-disabled families where HoH, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, and neither the HoH, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61.	Expected *number* of non-disabled families where HoH, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, and neither the HoH, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 that move into a covered site between 7/1/14 & 6/30/15.	Actual *number* of non-disabled families where HoH, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, and neither the HoH, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 that moved into a covered site between 7/1/14 & 6/30/15.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
N/A. This is not a rent reform activity.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
N/A. This activity has proven effective, and all benchmarks have been met.

4. *Revised Metrics*
N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #23-2010: Lease-Up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
Activity #23-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010.

2. *Description*
This activity provides lease-up incentives to new residents at Dosker Manor, an elderly/disabled high-rise located in downtown Louisville. New residents receive a waiver of the initial deposit and the first month's rent free.

Before the initiative's implementation in FY 2010, occupancy at Dosker Manor had consistently averaged below 90% for some time. In FY 2009, the year before implementation, occupancy was 87%. At the end of FY 2015, occupancy at this site was 94%.

This activity was implemented in FY 2010; it is on schedule.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2013:[1] $1,212,767	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$1,441,884	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
	Annual rental revenue from Dosker Manor households prior to implementation	Expected gross annual rental revenue at Dosker Manor between 7/1/14 & 6/30/15	Actual gross rental revenue from Dosker Manor households between 7/1/14 & 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2013 is the earliest year for which data is available.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
N/A. This is not a rent reform activity.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
N/A. No FY 2015 benchmarks were established. Since implementation of this activity in FY 2010, Dosker Manor occupancy has consistently been higher than pre-implementation. For this reason, LMHA considers this initiative to be effective.

4. *Revised Metrics*
N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)

The MTW Demonstration also allows LMHA to rethink other policies – like the rent policy for the Public Housing and HCV programs – to encourage families to work towards housing self-sufficiency. Alternate rent structures also ease the burden on residents and the agency. As part of LMHA's rent reform goals, the Authority will continue to use HUD's Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) System in its day-to-day operations.

ACTIVITY #32-2012: Elimination of the Mandatory Earned Income Disregard

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #32-2012 was proposed and approved in FY 2012. It was implemented in the HCV Program in FY 2012 and in the Public Housing Program in FY 2014.

2. *Description and Impact*
   The Earned Income Disregard (EID) allows tenants who have been out of work to accept a job without having their rent increase right away. During the first year of employment, all earnings are excluded from the calculation of the tenant's rent. During the second year of employment, only half of the tenant's earnings are excluded from this calculation. A tenant may only benefit from the EID for a maximum of 48 months during their lifetime.

   <u>HCV Program</u>
   This activity was implemented on schedule in the HCV program in FY 2012.[1] The 15 families actively taking advantage of the EID benefit at that time were allowed to continue receiving the disregard under the rules applicable to traditional PHAs. During FY 2012, the Housing Authority saved $391 in administrative costs by eliminating the calculation of EID, and annual rent revenue increased by approximately $7,646. Full savings from the activity were not realized that year, as some families continued to receive the EID (Over the course of the year, the number of households receiving the EID decreased from 15 to 5).

   By the end of FY 2014, no HCV program households were receiving the EID, saving the agency $447 in administrative costs and increasing annual rent revenue by approximately $23,246 when compared to the FY 2011 benchmark. These savings continued into FY 2015.

   <u>Public Housing Program</u>
   LMHA stopped processing the EID for newly-eligible families in the Public Housing program as of April 1, 2014. At baseline, 62 households were receiving the EID. Annual administrative costs to the agency were $2,154, and the agency forewent approximately $93,300 in annual rent revenue.

   By June 30, 2015, only 10 families were receiving the EID, saving the Housing Authority $1,807 in administrative costs, and increasing annual rent revenue by $72,213 when compared to benchmark.

---

[1] Under MTW activity #6-2008, elderly families, whose only other source of income (in addition to earnings from employment) is their Social Security entitlement, are eligible for a $7,500 annual EID. These families are excluded from activity #32-2012.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: $447 (15 households * $29.80)	$0 (0 households * $0)	$0 (0 households * $0)	Meets benchmark
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014:[1] $2,154 (62 households *$34.74)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY 2015 Plan	$347 (10 households *$34.74)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average cost per household to track/calculate annually prior to implementation	Anticipated number of households that will receive EID *multiplied by* the average anticipated cost per household to track/calculate annually as of 6/30/15	Actual number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the actual average cost per household to calculate/track annually as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: 20.1 hours (15 households * 1.34 hours)	0 hours (0 households * 0 hours)	0 hours (0 households * 0 hours)	Meets benchmark
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014:[1] 65.1 hours (62 households * 1.05 hours)	N/A. No benchmark included in FY 2015 Plan	10.5 hours (10 households * 1.05 hours)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually prior to implementation	Expected number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually as of 6/30/15	Actual households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). The task is tracking/calculating a household's TTP according to the Mandatory EID rules.	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: Not tracked	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A (EID no longer calculated)
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014:[1] Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Average error rate, as a *percentage*, of tracking/calculating household TTP according to EID rules prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a *percentage*, of tracking/calculating household TTP according to EID rules as of 6/30/15	Actual error rate, as a *percentage*, of tracking/calculating household TTP as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Staff logs; Emphasys				

[1] Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: Not tracked[1]	$23,246	$23,246	Meets benchmark.
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014:[2] $93,300	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan	$72,213	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Gross annual rent revenue foregone from households receiving EID prior to implementation	Expected increase in annual rent revenue during FY 2015 due to elimination of EID	Actual increase in annual rent revenue during FY 2015 due to elimination of EID	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

[1] Although the sum of annual rent revenue from families receiving the EID prior to implementation is not available, the Housing Authority did track the amount of annual income disregarded through the EID policy in FY 2011 ($77,487). Assuming approximately 30% of this amount would have been contributed to the tenant's annual rent, the agency forewent approximately $23,246 in rent revenue.

[2] Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
No hardship requests were received during FY 2015.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
N/A. All HCV program metrics were achieved. No FY 2015 benchmarks were established for the Public Housing program.

4. *Revised Metrics*
N/A. No metrics were revised.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
N/A. There were no changes to data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #8-2008: Standard Medical Deduction

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
Activity #8-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. *Description and Impact*
Under this activity, disabled and elderly families in both the Public Housing and HCV programs are eligible to receive a $1,600 standard medical deduction. Families electing the deduction do not have to furnish documentation of medical expenses, such as bills, receipts, records of payment, dates of trips, mileage log, or receipts for fares and tolls. The standard medical deduction is not mandatory; if the families' health care costs exceed the $1,600 exemption, the family can choose to have their expenses itemized.

This activity continued to result in administrative cost savings during FY 2015. Foregoing the verification of medical expenses for the 5,020 households that took the standard medical deduction resulted in savings of $45,343.

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[1]	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of verifying household medical expenses and calculating household medical deductions in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2009: $29,714 (3,529 households * $8.42)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$27,982 (3,446 households * $8.12)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2009: $5,246 (623 * $8.42)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$17,361 (1,574 households * $11.03)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric

	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY 2009: $34,960 ($29,714 in HCV+ $5,246 in Public Housing)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$45,343 ($27,982 in HCV + $17,361 in Public Housing)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Number of households receiving the itemized medical deduction *multiplied by* the average cost per household to calculate/verify medical expenses annually prior to implementation	Anticipated number of households receiving the standard medical deduction *multiplied by* the average cost savings per household to use the standard deduction during FY 2015	Actual number of households receiving the standard medical deduction *multiplied by* the average cost savings per household to use the standard deduction during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available. Staff cost averages hourly rate with benefits for HCV Specialist and Public Housing Service Specialist ($25.25 / hour).

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete verifications of medical expenses and calculations of medical deduction in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2009: 1,176 hours (3,529 households * 0.33 hours)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	1,149 hours (3,446 households * 0.33 hours)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2009: 208 hours (623 households * 0.33 hours)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	525 hours (1,574 households * 0.33 hours)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY 2009: 1,384 hours (1,176 hours in HCV + 208 hours in Public Housing)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	1,674 hours (1,149 hours in HCV + 525 hours in Public Housing)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Number of households receiving the itemized medical deduction *multiplied by* the average staff time required per household to calculate/verify medical expenses annually before implementation	Anticipated number of households receiving the standard medical deduction *multiplied by* the average staff time savings per use the standard medical deduction during FY 2015	Actual number of households receiving the standard medical deduction *multiplied by* the average staff time savings per use the standard medical deduction during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error	Average error rate of	Expected average error	Actual average error rate	Whether the

rate in completing the calculation of a household's medical deduction, as a percentage (decrease).	task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Average error rate, as a *percentage*, of calculating a household's medical deduction prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a *percentage*, of calculating a household's medical deduction as of 6/30/15	Actual error rate, as a *percentage*, of calculating a household's medical deduction as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$12,234,144	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$3,243,984	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$15,478,128 ($12,234,144 in HCV + $3,243,984 in Public Housing)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Sum of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households receiving medical deductions prior to implementation	Expected *sum* of gross (net) annual rental revenue from households receiving standard medical deductions as of 6/30/15	Actual *sum* of gross (net) annual rental revenue from households receiving standard medical deductions as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were made during FY 2015. Thirty-two families in the HCV program and 13 families in the Public Housing program with medical expenses exceeding $1,600 chose to have their medical expenses itemized.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
   N/A. No benchmarks were established for this activity in the FY 2015 Annual Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*
   N/A. No metrics were revised.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. No changes have been made to the data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #4-2007: Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #4-2007 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. *Description and Impact*
   This activity allows LMHA to conduct a re-certification of elderly and disabled families in the Public Housing and HCV programs once every two years instead of annually.

   In the HCV program, eligible households receive a full reexamination every odd numbered fiscal year. In even numbered years, families are required to complete a mini-recertification packet, which they return to the agency by mail. In the Public Housing program, each year 50% of eligible families receive a full reexamination of eligibility on the anniversary of their lease-up date.

   This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008. Originally, the only households eligible for biennial recertifications were elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+. The activity was significantly amended in FY 2012 to include all disabled families, and HCV staff began conducting biennial recertifications for all disabled families that year. The expanded activity has not yet been implemented in the Public Housing program. The required changes were made to the agency's ACOP during FY 2014, and the new policy will be implemented beginning with recertifications that have an effective date of October 1, 2015.

