Cincinnati Metro Area
Voucher Holders Relative to Tract Level Poverty Rate

2010 Census Tract Boundaries
Voucher Holders*
Housing Choice Vouchers by Tract
1 Dot = 10 Persons

Poverty Rate by Tract**
- Low
- Moderate
- Moderate-High
- Very High

Sources:
*Housing Choice Vouchers by Tract
http://egis.hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/8d4eb34f77644303586f6da448d60ca12_0

**ACS 5 Year Socioeconomic Data By Tract As of 2012
http://egis.hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/fcd19c33224b9f99f1fac01ad10396_0

Prepared by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Program Monitoring and Research Division's EGIS team.
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Cincinnati Metro Area
Voucher Holders Relative to African American Communities

2010 Census Tract Boundaries

Voucher Holders*
- Housing Choice Vouchers by Tract
  1 Dot = 10 Persons

African American Communities**
- At, American Population < Regional Average
- At, American Population > Regional Average

* Regional average of African American share of tract level population for the Cincinnati Metro area reported as 12%
** Regional average based on the 2011 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Sources:
* Housing Choice Vouchers by Tract http://egis.hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/8d46c347f76443358661bca48b00ca12_0
** ACS 5 Year Demographic Data by Tract as of 2012 http://egis.hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/5474ed012d00a9a296c6b360e6b084e8_0

Prepared by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research Program Monitoring and Research Division's EDIS team
Current as of: 1/14/2016
Cincinnati Metro Area
Voucher Holders Relative to Communities of Opportunity

2010 Census Tract Boundaries

Voucher Holders*
- Housing Choice Vouchers by Tract
- 1 Dot = 10 Persons

Assessment of Relative Opportunity**
- Opportunity Score < Regional Average
- Opportunity Score > Regional Average

**Opportunity Areas denote census block groups scored according HUD's School Proficiency Index.
- Scores determined by 4th grade test results.
- Higher index scores indicate higher quality schools.
- Regional average index score = 53.0%

Sources:
* Housing Choice Vouchers by Tract
  http://geos.hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/8d4b347f744d3086e76f448b8f0c12_0

** School Proficiency Index
  http://geos.hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/7f1b86f47f3b344c7f3b373b_2
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Cincinnati Metro Area
Housing Tenure & Affordability Relative to Communities of Opportunity

2010 Census Tract Boundaries

Affordable Housing*
Available Rental Units
1 Dot = 25 Units

Assessment of Relative Opportunity**
Opportunity Score < Regional Average
Opportunity Score > Regional Average

*Includes renter occupied OR vacant for rent AND gross rent would be affordable to a household with income less than or equal to 80% of HAVPI AND unit is vacant (available) or occupied by a household with income less than or equal to 80% of HAVPI.

**Opportunity Areas denote census block groups scored according to HUD's School Proficiency Index.
- Higher Index scores indicate higher quality schools.
- Regional average Index score = 53.0.

Sources:
*ACS CEN 2010 Data at Summary Level 080. As of 2011.
**School Proficiency Index

Prepared by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research Program Monitoring and Research Division's EOD team

Current as of: 1/14/2014
Mobility, collaboration, and project-based vouchers

Chicago’s Regional Housing Initiative
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Emerson Square, Evanston
The Chicago region

- 7 counties
- 284 municipalities
- 123 townships
- 307 school districts
- 136 fire districts
- 173 park districts
- 108 library districts
- 26 entitlements
- 15 public housing authorities (PHAs)
Catalyst for INITIAL PHA coordination

- **Section 8 Working Group** called for 1999 Regional Rental Market Analysis.
- This study spotlighted that 1990s job and population growth were not accommodated by housing trends.

Greatest deficit of housing for households earning below $20,000 per year
“Non-economic” barriers guided the market

- Negative public perceptions of “affordable housing” through the 1990s/2000s
- 280 municipalities in the Chicago region, each responsible for housing policy “in their own backyard”
- Lack of community support, state leadership
1. Municipal coordination and leadership.

