

2014 Moving-To-Work Annual Report

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority

2832, State Route 59, Ravenna, OH 44266

Fred Zawilinski, Director
(330) 297-1489 Ext. 246

Submitted for Approval: July 2, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I: Overview of Short-Term and Long-Term Goals.....	3
Section II: General Housing Authority Operating Information.....	5
Section III: Proposed MTW Activities.....	9
Section IV: Approved MTW Activities.....	10
Section V: Sources and Uses of Funds.....	71
Section VI: Administrative.....	72

Section I: Overview of Short-Term and Long-Term MTW Goals

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority established the following goals and objectives for 2014:

1. Maintain and Expand Excellence in Property Management

- PMHA will operate Public Housing to the level of a High Performer.
- PMHA will expand the number of units within its portfolio of housing.

PMHA's Public Housing scored in the mid-90s for physical condition and operations management. PMHA did not add any units in 2014, and indeed reduced its portfolio through the disposition of a duplex. PMHA did add 65 units of tax credit housing as part of the portfolio it is managing.

2. Achieve and Maintain Excellence in Tenant-Based Housing Programs

- PMHA will continue to achieve program results equating to High Performer status.
- Tenant-based housing programs will achieve and maintain full lease-up.
- Five households will become new homeowners through the Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program in 2014.

PMHA made progress on lease-up measures for its Housing Choice Voucher program, but needs to continue making progress in some special voucher programs. Only 2 households became homeowners, as Portage County saw a reduction in the amount of pre-ownership counseling services available for low-income voucher participants.

3. Improve Productivity and Cost Effectiveness

- Further development and enhancement of the Yardi software system to better manage PMHA programs and operations.

PMHA maintained its Yardi software, switching to a "cloud-based" system that protects PHA data and increases operational flexibility and efficiency. Additionally, PMHA has continued to add new elements of electronic data management to its operation.

4. Collaborate with Community Partners to Leverage Resources to Benefit Households Assisted by PMHA and Portage County

- PMHA will investigate opportunities to develop and manage permanent supportive housing.
- PMHA will investigate methods of inter-agency cooperation that will lessen barriers to assistance for applicants and participants.
- PMHA will seek to expand partnerships that improve community housing activities for all citizens.

PMHA has maintained inter-agency cooperation and partnerships related to permanent supportive housing, homelessness, and related areas.

PMHA's long-term vision for the direction of its MTW program, extending through the duration of the MTW Agreement includes:

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority seeks to develop itself as a top-quality real estate organization with the mission of integrating community services that will assist non-disabled, non-elderly residents in continual economic improvement leading to either homeownership or private market housing; and for elderly and disabled residents, PMHA seeks to provide decent, safe and affordable housing as a matter of choice for each household.

To accomplish the long-term vision, PMHA seeks to continual improvement in streamlining the delivery of housing to low-income families and individuals through improvements in efficiency and effectiveness within its own resources offered by the Federal Government, by developing new, non-governmental sources of funding that will assist in achieving the vision and mission of the housing authority, and through cooperation and collaboration with community partners to leverage resources and strengths to better housing and living conditions for all persons living with Portage County, Ohio.

In this effort, Moving to Work is expected to remain a critical element of achieving these goals. PMHA is committed to developing a rent calculation system that is easier to administer and understand without compromising the agency's commitment to the integrity of federal funds. In addition, PMHA envisions a rent system that remains affordable to low-income households, but also provides incentive and encouragement to people working to the best of their abilities to improve themselves.

Also, the Moving to Work vision includes removing barriers to rational property management decisions, allowing the agency to administer its real estate inventory with solutions appropriate to the mission. What works in Windham or Ravenna, Ohio may not be the same solution for Cleveland, Ohio or Washington, DC. Local, informed decision-making has brought PMHA to the high performer status it has earned under HUD evaluation to this day; PMHA seeks to provide one example of "how to" that might serve as an example for other housing authorities in finding solutions. PMHA does not seek to provide THE example because the agency is committed to the value that local decision-making will free the creativity of housing authority boards and staffs throughout the nation.

B. MTW Report: Leasing Information

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

Non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	0.096746575	
	Planned	Actual
Mainstream 74 planned-68 actual; VASH 25-19 actual; Enhanced 18-7 actual	117	94
ModRehab2 81 planned-68 actual; ModRehab3 91-77 actual; ShelterPlus 50-53 actual	222	198
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	0
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	339	292

* 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

Housing Program:	Unit Months	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based	N/A	0
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based	N/A	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	0
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	0	0

Explanation for differences between planned and actual households served

*** 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
 **** 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

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	24	29	38	37	X	X	X	X
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	24	29	38	37	X	X	X	x
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	100%	100%	100%	100%	X	X	X	X

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

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be	Baseline Percentages of
1 Person	X	X	X	X	X
2 Person	X	X	X	X	X
3 Person	X	X	X	X	X
4 Person	X	X	X	X	X
5 Person	X	X	X	X	X
6+ Person	X	X	X	X	X
Totals	297	1311	0	1608	100%

Explanation for Baseline: Beginning, March 1999 and since, the Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority did not determine number of Households occupied by Household

Mix of Family Sizes Served-PH & Sect8

	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	1608
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year 2014	677	665	553	90	14	6	2005
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year 2014	34%	33%	28%	5%	1%	0%	1.001
Percentage Change	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	0.001

Justification and Explanation:

* "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,
 ** 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
 **** 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

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	No leasing issues
Section 8 Voucher	Voucher programs dependent on external referrals for eligibility periodically have leasing issues.
Local Non-Traditional Voucher	No leasing issues

Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End		
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
PH Households w/ Wages	127	Households With Wage Income
Section 8 Households w/Wages	531	Households With Wage Income
Section 8 Family Self-Sufficiency Program	24	Section 8 FSS Participation
Homeownership Program	28	Homeownership Program Participation
Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	5	
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	705	

II.6.Report.Leasing
C. MTW Report: Wait List Information

Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End				
Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community-Wide	2,390	Open	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide	2,192	Closed	no
Local Non-MTW Voucher Programs (Mod-	Community-Wide	1718	Open	no

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

PH: AmInd=0.5%; Asian=0.0%; Black=34.7%; Nat.HI=0.1%; White=58.8%; Multiple=1.7%; Unknown=4.2%
Section 8: AmInd=0.4%; Asian=0.2%; Black=37.2%; NatHI=0.1%; White=57.9%; Multiple=1.0%; Unknown=3.1%
Mod-Rehab: Amind=0.5%; Asian=0.2%; Black=35.3%; HatHI=0.1%=White=56.9%; Multiple=1.1%;Unknown=5.9%

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

Name and Description of "other" wait list type
Name and Description of "other" wait list type
Name and Description of "other" wait list type

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.

There were no changes to the wait list during 2014.

Section III: Proposed MTW Activities

All proposed activities which were granted HUD approval are reported in Section IV as “Approved MTW Activities”.