   As FY 2015 was an odd numbered fiscal year, LMHA conducted full recertifications for all elderly and disabled families in the HCV Program. For this reason, no savings were realized in the HCV Program during FY 2015.

   In the Public Housing program during FY 2015, the agency spent $14,743 to conduct full reexaminations of 594 of the 1,023 households that were either elderly families or disabled families where the head, co-head, and/or spouse was age 55+. Had LMHA done a full reexamination of all 1,023 of these Public Housing families, the cost would have been $25,391. Thus, this activity produced $10,648 in administrative cost savings in the Public Housing program during the fiscal year.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**

Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2008:[1] $65,801 (2,607 full recertifications * $25.24)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$87,246 (3,583 full recertifications * $24.35)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2008:[2] $33,847 (1,788 households *$18.93)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$14,743 (594 full recertifications * $24.82)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2008: $99,648 ($65,801 in HCV + $33,847 in Public Housing)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$101,989 ($87,246 in HCV + $14,743 in Public Housing)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Number of recertifications of eligible families *multiplied by* the average cost to conduct a recertification prior to implementation	Expected number of recertifications of eligible families during FY 2015 *multiplied by* the average cost per recertification	Actual number of recertifications of eligible families during FY 2015 *multiplied by* the average cost per recertification	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs.				

[1] FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 919 mini-recertifications were conducted that year. However, in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2012 to include all disabled families. Baseline estimates cost of doing a full recertification for all FY 2008 families that would have been eligible for current, expanded activity as follows: 1 hour per household * $25.24 per staff hour * 2,607 households (919 households eligible for activity in FY 2008 + 1,688 disabled households that would have been eligible under current expanded activity).

[2] FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 894 full reexaminations were conducted that year. Assuming twice as many families would have been reexamined had the activity not been in place, the baseline has been estimated as follows: 1,788 households * 0.75 hours per household * $24.90 per staff hour.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2008:[1] 2,607 hours (2,607 recertifications * 1 hour)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	3,583 hours (3,583 full recertifications * 1.0 hours)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2008:[2] 1,341 hours (1,788 full recertifications *0.75 hours)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	446 hours (594 full recertifications * 0.75 hours)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2008: 3,948 hours (2,607 hours in	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015	4,029 hours (3,583 hours in HCV + 446	N/A. No benchmark set for

	HCV + 1,341 hours in Public Housing)	Plan	hours in Public Housing)	this metric
	Number of recertifications of eligible families *multiplied by* the average staff time required per recertification before activity implementation	Expected number of recertifications of eligible families during FY 2015 *multiplied by* the average staff time required per recertification	Actual number of recertifications of eligible families during FY 2015 *multiplied by* the average staff time required per recertification	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 919 mini-recertifications were conducted that year. However, in FY 2008, only elderly families and families where head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2012 to include all disabled families. Baseline estimates total hours of staff time required to conduct a full recertification for all FY 2008 families that would have been eligible for current, expanded activity as follows: 1 hour per household * 2,607 households (919 elderly households eligible for activity in FY 2008 + 1,688 disabled households that would have been eligible under current expanded activity).

[2] FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 894 full reexaminations were conducted that year. Assuming twice as many families would have been reexamined had the activity not been in place, baseline estimates staff time as follows: 1,788 households * 0.75 hours per household.

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$12,948,984	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$2,715,240	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$15,664,224 ($12,948,984 in HCV + $2,715,240 in Public Housing)	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Gross annual rent revenue from eligible households prior to implementation	Expected gross annual rent revenue from eligible households as of 6/30/15	Actual gross annual rent revenue from eligible households as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were made during FY 2015. Elderly (55+) and/or disabled families that experience a loss of income or an increase in expenses between biennial recertifications may request an interim reexamination.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. No benchmarks were established for this activity in the FY 2015 Annual Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*
   N/A. No metrics were revised.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. No changes have been made to the data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #6-2008: Earned Income Disregard for Elderly HCV Families

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #6-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. *Description and Impact*
   This activity provides a $7,500 earned income disregard to elderly families in the HCV program who's only other sources of income (in addition to earnings from employment) are Social Security entitlements.

   During FY 2015, four elderly HCV households took advantage of the EID, and a total of $14,751 of earned income was disregarded. Assuming these families would have paid approximately 30% of these earnings in rent, these families retained a total of $4,425 in additional income that otherwise would have gone to rent payments. In addition, LMHA did not have to verify earned income for these four families, producing $24.35 in administrative cost savings.

   This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008. Baseline data for the year prior to implementation (FY 2007) is not available. Baseline data is as of the earliest year for which data is available, FY 2009.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**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 after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	FY 2009: $5,651	$5,000	$3,688	Outcome does not meet benchmark. See section 3 below for explanation.
	Average gross annual earned income from the number of eligible HCV households before implementation	Expected average gross annual earned income from the number of eligible HCV households as of 6/30/15	Actual average gross annual earned income from the number of eligible HCV households as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC				

[1] FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[1&2]	**Benchmark**[2]	**Outcome**[2]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	**As of FY 2009:** 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(2) Employed Part-Time	**As of FY 2009:** 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	**As of FY 2009:** 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	**As of FY 2009:** 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(5) Unemployed	**As of FY 2009:** 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(6) Other	**As of FY 2009:** 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

[2] HUD's instructions indicate that baseline, benchmark, and outcome numbers should include the "percentage of total work-able households" in each category. LMHA does not consider elderly families to be "work-able" households.

Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[1&2]	**Benchmark**[2]	**Outcome**[2]	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2009: 0	0	0	Meets benchmark.
	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services as of 6/30/2015	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services as of 6/30/2015	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.
[2] Elderly and disabled families are excluded from LMHA's definition of "households transitioned to self sufficiency" as these households are not considered "work-able." Since these households by definition cannot transition to self-sufficiency, they are not considered to receive services that promote self sufficiency.

Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1&2]**	**Benchmark[2]**	**Outcome[2]**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0	0	0	Meets benchmark.
	Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency annually prior to implementation	Anticipated number of households transitioned to self sufficiency during FY 2015	Actual number of households transitioned to self sufficiency during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.
[2] Elderly and disabled families are excluded from LMHA's definition of "households transitioned to self sufficiency" as these households are not considered "work-able."

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2009: $102.16 (16 households * $6.39)	$59.20 (10 households * $5.92)	$24.35 (4 households * $6.09)	Outcome exceeds benchmark. Fewer households used EID than expected, resulting in lower total cost to calculate / track EID
	Number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average cost per household to track/calculate annually prior to implementation	Anticipated number of households that will receive EID *multiplied by* the average anticipated cost per household to track/calculate annually as of 6/30/15	Actual number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the actual average cost per household to calculate/track annually as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2009: 4 hours (16 households * 0.25 hours)	2.5 hours (10 households * 0.25 hours)	1 hour (4 households * 0.25 hours)	Outcome exceeds benchmark. Fewer households used EID than expected, resulting in less staff time to calculate / track EID
	Number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually prior to implementation	Expected number of households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually as of 6/30/15	Actual households receiving EID *multiplied by* the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**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.
	FY 2009: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. No benchmark set for this metric
	Average error rate, as a *percentage*, of tracking/calculating household TTP according to EID rules prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a *percentage*, of tracking/calculating household TTP according to EID rules as of 6/30/15	Actual error rate, as a *percentage*, of tracking/calculating household TTP as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Staff logs				

[1] FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2009: Not	N/A. No benchmark	$24,756	N/A. No benchmark

	tracked	included in FY2015 Plan		set for metric
	Gross annual rent revenue from households receiving EID prior to implementation	Gross annual rental revenue from households no longer receiving EID as of 6/30/15	Gross annual rental revenue from households no longer receiving EID as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

[1] Although the sum of annual rent revenue from families eligible for the activity in FY 2009 is not available, the Housing Authority did track the amount of annual income disregarded through the EID policy that year ($90,420). Assuming approximately 30% of this amount would have been contributed to the tenant's annual rent, the agency forewent approximately $27,126 in rent revenue.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were made during FY 2015. Activity cannot adversely affect eligible households

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income

LMHA anticipated that the average earned income of elderly HCV households taking advantage of the EID during FY 2015 would be $5,000. In fact, earned income averaged $3,688. However, of the 4 households benefiting from the EID, half earned less than $5,000 and half earned more than this amount with earned income ranging from $180 to $6,379. Given the small sample size and the fact that half of affected households earned more than the benchmark, LMHA does not believe that this outcome indicates reduced effectiveness of the activity.

4. *Revised Metrics*

N/A. No metrics were revised.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. There have been no changes to the data collection methodology.

A.3 HUD/MDRC HVC Rent Reform Demonstration

LMHA was selected to participate in a HUD-commissioned study to evaluate an alternative HCV rent reform policy (the "Study"). MDRC, a nonprofit and nonpartisan education and social policy research organization, is conducting the Study on behalf of HUD. The Study sets forth alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies that have been implemented at several Public Housing Agencies (PHA) across the country in order to fully test the policies nationally.

The goals of this alternative rent policy are to:

- Create a stronger financial incentive for tenants to work and advance toward self-sufficiency
- Simplify the administration of the HCV Program
- Reduce housing agency administrative burden and costs
- Improve accuracy and compliance of program administration
- Remain cost neutral or generate savings in HAP expenditures relative to expenditures under current rules
- Improve transparency of the program requirements

Study participants for both the Alternative Rent Group and the Control Group were randomly selected from the eligible voucher programs by a computer generated program. The Alternative Rent Group vouchers (approximately 1,000 vouchers) are being managed using the proposed policies. The Control Group vouchers (also approximately 1,000 vouchers) are being managed using the LMHA's standard policies.

Only vouchers administered under the MTW Program are eligible for the Study. Non-MTW Vouchers (i.e., Veterans Assisted Special Housing, Moderate Rehabilitation, and Shelter Plus Care), Enhanced Vouchers, and HUD Project Based Vouchers are excluded from the Study. In addition, households receiving a biennial certification were not eligible for Study selection.