2. Public Housing Authority (PHA) coordination and accountability.

3. Employer engagement, investment and support.

4. Interagency policy incentives for above!
Structure

- RHI is a **virtual pool** of project based vouchers (PBVs) contributed by participating PHAs.
- Through a **single competitive application**, developers can access PBVs for regionally significant development proposals.
- RHI efforts are supported by the State’s **Qualified Allocation Plan** scoring.
- Developments must support the **Metro Mayors Caucus Housing Endorsement Criteria**, the CMAP GoTo2040, and its FHEA.
- **Regional Wait List** now creates provides needed efficiency.
Pooling vouchers regionally

The RHI virtual pool consists of vouchers, contributed by all ten housing authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHI Public Housing Authority Partner:</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Housing Authority</td>
<td>350*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Cook County</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Housing Authority</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage Housing Authority</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry Housing Authority</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park Housing Authority</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Joliet</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Housing Authority</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Park Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Chicago Housing Authority</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>771</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In January, still subject to final board approval, the CHA increased its commitment from 219 to 350.
RHI Starting Point

*(Philanthropic Funding)*
3 of the Region’s 14 PHAs Participating in RHI with MPC and IHDA
Opportunity Area Equivalent to Metro Mayors Caucus Housing Endorsement Criteria
3 QAP points for RHI Ineffective Referral and Wait List Process

During HUD-funded Pilot
8 of the Region’s 14 PHAs Participating in RHI with MPC and IHDA
Opportunity Area Strengthened via Pre-FHEA Metrics
QAP Embedded with RHI Priorities
Create new Regional Wait List

Today/What’s Next
*(Focused on Sustainable Funding)*
10 of the Region’s 14 PHAs Participating in RHI with CMAP
Opportunity Area to be further linked with CMAP’s FHEA
Pursuing Sustainable Funding Model and Broader Financing Incentives
Improving Efficiencies of Regional Wait List
CMap and RHI

- Regional planning agency for northeastern Illinois
- Leads the implementation of GO TO 2040
- HUD Sustainable Communities grantee
- Close relationship with municipalities, particularly due to the Local Technical Assistance Program
- Resources that help further implementation
CMAP and RHI

- Expanded opportunity definition from FHEA
- Data and analysis from MPO functions
- Evaluation of plan implementation
- Deeper understanding of PHA issues/concerns
- PHA expertise on development evaluation
RHI units 2003-present
RHI outcomes

- 34 developments
- 546 RHI subsides within 2,200 total rentals
- Most RHI apartments now in opportunity areas
- Selection process tightly linked to LIHTC, but opportunity area preservation is growing priority.
- Regional waiting list referred > 700 unique households to 17 developments across the region; over 70 households moved into RHI developments*

*New Olmstead-related State requirements created unanticipated challenges/lessons
Replicability

- Align critical housing authority policies to create efficiencies, while remaining true to local needs, costs and policies.
- Incentives for housing authority participation in regional equity initiatives.
- Incentives for MPOs to support PHA collaborations.
- Shared definition of “opportunity.”
- Capacity, role, and value of a third party.
- Coordinate and leverage a consortium, with PHAs and MPO at the core.
What’s Next?

How can we leverage or pursue the following to support operation and expansion of regional PBV approaches?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Create/ manage operations of regional housing strategies</th>
<th>Commit and administer regional vouchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement funds</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial consortia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2W leveraging</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small area FMR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMAP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility set asides</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA admin fees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer fees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD counseling fees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Alison Bell Shuman, Executive Director, Baltimore Regional Housing Partnership,
Christine Klepper, Executive Director, HCP of Illinois, Inc.
WHAT DO WE MEAN BY REGIONAL TENANT-BASED HOUSING MOBILITY?

- Preparing families to move to higher opportunity areas by removing barriers
  1. Not all families will move nor will they all move to the highest opportunity areas
  2. Mobility is suggested as another strategy in addition to place-based strategies

- Encouraging moves that will increase individual success and reduce poverty
  1. Recent studies show more negative life outcomes, especially for children growing up in highly toxic areas
  2. And more positive life outcomes when families move to areas with greater opportunity.
  3. Entire regions benefit economically where there is less segregation

- Use of tenant-based HCV to increase the number of low-income families who are able to access areas with good schools, low crime and better employment options.
THINKING REGIONALLY

- To consider where vouchers are located currently in a region and expand the possibilities of where vouchers could be used.
  1. Most vouchers in the central city; most opportunity areas in the suburbs,
  2. How can we collaborate to assist families in accessing great neighborhoods?