Section IV: Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

A. Implemented Activities

Housing Choice Voucher Program

HCV-1 Restrict portability moves out of Portage County for the Housing Choice Voucher Program:

PMHA will approve portability only to housing authorities who absorb the incoming family, or administer Fair Market Rents at or below the amounts applicable to Portage County. This restriction does not apply to portability moves out of Portage County that are justified under laws and regulations applicable to reasonable accommodations for disability and to federal Violence Against Women Act provision. Plan Year: 2009 Implementation: 2010.

<i>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
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)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$300 per household	\$150 per household	6 households \$551	Cost savings per household decreased to \$92 per household- Benchmark was exceeded

<i>CE#2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	6 hours per household	2 hours per household	2 hours per household	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: This activity is a part of the “port-out” process for Housing Choice Voucher participants who are seeking to move to communities where payment standards exceed those of PMHA as a means of reducing impact on budget resources caused by portability moves outside of Ohio to high-rent communities where the receiving Housing Authority may not absorb the in-coming participant

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: This activity is on scheduled and benchmarks have traditionally been met or exceeded.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Not applicable

HCV-2 Amend the Homeownership Voucher Program to include households who are presently homeowners and under foreclosure

MTW Homeownership Program: PMHA will continue to expand the MTW homeownership program, which identifies families with homeownership as one of their goals, screens the family for eligibility and applies a homeownership assistance payment to participants who purchase a home under the program. Plan Year: 1999. Implementation: 2000

This activity was amended to include households who are presently homeowners and under foreclosure to receive assistance with resolving issues with bank/mortgage company seeking foreclosure. Plan Year: 2010 Implemented: 2010

HC #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	Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of	Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

	the activity. This number may be zero.	the activity (number)	the activity (number)	
	0	2 per year	51 households purchased homes between 2001-2014 2014-2 households purchased homes	Benchmarks have traditionally been met or exceeded for each year.

HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase)	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity. This number may be zero.	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	0	1 per year	1 household received service during 2014	Benchmark met for 2014. Foreclosure prevention services are offered to households after homeownership achieved.

Description of detailed information on activity impact: The PMHA Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program has been assisting, at minimum 2 households per year, since its implementation. Over the course of 19 years, a total of 51 households achieved homeownership. It should be noted that foreclosure prevention services that are offered are not always successful in preventing foreclosure. The most common reason for such is the failure of the homeowner to “follow through” on the recommended activities that may prevent foreclosure.

In reviewing the program and current homeownership requirements established by HUD, the PMHA homeownership program probably does not need MTW authorization to operate. However, the slight provisions under MTW provide preferences to maintain the program for Public Housing residents who wish to become homeowners. Public Housing residents with higher incomes are invited to participate in the homeownership program. If enrolled in the program, assistance is provided to obtain homeownership.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: This activity is on schedule.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests:

Not applicable to this activity.

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable at this time.

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes were made.

HCV-3 RE-POSED: Initial rent burden cap from 50% to 70% of adjusted monthly income

In Plan Year 1999 and Implemented in 2000, PMHA allowed HCV participants to utilize an initial rent burden of 50% as an effort to maximize housing choice and maintain a level of affordability.

During 2014, PMHA implemented an increased Initial Rent Burden Cap of 70% of household's monthly income in an effort to assist in increasing housing choices for families who desire to use a greater share of income for housing. Plan Year: 2014
Implemented: August 2014

Metric for Initial Rent Burden Cap of 50%-January 1, 2014-July 31, 2014

HC #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)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	0	10 households or 10% of all households (whichever is greater) MODIFIED for Period in effect-Jan thru Jul-6 households	7 (29%) of 24 households	Benchmark met

Metric for Initial Rent Burden Cap of 70%-August 1, 2014-December 31 2014

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Unit of	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark

Measurement				Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available to households at or below 80% AMI as a result of this activity	0.	Expected number of new housing units made available to households at or below 80% AMI as a result of this activity	Actual number of new housing units made available to households at or below 80% AMI as a result of this activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	0	15 new housing units or (6 per 5 months)	25 (25%) of 100 households	Benchmark met

HC #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)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	0	15 households or (6 per 5 months)	August thru December 2014- 25 households	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: Households participating were willing to adjust family expenditures to reflect desires for housing over other wants and needs.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The activity is now on schedule, and baselines and benchmarks have been met.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No change was made

HCV-4 Project-Based Voucher Program to assist non-profits and developers to increase housing choices for low-income households

PMHA uses a number of waivers from the original and current HCV guidelines to assist developers to build or rehabilitate properties for the use of homeless, disabled or other families in need of supportive services. Plan Year: 1999 Implemented: 2002 and with revision in 2009

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households (homeless, disabled or others in need of social services) at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase).	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	0	50	151	Benchmark exceeded

Description of detailed information on its impact: MTW authorizations and waivers have allowed a locally-designed program to remain responsible to potential new projects by local housing developers and foster additional purchase and rehab of existing real estate by those entities.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Benchmark was exceeded and the activity is on schedule

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions were made

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes were made

HCV-5 Alternative Housing Quality Standards Compliance

Refer to D. Closed Out Activities

HCV-6 Time Limits for Housing Choice Voucher Participants Plan Year: 2013

Refer to B- Not yet Implemented Activities

HCV-7 Capped Utility Reimbursement Checks

Plan Year 2012 Implemented: 2012 Refer to C.-Activities on Hold

HCV-8 Transitional Housing Vouchers Plan Year: 2012 Implemented: 2012

The Transitional Housing Voucher allows for PMHA to move a long-standing transitional housing program previously located at Renaissance Place, a Public Housing development, to a tenant-based program. This change allows for Public Housing to become more uniformly managed while offering a more flexible approach to housing formerly homeless persons for one year and offers a greater choice in housing for this population. Supportive services are provided to participating households. This activity provides a one-year voucher to families. Intensive supportive services are provided to participants, with an emphasis on employment and self-sufficiency. The voucher ends after one year and is not renewable, but participants are eligible to obtain Public Housing or a traditional Housing Choice Voucher during their time in this program.

<i>CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	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 average amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Benchmark met
The Transitional Housing Program depends on a long-standing partnership with Family and Community Services to provide intensive case-management services to previously homeless households. PMHA's offering has been to provide the "shelter" needed to solidify the existence of the program. Thus, no resources were leveraged on behalf of the PMHA				

<i>SS #5 Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services	Households receiving self-sufficiency services	Expected number of households receiving self-	Actual number of households receiving self-	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark

aimed to increase self-sufficiency	prior to implementation of the activity (number)	sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number)	sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number)	
	0	1 per year	1	Benchmark met
The Transitional Housing Voucher program allows households to remain on program for not more than one year. Since the program became voucher based in 2012, a total of 5 previous homeless households participated.				

<i>SS #8 Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase)	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number) This number may be zero	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	0	1	1	Benchmark met

<i>HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase)	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity (number) This number may be zero	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	0	1	1	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: This activity allows for homeless households to secure shelter and case-management services and allows for the continuation of the transitional housing program in Portage County.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The activity is on schedule, and outcomes meet the expectations of a one-year program.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions have been made

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes have been made.