The Study is focused on work-able populations, and does not include Elderly Households, Disabled Households, and households headed by people older than 56 years of age (who will become seniors during the course of the long-term study). Households utilizing the childcare expense deduction for purposes of determining adjusted annual income, as well as households participating in Family Self Sufficiency and Homeownership programs, were not eligible for Study selection.

In addition, households that contain a mix of members: 1) with an immigration status that is eligible for housing assistance, and 2) with an immigration status that is non-eligible for housing assistance, are not included in the Study.

Finally, households receiving case management or supportive services through one of the Housing Authority's MTW Special Referral Programs are not eligible to participate in the Study.

Households selected for the Alternative Rent Group receive an opportunity to meet with an LMHA Housing Specialist to review the Study and their specific calculation of Total Tenant Payments under both the traditional and Study policies. They then have a period of 30 days to consider whether to select to be excluded from the Study.

ACTIVITY #43-2015: HUD / MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration for HCV Households

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #43-2015 was proposed, approved, and implemented in FY 2015.

2. *Description and Impact*

The Study is designed to test an alternative strategy to standard HUD operating rules for the HCV Program. The alternative rent policies include the following five key features:

1) Simplify income determination and rent calculation of the household's Total Tenant Payment (TTP) and subsidy amount by:
   a) Eliminating deductions and allowances;
   b) Changing the percent of income from 30% of adjusted income to a maximum of 28% of gross income;
   c) Ignoring income from assets when the total household asset value is less than $25,000;
   d) Using retrospective income, i.e., 12-month "look-back" period and, in some cases, current/anticipated income in estimating a household's TTP and subsidy; and
   e) Capping the maximum initial rent burden at 40% of current gross monthly income.

2) Conduct triennial income recertification rather than annual recertification with provisions for interim recertification and hardship remedies if income decreases.

3) Streamline interim certifications to eliminate income review for most household composition changes and moves to new units.

4) Require the Tenant Rent to Owner is the greater of TTP (see #1 above) or the minimum rent of $50. A portion of the Family Share will be paid directly to the landlord.

5) Simplify the policy for determining utility allowances.

Additionally, the Study offers appropriate hardship protections to prevent any Alternative Rent Group member from being unduly impacted as discussed in Section 2.i below.

Descriptions of the Five Key Rent Reform Demonstration Features
(Applicable Only to Alternate Rent Group Members)

1) **Simplified Income Determination and Rent Calculation**

   Under the current HUD regulations, the TTP is a calculation derived from 30% of the voucher household's adjusted monthly income (gross income less HUD prescribed exclusions, deductions, and allowances). LMHA follows a process of interviewing the household to identify all sources of income and assets, then proceeds to verify the information and perform the final calculation. The process is complex and cumbersome, which increases the risk of errors. According to HUD's *Occupancy Handbook*, Chapter 5 "Determining Income and Calculating Rent," the most frequent errors found across PHAs are: Voucher holders failing to fully disclose income information; errors in identifying required income exclusions; and incorrect calculations of deductions often resulting from failure to obtain third-party verification. The complexity makes the HCV program less transparent and understandable by the public, landlords, and voucher holders.

   a) Elimination of Deductions

      The calculation of deductions and allowances in the determination of annual income has been eliminated.

b) Percent Annual Gross Income.
The TTP rent calculation is determined by establishing gross annual income and then determining the greater of 28% of the gross annual income or the minimum rent of $50.

c) Elimination of Income from Assets when household total value less than $25,000
The verification and calculation of income earned from household assets with total value less than $25,000 has been eliminated. Households are not required to document assets worth less than that amount. This reduces administrative costs and simplifies the program for greater transparency and program compliance.

d) Review of Retrospective Income
To establish annual gross income for the three year certification period, LMHA reviews the total household income without deductions for a 12-month period prior to recertification, i.e., the "Retrospective Income." A household's TTP depends on its *Retrospective Income* during a 12-month "look back" period.

At the certification, if a household's current/anticipated income is less than its retrospective income by more than 10%, a "temporary" TTP based on current income alone is set for six-month grace period. After that grace period, the TTP is automatically switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined average retrospective income. No interim recertification interview is required to reset this TTP.

e) Capping The Initial Maximum Rent Burden
HUD places a rent maximum for households moving into a new unit under the HCV Program. This maximum rent burden is determined to be 40% of the household's adjusted annual income. However, under the Rent Reform Study the PHA is no longer adjusting household income using deductions and allowances. The household must not pay more than 40% of gross current monthly income for rent when the family first receives voucher assistance in a particular unit (This maximum rent burden requirement is not applicable at reexamination if the family stays in place.).

2) **Triennial Certifications**
Generally, LMHA performs re-certification of HCV households on an annual basis. The annual certification reviews program eligibility, household composition, income, and other household circumstances. Additional re-examinations ("interim certifications") may be required for changes in the household situation such as: composition, income, and change in unit.

LMHA performs re-certification of Alternative Rent Group members every third year (triennial). The triennial certification reviews program eligibility; household composition; current income and Retrospective Income; unit information; and sets the TTP and the family share of the gross rent. The TTP for Alternative Rent Group members remains in effect during the three year certification period, with some exceptions related to decreases in income and changes in household composition.

Under the alternative rent policy, a household's TTP is generally calculated using its reported (and verified) *retrospective gross income* during a 12-month "look-back" period (In this calculation, gross income excludes any prior income from sources that have expired for the household during that period, such as TANF or Unemployment Insurance benefits, since the household can no longer count on them. It includes imputed welfare income – i.e., any sanctioned portion of a household's TANF grant.).

LMHA has created a local form to supplement the HUD form 9886 to provide tenant consent for LMHA to collect information relevant to the triennial recertification period.

If the household has an increase in annual income between certifications, the household's TTP is not re-determined and increased to reflect the higher income. However, if the household has a decrease in annual income, the household may request and LMHA may provide an interim re-certification or other remedies under the hardship process (see Section 2.i). The interim re-certification is conducted when a household has a reduction of retrospective gross income of more than 10% from the retrospective gross income used to establish the current TTP.

a) At the interim certification, LMHA re-calculates the household TTP based on a new retrospective gross income review to determine the greater of 28% of gross income or the minimum rent of $50. This new TTP remains in effect until the sooner of the next triennial certification or a tenant requested interim certification. The tenant may only request one interim certification per year. The year lasts 12 months from the effective date of the certification.

b) At the triennial certification at the beginning of the three-year period (and at subsequent triennials) if a household's current/anticipated income is less than its retrospective gross income by more than 10%, the current income alone is used to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period. After that grace period, the TTP is automatically switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined average prior income. No interim recertification interview is required to reset this TTP.

c) Alternative Rent Group members are allowed one request per year for an interim certification to reset their TTP. The year lasts 12 months from the effective date of the certification. The TTP is only reset if a household's new retrospective gross income (at the time of the request) is more than 10% lower than its most recent prior retrospective monthly income. If the limit on interim certification presents a hardship, the household will need to apply for a Hardship Exemption (See Section 2.i below).

3) **Streamline Interim Certifications**
LMHA has instituted a streamlined interim certification process for Alternative Rent Group members to report changes of circumstance that do not require adjustment in subsidy. For these events, LMHA does not request income information. These events include:

a) Changes to household composition. Alternative Rent Group members must report both additions and removal of members to the household to LMHA to determine program eligibility and other HUD required reporting (e.g. deceased tenant reporting). However, unless the addition of an adult member changes the voucher bedroom size appropriate for the household composition to prevent overcrowding or over-housing, LMHA does not request income information for the new household member until the next scheduled triennial certification.

   If the loss of a household member results in a reduction of more than 10% of the most recent retrospective gross income, the household is allowed to reset their TTP.

   In the event that the new or removed member requires a change to the voucher bedroom size, LMHA reviews the retrospective gross income of the newly added or removed household member(s), applies a new utility allowance, and resets the household TTP. A reduction in subsidy for new voucher bedroom size is implemented when the current lease ends and new lease begins.

Changes to household composition are not counted towards the limit of one requested interim certification per year.

b) Change of unit. Households seeking to move to a new unit may submit a request for move pursuant to current procedures. For households that move to more expensive units during the three-year period, LMHA absorbs the higher contract rent costs up to the lesser of the gross rent or the payment standard, which is consistent with traditional rent rules. However, unless the request for move is due to a change in household composition, LMHA does not request income information or reset the household TTP until the sooner of the next scheduled triennial certification or tenant requested interim certification to reset TTP. LMHA applies the new utility allowance schedule, if any, to the household at the new lease effective date.

c) Changes in Utility Allowances. When utility schedules are updated to reflect rate changes, utility allowances and utility allowance payments (UAPs) will be adjusted only when HAP subsidies or TTPs are recalculated for other reasons. More specifically, updated utility schedules will be applied when households:
   - Change their contract rent,
   - Recertify and the TTP is recalculated during interim or triennial,
   - Move to new units, or
   - Change their household composition requiring a change in voucher size.

4) **Minimum Rent to Owner**
Currently, HUD does not require minimum rents to be paid by the voucher holder to the landlord. LMHA requires that the Alternative Rent Group make a minimum payment of at least $50 directly to the HCV landlord in addition to LMHA's portion of rent (HAP). The total amount of rent equals the contract rent established in the lease. This policy mirrors the market system of tenants paying owners directly and creates a closer relationship and sense of responsibility for both the leaseholder HCV household and the property owner.

The amount of rent to owner the Alternative Rent Group pays is equal to their TTP less the Utility Allowance plus any amount over the payment standard for which the tenant may be responsible to pay. The Alternative Rent Group rent to owner is not less than the minimum rent. In the event that the Alternative Rent Group household TTP less the Utility Allowance is less than the minimum rent, the household pays the Owner the minimum rent, and LMHA reimburses the household the balance of the Utility Allowance. However, in the event that the minimum rent to owner exceeds 40% of the household current anticipated gross income, the household may request a Hardship Waiver as detailed in Section 2.i below.

5) **Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule**
Currently, LMHA annually reviews and periodically re-establishes a Utility Allowance Schedule which represents the reasonable expectation of costs for utilities as part of the tenant's lease. The utility allowance is based on utility surveys and analysis of the type of structure, bedroom size, appliances provided by tenant, and type of appliances (gas/electric).