- Can we move the needle from the 20% of families with children who live in low-poverty areas by using housing mobility counseling and the voucher as tools?

- Mobility program structures currently: voluntary individual PHA programs; voluntary regional programs, relocation programs and litigation.

- Source of Income protection and incentives like a tax abatement program can be tools to help make mobility more successful.
Chicago Area Demographics

Orange-Caucasian
Green-African American
Blue/purple-Latino and Asian
Chicago Regional Voucher Distribution with RCAPs

Light grey lower number of vouchers
Dark gray Higher number of vouchers
IN-DEPTH CASE STUDY

Baltimore Housing Mobility Program

administered by

Baltimore Regional Housing Partnership
IN-DEPTH CASE STUDY: BALTIMORE

- BHMP arose from *Thompson v. HUD* suit filed in 1995 by ACLU of Maryland
- Partial consent decree in 1996 created structure of BHMP; program began leasing in late 2002
- Final settlement in 2012 created regional administrator to oversee BHMP
The Program service area includes Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, and Howard Counties, as well as Baltimore City.
Prior Definition –
• <10% poverty
• <30% African American population
• <5% public housing

New Definition –
Defined at the census tract level, BRHP uses Opportunity indexes from the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the Opportunity Mapping Advisory Panel (OMAP), supplemented by

- HUD Picture of Subsidized Households data
- Maryland school performance data = MSA test scores
- American Community Survey data
- Internal administrative data
BHMP Initial Moves in 2015

- Opportunity area
- Non-opportunity area
- Non-residential area
- Water
- Pre-move location
- Post-move location
Opportunity area
Non-opportunity area
Non-residential area
Water
Pre-move location
Post-move location
Creating Moves to Opportunity

Counseling
- Pre-Move
- Housing Search
  - Landlord Outreach
- Post-Move
- Recertifications
  - Eligibility/Voucher Issuance
  - Search Time
- Inspections
- HCV
- Policy & Research
- Finance
  - HAP Payments
  - Security Deposit Loans
Key Features

- HCV administration
- Regional administration
  - No portability required
- Targeted vouchers with two-year opportunity requirement
- Moving to Work flexibilities
  - Counseling services funded
- Extensive pre-move counseling
  - Workshop series
  - Financial goals
  - Action plan completion
- Housing search assistance
- Landlord outreach/recruitment
- Security deposit loans
  - Foundation funded
- Payment standards between 90% and 130% of FMR to incentivize and disincentive areas
- Generous voucher search time
- 2 year initial move follow-up
- Mover counseling
Average Timeline: Application to Lease-up

10 months on waitlist
13 months in pre-counseling
4 months from pre-counseling to lease up
= 27 months
Program & Family Composition

• 9,747 people housed
• 3,094 families housed
• 3.1 average family size
• 63% 3+ bedroom households
• 8% 1 bedroom households
Neighborhood Characteristics

- $71,092 median income of tracts with BRHP families (or 80% of AMI)
- 74% of BRHP families in Opportunity Areas
- 19.1% median percent African American vs 89.5% in pre-move neighborhood
- 8.1% median tract poverty rate vs 30.3% in pre-move neighborhood
Moves