HCV-9 Elimination of Deductions in Total Tenant Payment Calculations
Plan Year: 2014 Refer to B-Not Yet Implemented Activities

HCV-10 Biennial Reviews for Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households:

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority would be required to conduct reviews of income at least once every 24 months as opposed to current requirements of annually. Families may continue to request interim reviews at anytime. This activity would be applied to all MTW Vouchers held by households not considered “elderly” or “disabled”.

Plan Year: 2014 Implemented: August 2014

PMHA anticipates this activity would reduce the costs of administering the program by cutting the responsibility for income re-certifications by 50% when fully implemented. Cost savings in part would be used to deal with HCV funding issues, but also to enable staff to devote time to more family self-sufficiency related efforts with the participants and away from an emphasis on paperwork.

<i>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
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 prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$115,228	\$57,614 Decrease	\$3,502	Benchmark exceeded based upon an estimated \$4,801 monthly savings

<i>CE#2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	8,600 hours per year	5,590 hours per year	324 hours	Benchmark exceeded based on an estimated 466 hours per month

<i>CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rent revenue in dollars	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity	Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Note: Changing the frequency of "annual" or regular household re-certifications is not expected to alter agency rental revenue

<i>SS#1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$9,500	\$9,800	\$13,008	Benchmark exceeded

<i>SS#2: Increase in Household Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average savings/escrow amount of	Average savings/escrow amount of	Expected average savings/escrow amount of	Actual average savings/escrow amount of	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark

households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	
	\$140	\$250	\$140	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact

<i>SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed Full-time	Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	319 (All HCV Households)	350	10 (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2014)	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact
Employed Full-time	Percentage of total work-able households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of total work-able households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-able households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	22%	25%	9% (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2014)	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact

Employed Part-time	Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	212	265	25 (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2014)	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact
Employed Part-time	Percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	15%	19%	23% (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2014)	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact

Enrolled in an Educational Program	Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	2014-4 HH	2014-4 HH	2014-4 HH	Beginning 2015, PMHA will not verify education program enrollment because it is not related to any MTW activities
Enrolled in an Educational Program	Percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity	Actual percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark

		(percentage)		
	4%	4%	4%	Beginning 2015, PMHA will not verify education program enrollment because it is not related to any MTW activities

Enrolled in a Job Training Program	Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	N/A	N/A	N/A	PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training program because it is not related to any MTW activities
Enrolled in a job Training Program	Percentage of total work-able households enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of total work-able households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-able households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	N/A	N/A	N/A	PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training program because it is not related to any MTW activities

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Unemployed	Heads(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	15	12	1	Note: It will take a

				cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact
Unemployed	Percentage of total work-able households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of total work-able households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-able households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	0.9%	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact

<i>SS#4: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease)	Households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	30	20	2 (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2014)	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact

<i>SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency</i>				
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	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark

		(number)	(number)	
	0	357	357	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact

<i>SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase)	Households transitioning to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected households transitioning to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual number of households transitioning to self-sufficiency implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	531	600	To Be Determined	Note: It will take a cycle of 2 years before outcome can be evaluated for impact

Description of detailed information on its impact: While this activity will reduce administrative costs when fully implemented, it most likely will take a full cycle to evaluate its impact. The staff time spent on self-sufficiency efforts will also need to be evaluated in terms of increasing the number of participating households with earned income and the ability to maintenance such.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: This activity was implemented during the last five months of 2014. As a result, the data expressed is a fragment of total implementation. The delayed implementation was due to the dates of the approved MTW Annual Plan and PMHA Board approval.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: As noted, the achievement of benchmarks will be significant as time progresses since the impact of this activity spans a two-year cycle

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Not applicable

HCV-11 Permit Households at \$0 HAP to Self-Certify Income

This activity would permit families who are at \$0 HAP to self-certify their income rather than be subjected to a verification process that should have no effect on housing assistance levels, thus reducing costs and staff time while achieving greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

Plan Year: 2014 Implementation: August 1, 2014

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 prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$3,360	\$420 Decrease	\$151	Benchmark met

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	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	40 hours per year	5 hours per year	2	Benchmark met

CE#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)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark

	1% estimated	0%	0%	Benchmark met

CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rent revenue in dollars	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity	Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Note: HCV program does not impact agency rental revenues. Thus, this activity is not expected to alter agency rental revenue

Description of detailed information on its impact: This activity eliminates the income verification process for this population without negative impact on overall program operations.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The activity is on schedule after a delay in implementation due to MTW Annual Plan approval date and PMHA Board approval.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No requests for hardship were received.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions were made

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes were made

HCV-12 Use Lesser of Actual Unit Size or Unit Size of Voucher Issued for Utility Allowances Plan Year: 2014 Implemented: July 2014

PMHA will apply the lesser utility allowance of either the actual unit size leased by the family, or the unit size of the voucher issued. This activity will be applied to new admissions to the program upon admission. For existing households, the activity will be applied to current participant households at the next scheduled recertification. PMHA estimates the impact of this change would save approximately \$9,000 per hear of HAP funds when fully implemented. The impact of this activity will assist PMHA in cost control for the program while ensuring that the family receives an appropriate amount of assistance for its utilities costs.

NOTE: This proposed activity was passed into a Federal Law July 2014. As a result, it is no longer feasible or practicable to consider this as a MTW feature.

HCV-13 *Extend the \$0 HAP Period to 12 Months*

Plan Year: 2014 Implemented: August 2014

PMHA proposes to extend the period of time a family may be considered a Housing Choice Voucher participant household from the current six months to up to 12 months.

The impact of this activity asserts that some families either are reluctant to attain \$0 HAP status or when notified that they are at \$0 HAP, they take measures that reduce their income so as to begin receiving HAP assistance again. By increasing the period allowed for \$0 HAP, PMHA expects to see more families achieve \$0 HAP and to exit the program at \$0 HAP rather than to return to HAP payment status. For those who achieve \$0 HAP status through employment, the extended period allows a safety net to the household as they adjust to paying market rents without assistance and stabilize themselves in their new employment situation.