The simplified schedule is based on the analysis of data collected from LMHA's existing HCV portfolio including the most common structure and utility types. The goal is to reduce administrative costs and reduce errors associated with the traditional method of applying the Utility Allowance Schedule. The simplified utility allowance schedule is also anticipated to benefit property owners who now have a more accurate understanding of the gross rent to be applied to their properties and to the Alternative Rent Group member who is able to use this new schedule to clarify gross rent in their selection of housing units.

This schedule is applied to the lesser of: the actual size of the unit or the size of the voucher rather than the larger of the actual unit size or the voucher size. LMHA will continue to use current market consumption data to determine when adjustments to the simplified schedule are needed (upon change of more than 10% in rates).

The enrollment process for both the Alternate Rent Group and the Control Group began in September 2014. As of FYE 2015, LMHA had contacted 1,539 Study-eligible households. Forty-six of these families opted out of the Study. The Housing Authority anticipates enrollment will be complete in December 2015.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars	Cost of task prior to implementation (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	Cost per Annual Certification			
Total cost of task in dollars	**As of FY2015:** $54,920.00 (1 annual certification per household * 1,000 households * $54.92 per certification) <u>Cost per annual certification:</u> $54.92 [$50.14 staff cost (2 hours * $25.07 per hour) + $4.78 (mail & reproduction costs)]	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
Total cost of task in dollars	Average number of annual certifications received by study-eligible households[1] multiplied by number of expected Alternate Rent Group / Control Group households multiplied by average cost to complete a certification prior to implementation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group / Control Group annual certifications during FY multiplied by average cost per certification	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group / Control Group annual certifications during FY multiplied by average cost per certification	Explanation to be provided.
	Cost per Interim Certification			
Total cost of task in dollars	**As of FY2015:** $75,220.00 (2 interim certifications per household * 1,000 households * $37.61 per certification)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.

	<u>Per interim certification cost:</u> $37.61 (staff cost of $25.07 per hour * 1.5 hours)			
	Average number of interim certifications received by study-eligible households[1] multiplied by number of expected Alternate Rent Group households multiplied by average cost to complete a certification prior to implementation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group interim certifications during FY multiplied by average cost per certification	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group interim certifications during FY multiplied by average cost per certification	Explanation to be provided.
	Cost per Streamlined Interim Certification			
	As of FY2015: $75,220.00 (2 traditional interim certifications per household * 1,000 households * $37.61 per certification) <u>Per interim certification cost:</u> $37.61 (staff cost of $25.07 per hour * 1.5 hours)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Average number of traditional interim certifications received by study-eligible households[1] multiplied by number of expected Alternate Rent Group households multiplied by average cost to complete a certification prior to implementation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group streamlined interim certifications during FY multiplied by average cost per certification	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group streamlined interim certifications during FY multiplied by average cost per certification	Explanation to be provided.
	Cost of Rent Calculation			
	As of FY2015: $25,070.00 (1,000 households * $25.07 per rent calculation) <u>Per rent calculation cost:</u> $25.07 (staff cost of $25.07 per hour * 1.0 hours)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households multiplied by average cost to complete rent calculation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households during FY multiplied by average cost to complete rent calculation	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households during FY multiplied by average cost to complete rent calculation	Explanation to be provided.
	Cost to Determine Income from Assets			
	As of FY 2015: $6,270 (1,000 households * $6.27 per asset income determination) <u>Per asset income determination cost</u>: $6.27 (staff cost of $25.07 per hour * 0.25 hours)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.

	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households multiplied by average cost to determine income from assets prior to implementation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households having income from assets determined during FY multiplied by average cost to determine asset income	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households having income from assets determined during FY multiplied by average cost to determine asset income	Explanation to be provided.

[1] Includes all households receiving MTW vouchers except households that are 1) disabled; 2) elderly; 3) headed by individuals over age 56; 4) currently using the childcare expense deduction for purposes of determining adjusted income; 5) enrolled in the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program; 6) participating in the HCV Homeownership Program; 7) participating in a Special Referral Program; and/or 8) of mixed immigration status.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	Time to Complete Annual Certification			
	As of FY 2015: 2,000 hours (1,000 households * 1 annual certification each * 2.0 hours per annual certification)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving an annual certification multiplied by average time to complete an annual certification prior to implementation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving an annual certification during FY 2015 multiplied by average time to complete an annual certification	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving an annual certification during FY 2015 multiplied by average time to complete an annual certification	Explanation to be provided
	Time to Determine Tenant Rent			
	As of FY 2015: 1,000 hours (1,000 households *1.0 hours per tenant rent determination)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households having their tenant rent determined multiplied by average staff hours required to determine tenant rent prior to implementation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households having their tenant rent determined during FY 2015 multiplied by average staff hours required to determine tenant rent	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households having their tenant rent determined during FY 2015 multiplied by average staff hours required to determine tenant rent	Explanation to be provided
	Time to Determine Utility Allowance			
	As of FY 2015: 250 hours (1,000 households *0.25 hours per utility allowance determination)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.

		2016.		
	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households having their utility allowance determined multiplied by average staff hours required to determine utility allowance prior to implementation	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households having their utility allowance determined during FY 2015 multiplied by average staff hours required to determine utility allowance	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households having their utility allowance determined during FY 2015 multiplied by average staff hours required to determine utility allowance	Explanation to be provided

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	Average Error Rate in Determining TTP			
	As of FY2015: Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	For study-eligible households, average error rate, as a *percentage*, of determining household TTP prior to implementation	For Alternate Rent Group households, expected average error rate, as a *percentage*, of determining household TTP during the FY	For Alternate Rent Group households, actual average error rate, as a *percentage*, of determining household TTP during the FY	Explanation to be provided.
	Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance			
	As of FY2015: Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	For study-eligible households, average error rate, as a *percentage*, of determining household utility allowance prior to implementation	For Alternate Rent Group households, expected average error rate, as a *percentage*, of determining household utility allowance during the FY	For Alternate Rent Group households, actual average error rate, as a *percentage*, of determining household utility allowance during the FY	Explanation to be provided.

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[1]	**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 after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2015: TBD	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Average annual gross earned income of study-eligible households prior to implementation	Expected average annual gross earned income of Alternate Rent Group households during FY 2015	Actual average annual gross earned income of Alternate Rent Group households during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	**As of FY 2015:** Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
(2) Employed Part-Time	**As of FY 2015:** Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	**As of FY 2015:** Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	**As of FY 2015:** Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
(5) Unemployed	**As of FY 2015:** Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
(6) Other	**As of FY 2015:** Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.

		with FY 2016.		
	Percentage of total study-eligible households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total Alternate Rent Group households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Actual percentage of total Alternate Rent Group households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.

Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2015: TBD [Percent of households receiving TANF (TBD%) multiplied by 1,000 households	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Percent of study-eligible households receiving TANF prior to implementation multiplied by expected number of Alternate Rent Group households	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving TANF as of 6/30/2015	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving TANF as of 6/30/2015	Explanation to be provided

Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2015: 0 [Percent of study-eligible households receiving self-sufficiency services (0%) multiplied by expected number of Alternate Rent Group households (1,000)]	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Number of study-eligible households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of activity	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving self-sufficiency services as of 6/30/2015	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving self-sufficiency services as of 6/30/2015	Explanation to be provided

Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidies per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2015: $633.67 per month	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Average monthly Section 8 subsidy per study-eligible household prior to implementation of activity	Expected Section 8 subsidy per study-eligible household as of 6/30/2015	Actual Section 8 subsidy per study-eligible household as of 6/30/2015	Explanation to be provided

Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2015: $3,525,240 ($3,525.24 average tenant share * 1,000 households)	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Average annual tenant share per study-eligible household multiplied by expected number of Alternate Rent Group households prior to implementation of activity	Expected total annual rent revenue from Alternate Rent Group households as of 6/30/2015	Actual total annual rent revenue from Alternate Rent Group households as of 6/30/2015	Explanation to be provided

Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."[1]				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	**As of FY 2015:** Not tracked	FY 2015 was baseline year. Benchmarks will be established beginning with FY 2016.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.	N/A. FY 2015 was baseline year.
	Percent of study-eligible households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation multiplied by expected number of Alternate Rent Group households	Expected number of Alternate Rent Group households transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY 2015	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided

[1] "Employment" means the household is receiving earned income.
"Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding $14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as of 6/30/2015 ($7.25) multiplied by 2,000 hours).
"Maintaining" employment is defined as being continuously employed for one year. If the head of household has completed education milestones within the last three months, they can meet this criterion provided they meet one of the following:

- For completion of a certification program – 9 months employment in the certified field;
- For completion of an associate's degree – 6 months employment in a related field;
- For completion of a bachelor's degree – 3 months employment in a related field.

Data Sources for Metrics Tables Above

LMHA will use several sources to obtain the data necessary to evaluate this activity:

1) *Emphasys LIB*. Information related to household income, assets, household composition, and unit information;
2) *Human Resources personnel data*. Determination of the average hourly cost per job title;
3) *Time study*. Determination of the average time spent on certifications and quality control tasks; and
4) *Section 8 quality control reports*. Determination of error rates.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

Two hardship requests were received during FY 2015. However, initial review of the tenant file by staff indicated requesting households were not eligible for a hardship exception.

No interim certifications were processed for loss of income.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. FY 2015 served as the baseline year for this activity. Benchmarks will be established beginning with the FY 2016 Annual Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*

N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

A.4 Occupancy Criteria for New Scattered Sites

ACTIVITY #9-2007: Term Limits and Employment / Education Requirements in New Scattered Site Units

ACTIVITY #21-2010: Mandatory Case Management in New Scattered Site Units

Many of LMHA's Scattered Sites are highly desirable properties, especially the newly acquired or constructed off-site Clarksdale (Liberty Green) HOPE VI Replacement Scattered Site units. The amenities and existing low rent structure may in some instances discourage residents from moving out of the unit towards self-sufficiency. LMHA is piloting term limits (Activity #9-2007), work requirements (Activity #9-2007), and mandatory case management (Activity #21-2010) for residents at these sites and evaluating the potential of the initiatives to incite residents to move up and out of the Public Housing program. Because these two activities affect the same population, including standard metrics tables for each activity would simply repeat the same metrics twice. The two activities function together, and the agency is unable to say how much each activity separately influenced the outcomes. For this reason, the LMHA has combined the reporting for these activities. All required reporting elements are provided for each activity.