• 51% of families remain in original unit
• 25% of families are in second unit
• 2.8 years, average time after family moves from original unit
• 1.7 times, average moves for families in the program 6+ years
## TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher cost-initiatives</th>
<th>Lower-cost initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Suite of Housing Mobility Counseling</td>
<td>Information on opportunity areas and portability clearly weaved in voucher briefings and program materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preparation for renting units where landlord screening criteria may be more stringent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of clients income, savings and debts to achieve credit goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Counseling on expanding family’s notions of what types of neighborhoods they can access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dedicated landlord outreach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Direct referrals to units in high opportunity areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing search assistance and transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Security deposit assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Post-move counseling to provide local resources, address any issues that may arise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landlord/tenant mediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Second and third move counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listings of rental units in opportunity areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of payment standards and consideration of requesting exception payment standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional cooperation regarding standardization and streamlining of portability procedures to increase ease of moves for families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnering with local advocates for source of income protections, more actively paying attention to fair housing challenges faced by participants (i.e. complaints certain landlords refuse families with children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased voucher search times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff training on affirmatively further fair housing and challenging ideas about where voucher holders “should” live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region-wide voucher administration with no required portability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CHICAGO EXPERIENCE:

- **Relocation - Include Mobility.** Funds for organizing can be carried over into regular voucher program.
  - Large and small PHAs with litigation and without. CHA, Rockford and Joliet, IL plus Port Arthur, TX.
  - CHA/HCP results. About 45% of 1000 public housing residents who took a voucher through the Plan for Transformation moved to low-poverty or opportunity areas.

- **Voluntary Individual PHA programs. CHA, Lake County, HACC, and others.**
  - In house or contracted to a mission-driven non-profit
  - Small, growing and substantive

- **Litigation-driven.** Baltimore, Dallas and Yonkers. Generally well-funded.

- **Regional approach.** Chicago Regional Housing Choice Initiative using a third party non-profit
CHA VOLUNTARY MOBILITY

SIMILAR TO BALTIMORE

- Counseling on expanded neighborhoods
- Dedicated landlord outreach
- Direct referrals to units in opportunity areas
- Search assistance with transportation
- Community tours
- Security deposit assistance
- Post move counseling
- Landlord/tenant mediation
- Second-third move assistance

DIFFERENT FROM BALTIMORE

- Moderate budget
- Non-targeted vouchers
- Significant exception rents
- Imbedded in PHA program
- Less control over HCV program/data
- **Intervention later in process
- **Less counseling
- **90 day search time with extension

Hybrid. Third largest PHA in the country (MTW); third most segregated city in the country and does the most besides litigation-driven programs (Gautreaux history).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals or averages</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5990</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHICAGO REGIONAL HOUSING CHOICE INITIATIVE

- **Elements of Total Program**
  Eight PHA’s spanning 2300 sq mi, One year organizing - two year implementation
  Included three strategies (tenant based, project-based and portability) with six treatment groups and randomization on top
  Funded by HUD, private foundations and CDBG program: low budget for scope

- **Tenant-based Portion-counseling group**
  - HCP standardized recruitment presentations (with local information included) to HCV households at move briefings given by PHAs.
  - PHA referred households to HCP for further assistance.
  - Three counselors interacted with 971 households with 417 attending a mandatory orientation; 138 moves to opportunity areas resulted. An additional 87 moves resulted from incentive only participants for a total of 225 moves.

- Participants moved to areas with lower poverty rates, less racial segregation and higher educational outcomes. Those who received counseling moved further away to access opportunity neighborhoods with lower poverty and higher median household incomes.
Pre and post move—school quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Measures</th>
<th>Pre move</th>
<th>Post move</th>
<th>% increase/ decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% children meet or exceed State standards—reading</td>
<td>53.59</td>
<td>72.89</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Ranking</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African American</td>
<td>46.94</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Caucasian</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>50.69</td>
<td>259%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LESSONS LEARNED

- Regional infrastructure can be created and worked very well

- More structural changes are needed
  - Earlier timing of the intervention allows longer preparation and search times
  - Greater resources—intensive counseling and landlord outreach
  - Focus on those living in high poverty areas
  - Larger incentive or security deposit assistance
  - Less stringent definition of opportunity areas
  - More exception rents
  - More supportive and reinforcing environment from HUD and PHAs

- Good success with port ins
GOING FORWARD

- Building low cost programs over time with evaluation to assess effectiveness with the goal of growing to include intensive counseling
- Take advantage of HUD Community Compass Technical Assistance
- New Round of Regional Demonstration Programs
- Sustainability:
  - Regional administration of port program which could be more efficient and save money to fund mobility counseling
- Let’s get started!