<i>SS#1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark Note: This activity is not expected to affect household income
	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$32,138	Benchmark exceeded

<i>SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Employed Full-time	Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	12	11	11	Benchmark met
Employed Full-time	Percentage of work-able households Employed Full Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of work-able households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-abled households Employed Full Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	100%	92%	92%	Benchmark met

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed Part-time	Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	1	1	1	Benchmark met
Employed Part-time	Percentage of work-able households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of work-able households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-abled households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	8%	8%	8%	Benchmark met

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Enrolled in an Educational Program	Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program prior to implementation of the activity	Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of	Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark

	(number)	the activity (number)	(number)	
	2014-2 HH	2014-2 HH	2014-2 HH	Beginning 2015, PMHA will not verify education program enrollment because it is not related to any MTW activities
Enrolled in an Educational Program	Percentage of work-able households Enrolled in an Educational Program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of work-able households Enrolled in an Educational Program after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-abled households Enrolled in an Educational Program after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	17%	17%	17%	Beginning 2015, PMHA will not verify education program enrollment because it is not related to any MTW activities

<i>SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Enrolled in a Job Training Program	Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	2014-0 HH	2014-0 HH	2014-0 HH	PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training program because it is not related to any MTW activities
Enrolled in a Job Training Program	Percentage of work-able households Enrolled in a job training program prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected percentage of work-able households Enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual percentage of total work-abled households Enrolled in a job training program after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark

	N/A	N/A	N/A	PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training program because it is not related to any MTW activities
--	-----	-----	-----	---

Unemployed	Heads(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	0	0	0	Benchmark met
Unemployed	Heads(s) of households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Expected Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual Heads(s) of households unemployed after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	0%	0%	0%	Benchmark met

SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families				
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)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	5	2	0	Benchmark Exceeded

SS#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 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)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Note: Households participating do not receive subsidy.

				Thus, a subsidy cost for these households is not possible.
--	--	--	--	--

SS#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)	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Benchmark met

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase)	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency	Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark
12	12	12	12	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: Zero HAP households remain on the program an additional six month. This additional time provides a safety net to continue working and build confidence in the ability to remain employed and maintain housing without subsidy

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The activity is on schedule and outcomes are as expected

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were received

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes were made

HCV-14 Permit Decreases in Payment Standards at Next Scheduled Verification

Plan Year: 2014 Refer to B-Not Yet Implemented Activities

HCV-15 Change the Allocation of Interest Earned for the Housing Choice Voucher Self-Sufficiency Program Plan Year: 2014 Refer to B-Not yet Implemented Activities

PUBLIC HOUSING

PH-1 Escalating Minimum Rent

Refer to D. Closed Out Activities

PH-2 Maximum Rent

Maximum Rent allows for rents set at less than 30% of adjusted income. Maximum rents are \$465 per month for 1 and 2 bedroom units, and \$490 per month for 3 and 4 bedroom units, regardless of income. Income re-verifications are biennially for these households. Households will have no time limit for ceiling rents.

Plan Year: 2009 Implemented: 2009

MAXIMUM RENT

<i>SS#1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Average earned income increased steadily since initial implementation. Multi-wage earners per household helped to increase the actual average earned income of households.
	\$0	\$25,000	\$35,327	

<i>SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>				
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)	The number of households receiving TANF decreased by 73% when comparing 2008 and 2014 data
	22	10	6	

SS#7: Increase in Agency Rent 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)	Rent revenue increased by at least \$4,000 per month since implementation
	\$33,899 per month (2008)	\$4,000 month increase per year	\$61,601 (2014)	

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase)	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number)	Of 43 households at maximum rent during 2014, 36 maintained maximum rent
	0	27	36	

Description of detailed information on its impact: The Maximum Rent feature offers rent relief to households who attain better employment and/or increase their income, capping their rents at levels designed to encourage long-term residents, resident asset accumulation, and provide greater stability to PMHA Public Housing developments.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Benchmarks have been achieved when compared to baselines and the activity remains on schedule.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There were no hardship requests since the implementation of this activity.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not Applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions have been made

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Data collection has traditionally been the Rent Calculation Summaries for all Public Housing Residents.

PH-3 Elderly and Disabled Rent Re-certifications Biennially

Note: The information listed below reflects data during the period of January 1 2014 thru August 31, 2014. This activity was re-posed in Plan Year 2014 to Re-Certification of Elderly and Disabled to Every Three Years. However the implementation of this change was effective September 1, 2014. The data for September 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014 is reflected in the re-posed activity B-10.

Elderly and disabled households who have 90% or more of their income from Social Security, SSI or other disability payments, and pensions will have a rent redetermination every two years. However, they may choose to have their income reexamined at any time. Plan Year: 1999 Implemented: 1999

Since these households receive such a slight annual increase (if any) for these types of income sources, the amount of time and costs to conduct annual re-certifications exceeds the amount of increased rent revenue gained.

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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	3 hours x 90 households x \$13 or current hourly salary of staff person= \$3,510	3 hours x 20 households x \$19 or current hourly salary of staff person= \$1,140	21 households 2014= \$1,197 Data is reflective from January 2014 thru August 2014	This activity historically has met or exceeded benchmarks since its implementation.

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	3 hours x 90 residents or 270 hours	3 hours x 20 residents or 60 hours	2014-21 residents Savings Time=63 hrs.	This activity historically has met or exceeded benchmarks since its implementation.

CE#5: Increase in Agency Rent Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Benchmark Achieved?
Rent revenue in dollars (increase)	Rent revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual rent revenue after implementation of the activity (dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	Information is not available	\$19,000 monthly rent	2013- \$21,764 2014- \$22,833 monthly rent	Rent revenues increase annually because not all residents are on the same annual re-certification schedule

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The activity is on scheduled and benchmarks have been met. The number of residents on a biennial recertification schedule varies due to move-ins and move-out as well as requests for a re-certification due to changes in family composition, medical expenses, income and other.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There were no hardship requests since the implementation of this activity.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective:

During 2014, this activity has been re-posed to increase the recertification time to three years. This modification will yield more additional time savings for staff. Refer to B-10.

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: As previously stated, refer to B-10 since the reposed activity is now implemented by both Public Housing the Housing Choice Voucher Programs. Both programs implemented a three-year recertification process during 2014. Data reflective after implementation is documented and available at B-10. The change from biennial to every three years was made due to the nature of the population impacted (elderly/disabled households). Also, the minimal amount of increase in rent revenue that would result by undertaking annual-recertification is cost effective.

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: There are no changes in the data collection as indicated for the current activity.

PH-4 Change in Employment Income

Change in employment income resulting in an increase in annual income of any amount is not processed until the next annual re-certification. However, residents are expected to report changes.