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #9-2007 (Term Limits and Work Requirements) was proposed and implemented in FY 2007. Activity #21-2010 (Mandatory Case Management) was proposed and implemented in FY 2010.

2. *Description and Impact*
   Activities #9-2007 (Term Limits and Employment / Education Requirements) and #21-2010 (Mandatory Case Management) apply to public housing families residing at detached single-family, scattered site houses created off-site under the Clarksdale HOPE VI Revitalization program and to those acquired or developed since LMHA fulfilled its Clarksdale one-for-one replacement commitment.

   Jointly, the activities impose a five-year occupancy term limit; require that adults who are neither elderly nor disabled be employed and working at least 20 hours per week; and provide that all families (including elderly and disabled) must participate in a case management program. The work requirement may be temporarily waived for full-time students enrolled at an accredited post-secondary educational institution.

   Residents moving from another public housing unit to one of these houses may choose between general case management requiring quarterly contact or the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program requiring monthly contact. Both case management options assist residents with movement toward self-sufficiency and include working to identify and eliminate barriers to sustained employment along with referrals to services related to education, employment, health, financial skills, and home ownership. Residents opting for FSS commit to a more structured program with required financial skills classes as well as the potential to benefit from the FSS escrow account or an Individual Development Account (IDA).

   Residents in the FSS program can benefit from two asset building options. Rent increases from earned income will be placed in an escrow account, which the resident will receive when completing FSS. Escrow accumulation will be limited for residents with significant earned income at the time of FSS enrollment. For these residents LMHA may offer an IDA (matched savings) account to supplement the escrow account.

Residents, who at the end of the five-year period are not ready to move to either market-rate rental housing or homeownership, may request an extension to the occupancy term limit. Extensions may be considered based on accident or illness, completion of post-secondary education, or documented evidence of efforts to obtain market-rate rental or purchase a home. Under no circumstance will participation be extended more than two additional years. Residents who fail to participate in mandatory case management activities will be submitted to property management staff; the next step is returning to a public housing development that does not have work / education / case management requirements.

By all measures this activity has been highly successful at moving families towards self sufficiency. In FY 2015, a full 44% of the 109 non-elderly / non-disabled families living in the units covered by these activities met LMHA's definition of **self sufficiency** (see next paragraph). The employment rate for these households is more than 3 times the rate across all of the agency's public housing (63% versus 21%), and average earned income is almost 6 times as high ($20,766 for affected households versus $3,636 across all public housing). Average monthly rent payments are also higher ($200 versus $158), reducing the agency's per unit subsidy costs for participating households.

One of the HUD Standard Metrics for this activity requires LMHA to report the "number of households transitioned to self sufficiency," and asks the Housing Authority to define **self sufficiency** for itself. LMHA has chosen to define **self sufficiency** as "the ability of a non-elderly / non-disabled family to obtain and maintain suitable employment." For the purposes of this definition, **employment** means the household must be receiving earned income, and **suitable** is defined as annual earned income equal to or exceeding the minimum wage multiplied by 2,000 hours, which is equal to $14,500 as of the writing of this Report. This is the minimum income required for a family to participate in the HCV Homeownership program. **Maintaining** employment is defined as being continuously employed for at least 1 year. If the head of household has completed educational milestones within the last 3 months, he/she can meet **maintaining** employment as follows: certification program – 9 months employment in the certified field; associate's degree – 6 months employment in a related field, and; bachelor's degree – 3 months employment in a related field.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**[1]	**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 after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked.	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$20,766	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
	Average gross annual earned income of households living in affected units before implementation	Expected average gross annual earned income of households living in affected units as of 6/30/15	Actual average gross annual earned income of households living in affected units as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

Self-Sufficiency #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked.	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$3,310	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
	Average escrow amount of households living in affected units prior to implementation	Expected average escrow amount of households living in affected units as of 6/30/15	Actual average escrow amount of households living in affected units as of 6/30/15	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome[2]**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	**As of FY 2010:** Not tracked[2]	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	45% (49 of 109 households)	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
(2) Employed Part-Time	**As of FY 2010:** Not tracked[2]	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	18% (20 of 109 households)	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	**As of FY 2010:** Not tracked	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	8% (9 of 109 households)	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	**As of FY 2010:** Not tracked	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	2% (2 of 109 households)	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
(5) Unemployed	**As of FY 2010:** 22% **(**17 of approximately 78 households)[4]	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	37% (40 of 109 households)	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
(6) Other	**As of FY 2010:** Not tracked	N/A - Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Not tracked	N/A – No benchmark set for this metric
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.
[2] Although LMHA did not track part-time vs. full-time employment in FY 2010, the agency did track employment status more generally. That year 61 (78%) of approximately 78 non-elderly / non-disabled heads of household were employed.
[3] Outcome data is as of 6/11/2015. Although 112 households lived in term-limited scattered site units as of this date, outcomes for this metric only include 109 non-elderly / non-disabled families. Three elderly / disabled families are excluded as these households are not subject to the employment / education requirement.
[4] Although 100 households lived in term-limited scattered site units in FY 2010, this baseline only includes 78 non-elderly / non-disabled families. Twenty-two elderly / disabled families are excluded as these households were not subject to the employment / education requirement.

Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	16% (18 of 112 households)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Number of households in affected units receiving TANF prior to implementation	Expected number of households in affected units receiving TANF as of 6/30/2015	Actual number of Alternate Rent Group households receiving TANF as of 6/30/2015	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: 36% (36 of 100 households)	85%	88% (98 of 112 households)	Outcome meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance; Emphasys				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidies per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan	$6,108	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to

				be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan	$247,188	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan	44% (48 of 109 households)[2]	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.
[2] As a baseline was not established for this metric, LMHA is not able to say how many families were "transitioned" to self sufficiency during the year. Instead, the outcome represents the number of households that met the agency's definition of "self sufficiency" as of 6/11/2015. Furthermore, although 112 households lived in term-limited scattered site units as of this date, the outcome only includes 109 non-elderly / non-disabled families. Three elderly / disabled families are not included as these households are excluded from the LMHA's definition of "self sufficiency" (See Section 1 above.).

Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan	28 months	N/A. Metric not included in FY2015 Plan

				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

   N/A. All benchmarks were met.

4. *Revised Metrics*

   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

A.5 Public Housing Development

LMHA's goal is to transform the physical stock of the original family developments owned and managed by the agency in the coming years, replacing the current public housing developments with mixed income communities, while at the same time providing replacement units so that the overall number of families served will not decrease. LMHA has implemented the following MTW initiative designed to expedite the redevelopment process and ensure that all new and newly acquired properties are energy-efficient and cost effective.

ACTIVITY #18-2009: Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #18-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

2. *Description and Impact*
   This activity simplifies the public housing development submittal process for each acquired or developed public housing property. Twice yearly, LMHA also submits a six month report summarizing the Agency's acquisition and development activities to the HUD Louisville Field Office. The activity has reduced the amount of time staff spends preparing development submittals and reduced the average length of time to close on a property.

   Although LMHA did not use the regulatory flexibility provided through this MTW activity during FY 2015 as the agency did not acquire any public housing units, between FY 2009 and FY 2013 the initiative reduced the amount of staff time required to prepare a proposal significantly from 25 hours to 7.5 hours. The length of time required to close on a property was also reduced from an average of 8-10 weeks to approximately 6 weeks.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: $12,249 (9 submittals *25 hours * $54.44 per hour)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	$0 (0 submittals * 0 hours)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available. Staff hourly rate for FY 2008 is not available. FY 2009 hourly rate of $54.44 (including benefits) was used instead.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**

Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 225 hours (9 submittals *25 hours)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	0 hours (0 submittals * 0 hours)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs				

[1] FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

   N/A. No FY 2015 benchmarks were established in the FY 2015 Annual Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*

   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

A.6 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities

ACTIVITY #3-2006: Amount and Distribution of HCV Homeownership Assistance

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #3-2006 was proposed and implemented in FY 2006.

2. *Description and Impact*
   This activity allows LMHA to offer a two-bedroom payment standard for all one-bedroom-eligible HCV Homeownership households and maintains the 110% of FMR local payment standard and the 120% of FMR payment standard in exception rent areas for the Homeownership program.

   During FY 2015, sixteen HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home. The average home sales price was $113,669, with an average mortgage interest rate of 3.531%. Six of the buyers were elderly and/or disabled. Four of the buyers together received a total of $51,372 in HOME down payment assistance through Louisville Metro Government.

   This activity permitted two one-bedroom-eligible families to purchase a unit using the two-bedroom payment standard. This family did not purchase a home in an exception payment standard area.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings[1]				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

[1] This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings[1]				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

[1] This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	2	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	Number of households that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	2	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
   N/A. No FY 2015 benchmarks were established for this activity.

4. *Revised Metrics*
   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #13-2009: Exception Payment Standards for HCV Homeownership

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #13-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity adjusts payment standards for HCV Homeownership to 120% of FMR in homeownership-specific Exception Payment areas, which are identified using Census 2000 Owner Occupied Median Value instead of Renter Occupied Median gross rent.

Since FY 2009 this activity has allowed a total of 11 families to buy homes in areas of opportunity. One HCV Homeownership Program participant purchased a home in an exception payment standard area during FY 2015.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings[1]				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

[1] This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings[1]				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

[1] This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 0	2	1	Does not meet benchmark
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	Number of households that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 0	2	1	Does not meet benchmark
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

   HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility and HC #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities
   LMHA anticipated that two HCV Homeownership Program participant families would purchase homes in exception payment standard areas during FY 2015. Instead, only one family purchased a home in these areas. As the number of families purchasing homes in exception areas has averaged between one and two families per year (1.57), this outcome is in line with LMHA expectations and historic data.

   Through its FY 2016 Annual Plan, LMHA will propose a significant change to this activity that will increase the number of exception payment standard census tracts. The Housing Authority anticipates that under the expanded activity, two to three families per year will purchase a home in an exception area.

4. *Revised Metrics*
   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #11-2009: Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications for HCV Homeownership

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #11-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

2. *Description and Impact*
   Under this activity, income verification for HCV Homeownership program applicants remains valid for eight months.

   Once approved for the HCV Homeownership Program, families have eight months to execute and close on a proposed sales agreement. Since the income verification completed during the program application process is now valid for eight months, staff no longer has to re-verify income for families who take more than 60 days to close on a sale. Thus, the cost of this task (re-verifying income after 60 days) has dropped from $179 pre-implementation (FY 2008) to $0.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: $179 (12 verifications * 0.5 hours * $29.78 per hour)	$0	$0	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs; PHA financial records				

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 6 hours (12 verifications * 0.5 hours)	0 hours	0 hours	Meets benchmark.
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs				

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A (Task no longer conducted)	N/A (Task no longer conducted)	N/A (Task no longer conducted)
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs.				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
N/A. All outcomes meet benchmark.

4. *Revised Metrics*

N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

A.7 Local Leased Housing Program

<u>Activity #44-2015: Special Referral MTW HCV Programs</u>
MTW allows LMHA to maximize the potential of locally available resources to develop programs for people with specific needs. The goal is to meet needs not met by other agencies and to partner with local organizations that have social services programs that need a housing support element. Some of these needs are transitional; others are for programs that provide more long-term support.

Special referral programs are intended to address the needs of traditionally underserved populations in the community, and provide the voucher as incentive for families to move toward economic self-sufficiency. The programs provide housing subsidy to up to 379 families through partnerships with a number of supportive services agencies. Families with specific needs often face multiple barriers to achieving their self-sufficiency goals. LMHA's special referral MTW HCV programs provide a strong incentive for participation as eligible applicants receive an admissions preference for the agency's HCV program, which has a current waitlist of approximately 17,500 applicants. These programs also increase housing choices for low-income families.

Per HUD's request, LMHA has combined the reporting for these activities under a single, umbrella activity (#44-2015). All required elements are reported for each special referral program sub-activity.

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
    1) Activity #1-2005 (The Villager / Center for Women and Families) was proposed and implemented in FY 2005.
    2) Activity #7-2008 (Day Spring) was proposed in FY 2008 and implemented in FY 2012.
    3) Activity #15-2009 (Louisville / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.
    4) Activity #20-2010 (Downtown / Family Scholar House with Spalding University was proposed in FY 2010 and implemented in FY 2011.
    5) Activity #30-2012 (100,000 Homes Initiative) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
    6) Activity #31-2012 (Stoddard Johnston / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
    7) Activity #34-2012 (Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
    8) Activity #35-2012 (Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
    9) Activity #36-2013 (Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
    10) Activity #38-2013 (Parkland / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2013.
    11) Activity #42-2015 (Seven Counties Services, Inc.) was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.
    12) Activity #44-2015 (MTW Special Referral Programs – Combined Reporting)

2. *Description and Impact*

    <u>Activity #1-2005: The Villager - Center for Women and Families</u>
    LMHA allocates up to 22 vouchers to a special referral program with the Center for Women and Families for their long-term transitional housing on their downtown campus. Programs at the Center focus on the elimination of domestic violence, sexual violence and economic hardship.

Activity #7-2008: Day Spring

LMHA provides housing assistance to up to four households with members who have a severe mental illness and who live in a Day Spring constructed unit while they participate in the program. Day Spring, a faith-based charitable organization, provides residential and supportive services to adults with developmental disabilities who want the opportunity to live independently in a supportive community setting. Under the initiative, not all of the residential units may be subject to typical HUD Housing Quality Standards and rent reasonableness requirements.

Activity #15-2009: Louisville Scholar House / Family Scholar House (formerly Project Women)

LMHA allocates up to 56 vouchers to a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Louisville Scholar House facility. Participants are solo heads of households, who often face multiple barriers to furthering their education and obtaining employment that will provide their families with adequate income to become self-sufficient.

Activity #20-2010: Downtown Scholar House - Family Scholar House with Spalding University

LMHA allocates 43 Housing Choice Vouchers annually to a special referral program with Family Scholar House and Spalding University at the Downtown Scholar House.

Activity #30-2012: 100,000 Homes Initiative

LMHA provides up to 50 vouchers to a Special Referral HCV program with the 100,000 Homes initiative of the Louisville Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Community Consortium. Participants in this Housing First model program, who are identified and referred by the Louisville SAMHSA, must be chronically homeless.

Activity #31-2012: Stoddard Johnston Scholar House - Family Scholar House

LMHA allocates up to 57 vouchers to a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Stoddard Johnston Scholar House location.

Activity #34-2012: Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility

LMHA provides housing assistance to up to five households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Youngland Avenue facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #35-2012: Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs

LMHA may, without prior HUD approval, allocate up to 10 MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to a Special Referral HCV program for service-enriched affordable housing programs within the agency's jurisdiction. To be eligible, programs must offer housing and supportive services targeted to families whose needs are not adequately served elsewhere in the community. Some allocations are incremental additions to existing special referral programs while others are allocations to newly established programs.

- In 2012, LMHA allocated up to 10 vouchers to Coalition for the Homeless for homeless families with children.

- In 2013, the Agency allocated up to an additional 10 vouchers to the same referral program, as well as up to 10 vouchers to Family Scholar House participants who may choose to live at York Towers. No York Towers vouchers have been issued to date.

- In FY 2014, up to 10 vouchers were allocated to a program operated by Choices, Inc., which serves solo parent families that are both homeless and disabled.

Activity #36-2013: Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility
This activity established a special referral program and local preference to provide housing assistance to up to five households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Youngland Avenue facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #38-2013: Parkland Scholar House - Family Scholar House
Under this activity, LMHA sets aside up to 53 vouchers, including five vouchers for participants who reside off-campus, for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Parkland Scholar House Facility. Vouchers become portable upon graduation and expire five years from participant's graduation date.

Activity #42-2015: Seven Counties Services, Inc.
LMHA sets aside up to 50 vouchers for a special referral program with Seven Counties Services, Inc. for households that include a member with a severe mental illness who is currently institutionalized at a personal care home or at risk of being institutionalized because of a lack of adequate community support.

The LMHA tracks the following, combined HUD Standard Metrics for these activities:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan

				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Cost Effectiveness #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Special referral program partner records				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**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.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan

(2) Employed Part-Time	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(5) Unemployed	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(6) Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in

				FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Special referral program partners				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidies per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric.[1] Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in

in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.				FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Various				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.
[2] LMHA defines **self sufficiency** as follows: "the ability of a non-elderly / non-disabled family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."

Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline[1]**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

[1] No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

A table summarizing LMHA's Special Referral Programs follows:

LMHA Special Referral MTW Voucher Programs
Fiscal Year 2015

Organization	Site	Voucher Allocation	FY Proposed (FY Activity Approved, if different)	FY First Voucher Issued	Portable? *Term Limited?*	Streamlined Admission?	MTW Inspections?
100K Homes Initiative	N/A	50	2012	2012	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Center for Women and Families	Villager	22	2005	2005	Full portability upon program completion.	Yes	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
Coalition for the Homeless (Rapid Re-housing)	N/A	20	2012	2013	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Day Spring	Day Spring constructed units	4	2009	2009, 2012*	Full portability.	Yes	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Family Scholar House	Louisville Scholar House	56	2008	2008	Full portability upon program completion. *5-year term limit post graduation.*	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and at recert.
Family Scholar House	Downtown Scholar House	54	2010	2011	Full portability upon program completion. *5-year term limit post graduation.*	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and at recert.
Family Scholar House	Stoddard Johnston Scholar House	57	2012	2012	Full portability upon program completion. *5-year term limit post graduation.*	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and at recert.
Family Scholar House	Parkland Scholar House + 5 off-site	53	2012 Amended	2012	Full portability upon program completion. *5-year term limit post graduation.*	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. will be used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and at recert.
Seven Counties Services, Inc.	N/A	50	2015	2015	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Wellspring	Youngland Avenue	5	2012	2012	Full portability.	Yes	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Wellspring	Bashford Manor/Newburg	8	2012	2013	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.

*Referral program suspended during FY2010 and FY2011.

2.i. *Rent Reform Hardship Requests*
N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
   N/A. No benchmarks were established in the FY 2015 Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*
   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #2-1999: MTW Unit Inspection Protocol

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #2-1999 was proposed and implemented in FY 1999.

2. *Description and Impact*
   Many of LMHA's partners' residential facilities are newly constructed or renovated. As such, LMHA has used MTW authority to allow the certificate of occupancy to suffice for the initial move-in inspection in lieu of a traditional HQS inspection. This substitution has saved the authority thousands of dollars since Louisville Scholar House first came online in 2008.

   Unit inspections of facilities at LMHA's Section 8 certificate programs that are managed by organizations with which the Agency has had a long-term and outstanding relationship, are waived upon initial occupancy, and the agency has the authority to conduct inspections once per year concurrently. Section 8 certificate programs include YMCA SRO, Roberts Hall and St. Vincent de Paul, and Willow Place. This activity has significantly reduced costs to inspect the units "tied" to these programs. In FY 2015, LMHA used this authority to inspect the 41 YMCA SRO units concurrently.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 1998: Not available	$976 (41 units * $23.80)	$1,005 (41 units * $24.52)	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records.				

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**

Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 1998: Not available	23.9 hours (41 units * 0.6 hours)	23.9 hours (41 units * 0.6 hours)	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records.				

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 1998: Not available	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
				Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Staff logs.				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
   N/A. All outcomes meet benchmark.

4. *Revised Metrics*
   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #27-2011: Amend HCV Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #27-2011 was proposed and implemented in FY 2011.

2. *Description and Impact*
   LMHA amended its HCV program admissions policy to allow for the deduction of verified ongoing child-care expenses from a working household’s gross income when determining income eligibility. In order to qualify for the adjustment, the family must include a head of household and/or spouse with a demonstrated work history for a period of 12 months or longer.