Plan Year: 2008 Implemented: January 2012

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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	Number of residents with income increases or decreases of \$1,000 or less in annual income 36 residents x 3 hours x \$19 (current hourly rate)= \$2,052	36 residents x 1 hour x \$19 (current hourly rate)= \$684	2014=36 residents x 1 hour x \$19 (current hourly rate)= \$684	Benchmark met

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in	Total amount of staff time dedicated	Expected amount of total staff time	Actual amount of total staff time	Outcome meets or exceeds the

staff hours	to the task prior to implementation of the activity	dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours)	dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours)	benchmark
	36 residents x 3 hours= 108 hours	36 residents x 1 hour= 36 hours	2014= 36 residents x 1 hour= 36 hours	Benchmark met

CE #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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	3%	0%	0%	Benchmark met

CE#5: Increase in Agency Rent Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Benchmark Achieved?
Rent revenue in dollars (increase)	Rent revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected rent revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual rent revenue after implementation of the activity (dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$36,865 (December)	\$35,000 monthly rent (December)	2013- \$37,192 2014- \$42,963 monthly rent (December)	Rent revenues increased indicating income exclusions have no negative impact

SS#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 prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$14,683 (average wage income 2011)	\$20,000	\$28,136	Average earned income increased steadily since 2011 due to Multi-wage earners and end of the PH Transitional

				Housing Program for previously homeless households.
--	--	--	--	---

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed Full-Time	Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	72	72	2014-76	The number of households employed full time increased when compared to both the baseline and benchmark
Percentage	60%	60%	61%	Benchmark met

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed Part-Time	Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	48	48	51	The number of households employed part-time increased when compared to both baseline and benchmark
Percentage	40%	40%	40%	Benchmark % remained the same

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Enrolled in an	Head(s) Households	Expected head(s) of	Actual Head(s) of	Outcome meets or

Education Program	of Enrolled in an Education Program prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number)	Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number)	exceeds the benchmark
			Information is not available	
Percentage				

Note: PH does not document enrollment in an education program. Information on such is not related to current MTW activities.

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Enrolled in a Job Training Program	Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	1	1	1	Benchmark met
Percentage	100%	100%	100%	

Note: PH tracks this information related to residents participating in Section 3

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Unemployed	Head(s) of Households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	103	97	93	Benchmark met
Percentage	47%	40%	32%	

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Other	Head(s) Households in other category prior to implementation of the activity	Expected head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity	Actual Head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark

	(number)	(number)	(number)	
	0	0	0	Benchmark Met
Percentage	0%	0%	0%	

SS#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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	11	9	6	The number of Households receiving TANF declined

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase)	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	110	120	127	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: Not processing earned income increases until the next annual re-certification results in the savings of staff time spent on securing and processing verifications. This activity also eliminates time and costs associated with resident/staff meetings. In short, this activity reduces typical time spent on such re-certifications by a minimum two-thirds, based on the assumption of **one** earned-income increase per household per year. No negative impact was indicated on monthly rent revenues.

This activity demonstrates a minimal impact on self-sufficiency when reviewing relevant metric data. This may be due to the fact that family households move to and from public housing throughout the year. Typically, families leaving public housing are higher-income households with earned income than families moving to public housing. Thus, the increase in full-time employment appears to be minimal.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Baselines and benchmarks are met and the activity is on schedule.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were made.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes were made

PH-5 Rent Adjustment for Income Decreases

Decreases in income resulting in less than \$1,000, or lasting less than 30 days, will not be processed until the next annual re-certification. Plan Year: 2009 Implemented: 2009

This rent reform activity is seldom used. However, whenever a household experiences an income decrease less than \$1,000, the time to process the decrease is costly to the PMHA and has minimal impact on the household when the income decrease lasts less than 30 days. On many occasions, households locate new employment or other sources of income within 30 days. Thus, the PMHA views this activity as being effective as a cost-savings feature. This activity does not give incentives to households to achieve self-sufficiency.

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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	3 hours x \$19-current hourly rate per 6 recertification= \$342	0 residents x 3 hours x \$19-current hourly rate = \$0	5 residents x 3 hours x \$19-current hourly rate = \$285	This activity has proven to be effective as a cost-savings measure

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	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	3 hours per re-certification	0 hours	15 residents hours	This activity has been proven effective as a staff time-savings measure

CE #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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	3%	0%	0%	Benchmark has been met

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The PMHA feels that is activity, even though seldom used, is beneficial to ward off having to process rent changes lasting less than 30 days or income changes less than \$1,000. Thus, no changes to baselines or benchmarks are indicated. The activity is on schedule.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There were no hardship requests since the implementation of this activity.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Not applicable

PH-6 Overall Percentage of Income Amounts for Rent Calculations

This activity was implemented April 1, 2012. The percentage of earned income would be set at 26% of income in an effort to promote work activity and offset the elimination of the allowance for non-reimbursed childcare expenses.

Plan Year: 2012 Implemented: April 1, 2012

PMHA evaluates this feature to ensure affordability on a quarterly basis. To date, households with wage incomes are experiencing gains in average annual income, which is an indication that impacts are being met.

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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$2,210	\$2,204 (113 households x 1.5 hours x \$13 or current hourly rate)	2014- (127 households) x 1.5 hours x \$19 \$3,620	Benchmark met

SS #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 prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$14,000	\$15,000	2014- \$17,841	Earned income of households has increased annually since implementation of this activity

SS #2: Increase in Household Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0	\$200	\$459	Benchmark was met

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed Full-Time	Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Full-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	72	72	2014-76	The number of households employed full time increased when compared to both the baseline and benchmark
Percentage	60%	60%	61%	Benchmark met

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed Part-Time	Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	48	48	51	The number of households employed part-time increased when compared to both baseline and benchmark
Percentage	40%	40%	40%	Benchmark % remained the same

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Enrolled in an Education Program	Head(s) Households of Enrolled in an Education Program prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in an Education Program after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
			Information is not available	
Percentage				

Note: PH does not document enrollment in an education program. Information on such is not related to current MTW activities.

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Enrolled in a Job Training Program	Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households Enrolled in a Job Training Program after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	1	1	1	Benchmark met
Percentage	100%	100%	100%	

Note: PH tracks this information related to residents participating in Section 3

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Unemployed	Head(s) of Households unemployed prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	103	97	93	Benchmark met
Percentage	47%	40%	32%	

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark

Measurement				Achieved?
Other	Head(s) Households in other category prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual Head(s) of Households in other category after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	0	0	0	Benchmark Met
Percentage	0%	0%	0%	

Note: PH had no households in the “other” category during 2014.

Description of detailed information on its impact: Rent process was simplified and the number of employed households has steadily increased.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Baselines and benchmarks have been met, and the activity is on schedule. This activity has proven to be cost effective by reducing the need for verifications and thus, saving staff time. Minimal increases are seen within the self-sufficiency metrics however, this may be due to the fluid nature of public housing. Families typically leave public housing with higher incomes than those households moving to public housing.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There have been no hardship requests.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: PMHA considers this activity to have a significant effect on cost effectiveness and will continue with implementation

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions were made.

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes were made.

PH-7 Eliminate Allowance for Non-Reimbursed Childcare Expenses Comment and Replace with 4% Overall percentage of earned income

1. Description:

Allowances for non-reimbursed child care expenses were eliminated from rent calculations in part of an overall rent reform that reduced the percentage of income counted towards rent for households with earned income. The purpose of this feature is

to simplify rent calculations for transparency shared by both residents and PHA staff, as well as reducing administrative burden relating to documentation.

Plan Year: 2012 Implemented: April 1, 2012

Description of detailed information on its impact:

This activity is intertwined as part of ***PH-6 Overall Percentage of Income Amounts for Rent Calculations described above***. Thus, metrics and detailed information on its impact are also available in ***PH-6***.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Refer to PH-6

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were received.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Refer to PH-6

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Refer to PH-6

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Data collection methodology has changes since the Allowance for Non-Reimbursed Childcare Expenses have been eliminated. Thus, this data is not used for current rent calculations. In lieu of including this data, and as outlined in PH-6-An overall percentage, or 26% of income is used for rent calculations.