The pool of potential families eligible for the child-care deduction is very small. No families received the deduction during FY 2015. However, because of the potential benefit to working families, the agency believes the activity merits continuation.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) prior to implementation.	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/15.	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/15.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

CE #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Sum of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households who received the deduction to determine eligibility.	Expected *sum* of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of 6/30/15.	Actual *sum* of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of 6/30/15.	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

   N/A. No benchmarks were established in the agency's FY 2015 Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*

   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #39-2014: HCV Program Rent Increase Limit

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

2. *Description and Impact*
   This activity is a 2% cap on annual contract rent increases for units where the tenant is receiving HCV rental assistance. At contract renewals, LMHA will conduct rent comparables and limit the landlord's requested rent increase to 2% of the previous contract rent for the same tenant or HUD's fair market rent, whichever is less.

   LMHA has not yet developed a mechanism to track the impact of this activity, but plans to do so in FY 2016.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) prior to implementation.	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/15.	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/15.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Sum of gross (net)	Expected *sum* of gross	Actual *sum* of gross	Explanation to

	annual rental revenue from households affected by this policy	annual rental revenue from households affected by this policy between 7/1/14 and 6/30/15	rental revenue from households affected by this policy between 7/1/14 and 6/30/15	be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
   N/A. No benchmarks were established in the agency's FY 2015 Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*
   N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
   N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

A.8 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

ACTIVITY #37-2014: Accessible Units Sublease Agreement with Frazier Rehab Institute

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

2. *Description and Impact*
   The activity allows LMHA to sublease fully accessible units as temporary housing for Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) out-patients of Frazier Rehab Institute. The units are transitional housing provided for up to six months per family. Frazier Rehab Institute is responsible for verifying that the family is eligible to live in the unit (e.g., a program participant, household income is at or below 80% AMI). Two fully-accessible units located at the Liberty Green Community Center are dedicated to this activity. The Community Center is ideally located one-half mile from the Frazier Rehab Institute. Frazier Rehab leases the apartments from LMHA and pay the cost of all utilities. Rent to Frazier Rehab is set at $210 per month (or roughly 30% of monthly SSI for one person), and Frazier Rehab has agreed to pass on no more than 100% of the rent plus utilities to the tenant (the sub lessee). Frazier Rehab uses a modified version of LMHA's public housing lease as its tenant sublease and has established a hardship policy to define circumstances under which households may be exempted or temporarily waived from the rent Frazier Rehab may charge to the sub lessee. Examples could include involuntary loss of income or unexpected medical expenses. Frazier Rehab also refers sub lessees to area service providers, including the Center for Accessible Living (Kentucky's first Independent Living Center), who can assist households with leaving the program.

   Often, the only housing option for SCI patients is a room at one of the extended stay hotels located at the edge of the city. A room can cost the patient and their family hundreds of dollars per week in addition to any travel costs they may have incurred coming to Louisville for treatment. For low-income families needing treatment, securing and paying for housing can be a great burden. Through this unique partnership, LMHA increases housing options for these families. In addition, the activity achieves greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures. LMHA had been experiencing difficulty leasing the two fully-accessible apartments to applicants on the public housing waitlist; consequently the units had been vacant. Under this activity, Frazier Rehab subleases the units to out-patients of the program and pays LMHA $210 per month for each unit, increasing the number of families served and rental revenue for the agency.

   In FY 2015, LMHA served three households through this activity.

   The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2013: N/A	12 hours	6 hours	Outcome exceeds benchmark. 6 more hours were saved than expected.

				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2013: 0	2	2	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PIC				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests
N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

4. *Revised Metrics*
N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

ACTIVITY #29-2015: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
Activity #29-2015 was originally proposed in FY 2011, but not approved by HUD as LMHA lacked Broader Use of Funds authorization at that time. The activity was re-proposed, approved by HUD, and implemented in FY 2015.

2. *Description and Impact*
This activity allows YouthBuild Louisville (YBL) to sublease public housing units to provide temporary housing for low-income YBL participants who are experiencing homelessness. LMHA subleases up to three 2-bedroom apartments for the use of YBL participants (and their families) and facility space for the YBL program. Units are provided to YBL on an as needed basis.

For unemployed young people who left high school without a diploma, YBL is an opportunity to reclaim their educations, gain the skills they need for employment, and become leaders in their communities. YBL serves low or very-low income youth, ages 16-24, who have dropped out of high school or are basic skills deficient, and, are a foster care recipient or have aged out of care, and/or a youthful or adult offender, a youth possessing a disability and/or a child of an incarcerated parent or a migrant youth. They are trained in small cohorts of 35 youth each year with one additional year of job placement, higher education assistance, community mentoring, and social service support. Youth receive individual and group education to complete their GED and/or high school diploma and pre-college curriculum, while all gain construction skills through the Homebuilders Institute Pre Apprenticeship Certificate Training (PACT) with additional elective certification in green construction, weatherization and facilities maintenance, and pre-nursing certification (30) through the American Red Cross and Norton Healthcare.

Participant housing is not a traditional component of the YBL program. For many students, maintaining stable housing is not a struggle; however, some participants are homeless or may become homeless. The sublease agreement between YBL and LMHA ensures that these young people have a place to call home so they are able to make the most of this unique learning opportunity.

For each month a unit is occupied by a YBL program participant, YBL pays LMHA $60. YBL certifies that students are income eligible upon entry to the YBL program through the application process and follow-up verification through local and state subsidy programs. The participant and their household may continue to live in the unit as long as they are active in the YBL program. Upon graduation, the household may elect to receive preference for either a public housing unit.

All participants residing in the subleased public housing units must meet basic Public Housing Program eligibility criteria (no outstanding rent balance with LMHA or other public housing authority, criminal background check, age 18 or older). LMHA staff verify that the YBL program participant is eligible for this MTW initiative.

In FY 2015, LMHA served one household through this activity.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2014: N/A	N/A.	N/A. Participants do not receive wages. Instead, they receive a stipend of $100/week.	N/A.
	Average annual gross earned income prior to implementation	Expected average annual gross earned income during FY 2015	Actual average annual gross earned income during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**

Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	**As of FY2014:** 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(2) Employed Part-Time	**As of FY2014:** 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	**As of FY2014:** 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	1	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	**As of FY2014:** 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	1	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(5) Unemployed	**As of FY2014:** 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	1	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
(6) Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Percentage of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Actual percentage of total households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2015 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.

Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2014: 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	1	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Number of households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of activity	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services as of 6/30/2015	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services as of 6/30/2015	Explanation to be provided

Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."[1]				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2014: 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation	Expected number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY 2015	Actual number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided

[1] "Employment" means the household is receiving earned income.
"Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding $14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as of 6/30/2015 ($7.25) multiplied by 2,000 hours).
"Maintaining" employment is defined as being continuously employed for one year. If the head of household has completed education milestones within the last three months, they can meet this criterion provided they meet one of the following:

- For completion of a certification program – 9 months employment in the certified field;
- For completion of an associate's degree – 6 months employment in a related field;
- For completion of a bachelor's degree – 3 months employment in a related field.

Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households able to move to a *better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). *Better unit is defined as a unit at one of the sites covered by the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2014: 0	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan	1	N/A. Benchmark not included in FY2015 Plan
	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation.	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity during FY 2015	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*
N/A. No benchmarks were established in the agency's FY 2015 Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*
N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*
N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

B. Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities

For each not yet implemented activity, LMHA has provided:

1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved; and
2) Discussion of any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.

ACTIVITY #40-2014: Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP – HCV Program

1. *Plan Year Approved*
   Activity #40-2014 was proposed and approved in FY 2014. It has not yet been implemented.

2. *Actions Taken Toward Implementation*
   When calculating an HCV participant's Total Tenant Payment, this activity allows LMHA to disregard financial aid exceeding amounts received for tuition for all households regardless of age or family status where the head of household is a student.

   No actions were taken toward implementation during FY 2015. However, the agency is currently in the process of making the required updates to its HCV Administrative Plan, and plans to implement the activity during FY 2016.

ACTIVITY #28-2011: Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance and Modernization of Public Housing

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*
   Activity #28-2011 was proposed and approved in FY 2011. It has not yet been implemented.

2. *Actions Toward Implementation*
   The activity is to explore using MTW authority to create locally defined guidelines for the development (including rehabilitation), maintenance and modernization of public housing. During FY 2015, LMHA continued to research reasonable and modest design guidelines, unit size guidelines and unit amenity guidelines that could be used for new public housing development activities. LMHA is also investigating how to incorporate green maintenance practices in addition to environmentally friendly and energy efficient design standards.

   The agency is investigating how it might use locally defined guidelines to inform plans for the redevelopment of Beecher Terrace, one of the largest HUD-assisted developments within the Russell Choice Neighborhood Initiative target area. If and when new guidelines are drafted, they will be submitted to HUD for approval.

ACTIVITY #26-2011: Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP – HCV Program

1. *Plan Year Approved*
   Activity #26-2011 was proposed and approved in FY 2011. It has not yet been implemented.

2. *Actions Taken Toward Implementation*
   This activity authorizes LMHA to acquire units for public housing or vacant land for developing public housing without prior HUD authorization if HUD does not respond to LMHA's request for authorization within ten days of the submittal date. All acquired properties must meet HUD's site

selection requirements. LMHA would request approval of the HUD Field Office when a pending acquisition deviates from the selection requirements and/or at the discretion of the Executive Director. Copies of all required forms and appraisals would be maintained in the project file.

No actions were taken toward implementation during FY 2015. LMHA will implement this activity if and when it is advantageous to utilize the purchasing flexibility (i.e., HUD has not responded to LMHA's request for authorization within 10 days of the submittal date).

C. MTW Activities On-Hold

For each activity on-hold, LMHA has provided:

1) Description, including the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved, implemented and placed on-hold; and
2) Any actions that were taken toward reactivating the activity.

ACTIVITY #25-2010: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities

1. *Description*

   Activity #25-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010. The activity was placed on-hold in 2012.

   HUD OGC investigated the use of public housing as emergency housing for victims of human trafficking and found that it was not feasible under MTW to permit families who could not produce valid identification to live in public housing communities.