PH-8 Deduction for Elderly or Disabled Adults

Refer to B. Not Yet Implemented Activities Plan Year: 2009

PH-9 Providing Transitional Housing

Refer to D. Closed Out Activities Plan Year: 1999

PH-10 PMHA to Operate Two Group Home as Public Housing

Plan Year: 2009 Implemented as a MTW Activity: 2009

(1) **Walnut House**, located in Ravenna, houses persons with severe mental illnesses in partnership with Coleman Professional Services. This property has 13 units of housing, but PMHA uses one of the 13 units as space for supportive services activities.

(2) **Washington Group Home**, located in Ravenna Township, has a capacity for 8 individuals to reside in a supportive, group home environment. PMHA has entered into a

partnership with Family and Community Services to lease the building for the purposes of providing housing and services to men who are addressing alcohol and drug addiction issues. The program has flourished and is well-received in the community. These comprehensive services will facilitate a successful transition back to community living. This project was finalized during the first half of 2013. Residents will not be entered in PIC due to the nature of the specific population served. Family and Community Services screens and selects eligible candidates for this program known as ROOT. Thus, Standard HUD Metrics do not apply.

PH-11 Deduction for Absent Child

Refer to D. Closed out Activities.

PH-12 Exclusions of Overtime, Bonuses and Income form Assets

To promote the accumulations of assets, PMHA excludes income from overtime, bonuses and interest from bank assets such as checking and savings accounts and certificates of deposit. Plan year: 1999 Implemented: 2000

This activity is relevant to both Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs for 2014. Metrics for both programs are reflected.

PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM

<i>SS #2 Increase in Household Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Benchmark Achieved
Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From Wage Exclusions	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Wage Exclusions	Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions	Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$5,000	\$5,000	2014- 138 HH \$5,366	Benchmark exceeded
Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From Income from Bank Assets	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Income from Bank Assets	Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$500	\$500	2014-Average- \$4,337-138 HH	Benchmark met

--	--	--	--	--

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From Wage Exclusions	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark From Wage Exclusions
	20 residents x 3 hours x \$13 or current hourly rate= \$780	20 residents x 3 hours x \$13 or current hourly rate= \$780	2014= 36 residents \$1,404	Benchmark exceeded
Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From Income from Bank Assets	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark From Wage Exclusions
	50 residents x 3 hours x \$13 or current hourly rate= \$1,950	50 residents x 3 hours x \$13 or current hourly rate= \$1,950	2014-138 residents \$5,382	Benchmark exceeded

Section 8 Voucher Program

SS #2 Increase in Household Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Benchmark Achieved
Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From Income from Bank Assets	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Income from Bank Assets	Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$200	\$200	2014- 606 HH= \$518	Benchmark met

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

Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From Income from Bank Assets	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark From Wage Exclusions
	500 residents x 3 hours x \$11.24 or current hourly rate=\$16,860	500 residents x 3 hours x \$11.24 or current hourly rate=\$16,860	2014-606 HH= \$20,434	Benchmark exceeded

Description of detailed information on its impact: The amounts of excluded income from these sources generally have minimal impact on rent revenue however, it has simplified some aspects of rent calculations as it relates to bank assets and as an alternative to the earned income disallowance. The exclusion of overtime and bonuses has become relatively insignificant in general, as both are not extensively exercised by employers.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: This activity is on schedule and baselines and benchmarks have historically been met or exceeded.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Hardship requests are not relevant to this activity.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions have been made

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes have been made

PH-13 Cap on Dependent Child Deduction

The Public Housing Programs will continue to give a \$480 allowance for each family member (other than the head or spouse), who is disabled or a minor, and for family members who are 18 and older who are full-time students or who are disabled. This allowance is not to exceed \$960, except that current residents (as of April 23, 1999) are entitled to an allowance of \$480 for each family member who is a minor and for family

members who were 18 and older and full-time students or who are disabled as of June 1, 2000. **Plan Year: 1999 Implemented: 2000**

Reposed Plan Year: 2014- This activity was reposed in 2014. It was previously identified as **B-1** under activities relating to both Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs.

CR #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Increase)	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$18,240	\$18,000 (varying on the composition of families at any one time	2014-43 Households \$26,880	Benchmark exceeded

Description of detailed information on its impact: The statutory objective is to reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures. The impact of this activity is that rental revenue will increase as compared to the traditional HUD system of treatment of dependent child deductions.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: This activity is on schedule and continues to meet or exceed baselines and benchmarks.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There is no recognition of hardship for this policy. Families with larger sized families will retain all rights to be housed in units appropriate for their family size.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions were made

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Authorization is necessary under MTW as there is no provision for capping dependent deductions within current law or regulation.

BOTH HOUSING VOUCHER and PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS

B-1 Cap on dependent child deduction

Plan Year: 1999 Implemented: 2000 Reposed Plan Year: 2014- This activity was reposed in 2014. It was previously implemented by both Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs. Because the Housing Choice Voucher program underwent rent reform activities in 2014 that led PMHA to reinstate conventional child deductions, this activity was closed for the HCV program. **Implementation continued throughout 2014** for Public Housing participants. Refer to **PH-13**

The Public Housing Programs will continue to give a \$480 allowance for each family member (other than the head or spouse), who is disabled or a minor, and for family members who are 18 and older who are full-time students or who are disabled. This allowance is not to exceed \$960, except that current residents (as of April 23, 1999) are entitled to an allowance of \$480 for each family member who is a minor and for family members who were 18 and older and full-time students or who are disabled as of June 1, 2000.

Housing Choice Voucher Program

<i>CR #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Increase)	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0.00	\$3,000	2014-454 Households= \$323,040	Benchmark exceeded

Public Housing Program

<i>CR #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Increase)	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0.00	\$10,000	2014-43	Benchmark

			Households= \$26,880	exceeded
--	--	--	--------------------------------	----------

This authorization is necessary under MTW as there is no provision for capping dependent deductions within current law or regulation.

B-2 Utility Allowance Payments are used to repay participant debts owed to the Housing Authority

PMHA will withhold utility allowance checks for households who owe PMHA money to be used to repay those debts. Once the tenant account is returned to zero balance, the utility allowance checks will resume. Plan Year: 2009 Implementation: 2010.

Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing Programs

CE # 4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0.0	\$5,300	2014-101 households repaid \$14,002	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: This activity has been useful in reducing the administrative burden of sending out utility allowance checks to the same households that the housing authority is pursuing collection actions against for the repayment of debts owed to the Housing Authority

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: This activity is on schedule. Benchmarks have been met or exceeded since its implementation

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There have been no hardship requests since the implementation of this activity.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: No revisions have been made

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes have been made

B-3 Pro-ration of the utility allowance schedule up to the percentage of pro-ration of funding as established by HUD due to appropriations: Plan Year: 2009

Public Housing Program: **Implemented: 2014**

Housing Choice Voucher Program: *Refer to Section B. Not Yet Implemented Activities for Housing Choice Voucher Program*

To offer an additional tool to deal with reductions in HUD subsidy for Public Housing or Housing Choice Vouchers, PMHA has authority to reduce utility allowance payments to address funding shortfalls.

Public Housing Program

CE # 4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0.0	\$29,892	\$29,892	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: This activity has reduced the impact of HUD funding decreases by decreasing expenses

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: This activity is on schedule for Public Housing. Benchmarks have been met. This activity will be implemented by the Housing Choice Voucher program during 2015.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were received.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Not applicable

B-4 Single Fund Budget Flexibility: Plan Year: 2009 Implemented: 2013

This activity is no longer considered a MTW activity and will no longer be reported as such. Related information is referenced in the Financial Section of this report

B-5 Income verifications conducted for approved government programs may be substituted for PMHA income verifications if performed within the previous 90 days: Plan Year: 2009

Refer to Section B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

B-6 Employment and education deductions

PMHA will give \$500 deductions from annual income where the head of household or spouse is employed 32 hours or more for the HCV Program in the same position or is registered as a full-time student at an educational institution, as defined by the standards of the institution, and maintaining a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average.

Note: This activity was closed out for Public Housing residents as of April 2012. See D. Closed Out Activities.

Plan Year: 1999 Implementation: 2000.

Housing Choice Voucher Program

<i>SS #2 Increase in Household Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds benchmark
	\$0.0	\$12.50 per month for each	Employment Deduction of \$500=	Benchmark met

		participating household	\$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2014-108 HH Education Deduction of \$500= \$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2014-24 HH Employment and Education Deduction of \$500 each=\$25 per monthly savings per Household 2014=2 HH	
--	--	-------------------------	--	--

Description of detailed information on its impact: It has been determined that a \$500 deduction results in a monthly rent savings of \$12.50 per month per household.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Benchmarks have been met. This activity will be closes for the Housing Choice Voucher program during 2015 as part of an over-all rent reform effort.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: There have been no rent hardship requests since the implementation of this activity.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identity potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes have been made

B-7 Adoption of Local Investment Policies

PMHA seeks to evaluate and utilize State of Ohio investment alternatives when appropriate for earning greater returns without compromising asset safety

Plan Year 2014 Implemented: 2014

CE # 4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on impact: PMHA has adopted new financial policies, but has not yet chosen to invest funds in an alternative investment vehicle.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: None

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not Applicable.

B-8 Verifications of Income Valid for 180 Days Plan Year: 2014

Implemented: Housing Choice Voucher Program: August 2014

Implemented: Public Housing Program: September 2014

PMHA will extend the length of time for verified application data to be considered valid to 180 days. It is anticipated that this activity will reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures. I also will reduce the amount of duplicative work caused by various factors in validating all needed information provided at the time of a completed application and process from the wait list.

Housing Choice Voucher Program

CE #1: Agency Costs 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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0	\$420	\$0	No HCV Households were impacted

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark

Measurement				Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	Total amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Expected amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Actual amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	0 hours annually	30 hours annually	0	No HCV Households were impacted

Public Housing Program

CE #1: Agency Costs 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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0	\$420	\$0	No Public Housing Households were impacted

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 time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Expected amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Actual amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	0 hours annually	30 hours annually	0	No Public Housing Households were impacted

Description of detailed information on its impact: Between August and December 2014, no households were impacted by this feature. Verifications were more current than indicated by this activity.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The implementation of this activity occurred later in 2014 due to the timing of PMHA's MTW Annual Plan and PMHA's Board approval. As a result, there was no need to reap the benefits of this feature.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Not applicable.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: The effectiveness of this activity will be determined during 2015 when it will be implemented for an entire year

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes are anticipated.

B-9 Eliminate All Excluded Income from the Income Verification Process

Plan Year: 2014

Implemented: Housing Choice Voucher Program: August 2014

Implemented: Public Housing Program: September 2014

PMHA would cease verifying any fully excluded income sources for households. While PIH 2013-04 provides guidance for this activity, the approval as a MTW activity would ensure that developed practices would continue if PIH 2013-04 is rescinded, amended or superseded. This activity is expected to simplify income verifications, saving time for PMHA staff, participants and other agencies.

Housing Choice Voucher Program and Public Housing Program

CE #1: Agency Costs 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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$5,600	\$0	\$0	Benchmark met

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 time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Expected amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Actual amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	400 hours annually	0 hours annually	0 hours annually	Benchmark met

CE #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 prior to implementation of the activity (percentage)	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	2%	0%	0%	Benchmark met

Description of detailed information on its impact: This implementation of this activity rendered the anticipated outcomes with respect to cost savings to the PMHA, staff time savings, and a decrease in error rate of task execution since excluded income is no longer verified. Such verifications have no impact on rent calculations.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The activity is on schedule.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: Hardship requests are not applicable to this activity.

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and it possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: Not applicable

B-10 Elderly and Disabled Rent Re-certifications Every Three Years

Plan Year: 2014

Implemented: Housing Choice Voucher Program: August 2014

Implemented: Public Housing Program: September 2014

This activity allows PMHA to conduct re-certifications at least once every three years for elderly and disabled households. PMHA will conduct the next recertification as scheduled for these households, and during that process determine if their next re-certification would occur in 1,2, or 3 years. The household would then be on a triennial schedule.

This activity is being reposed for Public Housing Program, which was on a biennial re-certification schedule, and is now increasing this activity from 2 to 3 years re-certifications. This activity now offers a three-recertification schedule to those elderly and disabled participants of the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

This activity is expected to increase administrative efficiency and reduce cost to PHA programs through the reduction of an estimated 415 annual re-certifications.

Housing Choice Voucher Program

CE #1: Agency Costs 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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$18,500	\$18,500	\$811	*
*25 Households were deemed eligible for this activity. Thus, the "Outcome" is not reflective of results for a full year of implementation. December 2015 data will provide more accurate results for evaluation.				

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 time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Expected amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Actual amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	2,760 hours annually	1,840 hours annually	75 hours	*
*25 Households were deemed eligible for this activity. Thus, the "Outcome" is not reflective of results for a full year of implementation. December 2015 data will provide more accurate results for evaluation.				

CE #5:				
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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A
Rent revenue is not impacted by this activity				

Public Housing Program

CE #1: Agency Costs 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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$0	N/A
Public Housing program implemented this activity September 2014. During the last four months of 2014, no residents were on a recertification schedule which qualified for a three-year re-certification.				

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 time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Expected amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Actual amount of time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	150	150	0	N/A

CE #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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A

Description of detailed information on its impact: This activity reduces the number of re-certifications taking place each year which results in staff-time savings and the reduction of calculation errors.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The Housing Choice Voucher program only had 25 households impacted by this activity. Thus, the data pool is insignificant to evaluate outcomes.