2. *Actions Taken Toward Reactivation*

   This activity will remain on hold until a resolution, allowing victims of human trafficking to receive much-needed housing assistance, can be reached.

D. Closed Out MTW Activities

For closed out activity, LMHA has provided:

1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented (if applicable) and a description of the activity;
2) The year the activity was closed out; and
3) In the year the activity was closed out,
    a. Discussion of the final outcome and lessons learned
    b. Description of any statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity
    c. Summary table, listing outcomes from each year of the activity (since the execution of the Standard MTW Agreement); and
    d. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table.

ACTIVITY #24-2010: Increased Flat Rents

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*
   LMHA proposed this initiative in the 2010 Annual Plan, and it was approved by HUD that year. LMHA proposed flat rents for the Agency's scattered sites be raised and adjusted based on the square footage, location, age and amenities at the property as rent comparables for the site were completed. LMHA decided not to implement this activity, and flat rents have since been raised across all of the agency's public housing units to meet HUD's recent requirement that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*
   The activity was closed-out in FY 2011.

3. *In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:*

   i. Final outcomes and lessons learned
   This activity was never implemented.

   ii. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit
   Unknown.

   iii. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity
   Not applicable.

   iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.
   Not applicable.

ACTIVITY #5-2007: Spatial Deconstruction of HCV Assisted Units

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*
   LMHA proposed this initiative in the FY 2007 Annual Plan, and it was approved by HUD that year. The activity was to limit the concentration of HCV-assisted units in complexes of one hundred or more units to 25% (excluding both elderly/disabled and special referral program sites). The goals of the activity were two-fold: to increase the number of communities in exception rent areas where

voucher holders live, and to decrease the number of assisted units in large properties that already exceeded the 25% cap.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*
   This activity was closed-out during FY 2009.

3. *In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:*

   i. Final outcomes and lessons learned
   LMHA was ultimately concerned that the activity would limit housing choices for low-income families. As documented in the 2009 year-end report, the activity did not reduce the number of large developments that failed to meet the spatial deconcentration goals. However, from 2006 to 2009, the number of assisted units in underutilized exception rent areas did increase. Regardless, had the 25% cap remained in place, the policy might have limited a family's choice to move to a certain community if it had a higher percentage of voucher holders.

   ii. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit
   None.

   iii. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity
   See table below from FY 2009 Annual Report.

TABLE 10.1 Spatial Deconcentration of HCV Assisted Units
Benchmark vs. Actual FY 09

Site-no. units	FY 06 Baseline	FY 07 Actual	FY 08 Actual	FY 09 Bmk	FY 09 Actual
A-130 units	106 (81.5%)	98 (75.4%)	107 (82.3%)	</=25%	**106 (81.5%)**
B-167 units	61 (36.5%)	68 (40.7%)	61 (36.5%)	</=25%	**75 (44.9%)**
C-161 units	24 (14.9%)	21 (13%)	19 (11.8%)	</=25%	**23 (14.3%)**
D-124 units	30 (24.2%)	17 (13.7%)	15 (12.1%)	</=25%	**15 (12.1%)**
E-150 units	47 (31.3%)	44 (29.3%)	46 (30.67%)	</=25%	**45 (30%)**
F-170 units	15 (8.8%)	13 (7.6%)	37 (21.8%)	</=25%	**38 (22.3%)**
G-400 units	50 (9.5%)	27 (6.7%)	22 (5.5%)	</=25%	**14 (3.5%)**
H-260 units	14 (5.4%)	25 (9.6%)	32 (12.3%)	</=25%	**41 (15.8%)**

TABLE 10.2 HCV Units in Exception Payment Areas
Benchmark vs. Actual FY 2009

Census Tract	FY 06 Baseline	FY 07 Actual	FY 08 Actual	FY 09 Bmk	FY 09 Actual
75	0	1	1	*+ unit*	**1**
76	0	3	3	*+ unit*	**4**
98	1	0	0	*+ unit*	**3**
100	33	52	54	-	**63**
101	12	9	10	*+ unit*	**11**
103	21	31	33	-	**36**
104	5	17	66	-	**65**
105	1	0	0	*+ unit*	**0**
106	2	4	4	*+ unit*	**6**
107	1	0	0	*+ unit*	**0**
108	9	11	12	-	**12**
111	114	130	136	-	**135**
114	9	9	9	*+ unit*	**8**
115	6	8	8	*+ unit*	**16**
117	2	5	5	*+ unit*	**5**
120	15	18	17	-	**21**
121	52	81	96	-	**114**
124	34	36	49	-	**54**
131	3	1	1	*+ unit*	**0**
Total	**320**	**416**	**504**	***50 more units***	**554**
no. of underutilized census tracts w/ exception payment areas	**12**	**11**	**10**	***less 1 census tract***	**9**
no. of underutilized exception payment areas	**26**	**24**	**23**	***less 1 area***	**22**

Notes
Underutilized is defined as 10 or fewer units.

63

iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.
None.

ACTIVITY #33-2012: Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income – Public Housing Program

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*
   Proposed and approved in the FY 2012 Plan, LMHA proposed that families receiving rental assistance under the Public Housing program would pay either 30% of their monthly adjusted income for rent, or the minimum rent established by the LMHA, whichever was higher. Upon further consideration, because the Housing Authority's housing stock includes tax credit units, LMHA considered amending the activity to include "ceiling rents" that would vary by bedroom size and that would be set in accordance with the annual tax-credit ceiling rents, as published by the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC). KHC is the tax credit allocating agency for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The proposal to change was never submitted to HUD, however. Rather, in 2014, LMHA raised flat rents to conform to new HUD regulations mandating that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*
   The activity was officially closed-out fiscal year-end 2014.

3. *In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:*

   i. Final outcomes and lessons learned
   In 2014, LMHA decided not to pursue this activity in response to newly-issued HUD regulations that require PHAs to set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR. As a result of the new rule, the agency raised flat rents significantly across the entire public housing stock. LMHA anticipates that higher flat rents will achieve the goals of the proposed activity within HUD's existing regulatory framework.

   ii. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit
   None.

   iii. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity
   This activity was not implemented.

   iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.
   Not applicable.

ACTIVITY #16-2009: Explore HUD's Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*
   Proposed and approved in the FY 2009 Plan, this activity was never implemented. HUD investigated the possibility of streamlined demolition/disposition activities for MTW agencies but found that it was not feasible under MTW. Out of concern for residents' rights and the public process, HUD decided that MTW agencies must follow the established procedures for demolition and disposition of property.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*
   This activity was officially closed-out FYE 2014.

3. *In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:*

   i. Final outcomes and lessons learned
   This activity was never implemented.

   ii. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit
   Unknown.

   iii. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity
   Not applicable.

   iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.
   None.

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

(V) Sources and Uses of Funds

Annual MTW Report (FYE 6/30/14)

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

A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

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

Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

LMHA used the single fund flexibility authorized through the MTW Program to transfer approximately $5,306,000 from the MTW HCV Program to the Public Housing Program. This transfer was necessary for the following reasons:

1. Operating subsidy for the Public Housing Program was funded at 89% of eligibility for 2014, and at 85% of eligibility for 2015 (six months of each calendar year affects LMHA's fiscal year ending June 30, 2015).
2. LMHA attempts to manage all of its public housing AMPs at a high level and maintain a balanced operating budget at each. The HUD approved project expense levels (PEL) for most AMPs do not adequately provide for management services at the level deemed necessary by LMHA.
3. LMHA incurs significant security costs while attempting to protect our elderly and disabled residents. Those security costs, as well as resident stipends, were included in LMHA's operating budget for FYE 6/30/15 due to the local HUD office's interpretation of the CFP rule issued in October, 2013. LMHA appealed that interpretation with the local HUD office, and will be moving those costs back to the CFP Program for FYE 6/30/16 because of flexibilities offered in the MTW Program.
4. Utility expenses significantly exceeded budget due to record snowfall and bitter cold temperatures in February, 2015. Utility rates increased as well.

Although LMHA utilizes the funding flexibility available through the MTW Program, LMHA adheres to all statutes and regulations relative to HUD's asset management program. All budgeting and reporting within the Public Housing Program is done on an individual site basis, and LMHA utilizes a "fee for service" methodology that charges the sites only for the services they receive.

During FY 2015, LMHA continued to employ a Multi-Cultural Specialist (Activity #17-2009) to address the unique needs of African immigrant families, including the provision of interpretation and translation services in several dialects commonly used in Somalia.

V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan

B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

Question	Yes	or	No
Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?	Yes		
Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?		or	No

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.

Question	Yes	or	No
Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?		or	No

N/A

V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds

C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds

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

Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
N/A	No current planned commitments or obligations.	*$0*	*$0*
N/A	N/A	*$0*	*$0*
N/A	N/A	*$0*	*$0*
N/A	N/A	*$0*	*$0*
N/A	N/A	*$0*	*$0*
N/A	N/A	*$0*	*$0*
N/A	N/A	*$0*	*$0*
N/A	N/A	*$0*	*$0*
	Total Obligated or Committed Funds:	***$0***	***$0***

N/A

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

VI. Administrative

A. HUD Reviews, Audits, and Physical Inspection Issues

The Housing Authority of Louisville was rated a high performer under the Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) and the Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) for FY 1998, and the agency retains this high performer designation for the duration of its participation in the MTW Demonstration.

LMHA had no HUD reviews, audits, or physical inspection issues that required the agency to take action to address the issue during FY 2015.

B. PHA-Directed Evaluations

Not applicable. LMHA is not currently directing any evaluations of its MTW Program.

C. Certification of Conformance with MTW Statutory Requirements

Certification of Meeting Moving to Work Demonstration Statutory Requirements

Acting on behalf of the Louisville Metro Housing Authority as its authorized official, I make the following certification to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development:

I certify that the Louisville Metro Housing Authority has met the three statutory requirements of the Moving to Work Demonstration program of:

1. Assuring that at least 75% 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.

Tim Barry	Executive Director
Name of Authorized Official	Title of Authorized Official
Tim Barry	9/30/2015
Signature of Authorized Official	Date

420 South Eighth Street | Louisville, KY 40203 | 502 569.3400 Fax 502 569.3459