While the Public Housing department implemented this activity, no eligible residents had re-certification due that would have reaped the benefits from this activity.

For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests: No hardship requests were received

If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective provide a narrative explanation of the challenges and if possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective: Not applicable

If benchmarks or metrics have been revised, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact: Not applicable

If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected: No changes were made

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

HCV-6 Time Limits: Plan Year: 2013

Participants will be permitted three years of Housing Choice Voucher assistance upon admission. They can earn extensions by reporting work and education activities or by documented participation in community service activities. The HCV time limits will not affect households with elderly or disabled members.

Anticipated implementation is May 2015. The delay in implementation is due to the upgrading of the PMHA computer system; staff training; and the notification and education of tenants of this activity.

HCV-9 Elimination of Deductions in Total Tenant Payment Calculations: Plan

Year: 2014 PMHA proposes to calculate total tenant payments and base Housing Choice Voucher assistance for all households on a calculation that is 29.6% of gross monthly income and eliminate deductions and allowances for being elderly or disabled, for dependents, and for unreimbursed medical and child care expenses. The only exception to the 30% of monthly gross income would be to continue a \$50 minimum rent for households who otherwise pay less than \$50 per month.

Anticipated implementation is May 2015. The delay in implementation is due to the upgrading of the PMHA computer system; staff training; and the notification and education of tenants of the new TTP calculations.

HCH-14 Permit Decreases in Payment Standards at Next Scheduled Verification Plan Year: 2014

PMHA proposes changing the implementation of new payment standards established by the housing authority to be effective at the date of the anniversary of household assistance (formerly known as the annual verification), rather than be implemented the second annual verification following the change. Under present regulations, housing authorities may not lower payment standards until the 2nd annual certification after the lowering of the payment standards, which hampers a PHA from taking action to lower HAP costs quickly and more fairly across all participant households. In 2013, PMHA raised minimum rents from \$25 to \$50 as part of its response to the federal sequester and the need to reduce HAP costs. This increased

the rent burden on the lowest income participants and for lesser results on HAP than if PMHA were permitted to reduce payment standards slightly, across the board for all participants. This activity is considered critical to PMHA being able to adjust HAP spending quickly and in a more equitable manner (compared to raising minimum rents or adjusting rent calculations) that can spread the cost of budget cuts across a greater portion of the HCV recipient population more quickly. This activity will be implemented in 2015.

HCV-15 Change the Allocation of Interest Earned for the Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency Program Plan Year: 2014

PMHA will no longer apply escrow credits for interest earned on funds deposited for the Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency Program. These funds will be made available for ongoing HAP needs for the Housing Choice Voucher Program as a whole. PMHA expects that the impact of this activity will provide minimal additional revenue (\$200) to the Housing Choice Voucher funds. Staff savings of approximately 12 hours per year will result. This activity will be implemented in 2015.

PH-8 Deduction for Elderly or Disabled Adults Plan Year: 2009

As indicated in the 2014 plan, this activity has not been implemented. It is unclear if this activity will be implemented in 2015 as an appropriate solution to the issue of verifying medical deductions that maintains affordability for the most vulnerable tenants while eliminating verifications in a responsible manner has not yet been determined.

B-3 Pro-ration of the utility allowance schedule up to the percentage of pro-ration of funding as established by HUD due to appropriations: Plan Year: 2009

This activity was implemented in 2014 for the Public Housing Program. Implementation is expected in 2015 for the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

B-5 Income verifications conducted for approved government programs may be substituted for PMHA income verifications if performed within the previous 90 days. Plan Year: 2009

This activity was not implemented as the agencies involved determined that the forecasted efficiencies were not going to be realized. The PMHA will consider implementation during 2015 if renewed discussions yield a positive result.

C. Activities on Hold

HCV-7 Capped Utility Reimbursed Checks: Plan Year: 2012 Implemented: 2012 Anticipated implementation: 2015

Utility allowance checks will be capped based on the rates and amounts provided through the Public Utilities Commission's PIPP Plus program, which allows low-income families to pay for utilities on a percentage of income rather than usage, with the difference forgiven by the utility.

This activity was found to have problems with software and tracking issues and was put on hold during 2013. PMHA plans to work with providers to design a solution for proper accounting of this feature.

D. Closed Out Activities

HCV-5 Alternative Housing Quality Standards Compliance

Plan Year: 2011 Implemented: 2011 This activity ended in 2014

Comment

PMHA may use the results of municipal housing/rental housing inspections as an alternative to HQS, where available. This activity was implemented as a means of ensuring Housing Quality Standards were upheld while minimizing the amount of intrusion upon Section 8 landlords and participants through multiple housing inspections by various government entities. HQS standards were met while reducing a duplication of efforts among inspection entities.

1. Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

This activity was workable when the PMHA served as a contract agent for the City of Ravenna to do its inspections of rental units. When this arrangement ended, it was not feasible to continue this activity due to incompatible inspection schedules. City inspections were no longer up-to-date when needed to ensure Section 8 compliance with Housing Quality Standards. The City of Kent inspections of rental units also did not meet the requirements for HQS compliance. Thus, this activity did not yield the expected results.

2. There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity

3. Summary Table:

<i>PMHA Metric: Streamline Inspection Process</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of Government Entities sharing inspection information	Number of government entities sharing inspection information prior to implementation of the activity	Expected number of government entities sharing inspection information after implementation of the activity	Actual number of government entities sharing inspection information after implementation of the activity	The outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	0	1	1-City of Ravenna	Benchmark met

4. Additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table- Not applicable

PH-1 Escalating Minimum Rent Plan Year: 2008 Implementation: 2008

This activity ended in 2011 as specified in the 2012 Annual MTW Plan.

Comment

Minimum Rent of \$25 will increase by \$25 every two years during tenure in Public Housing and will be capped not to exceed \$250 per month, which would be attained after 18 years of Public Housing residency. Households with a head or co-head of household, or spouse who is elderly (62 years of age or older, and/or disabled) will have no minimum rent. Departure or death of the sole elderly or disabled household member will result in the minimum rent requirement being re-instated for remaining household members.

i. Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

This escalating minimum rent feature was originally implemented as an alternative to arbitrary time limits. Benchmarks were achieved, but the feature proved to be very cumbersome in its implementation and operation. As a result, rent reforms permissible under conventional PHA rules were implemented by year-end of 2011, raising the minimum rent to \$50 per month for non-elderly, non-disabled households. The original activity of escalating minimum rent was unwieldy for administration and not helpful for achieving PMHA goals.

ii. There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity

iii. Summary Table:

<i>CE #5 Increase in PMHA Rental Revenue for Public Housing Households</i>				
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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	\$557,771	Increase of \$30,000	2010- \$587,771 2011- \$622,790	Benchmark met

iv. Additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table

While the activity met the projected benchmarks, the implementation yielded a high risk for inaccurate rent calculations due to the fluctuation of minimum rents which would vary among households.

PH-9 Providing Transitional Housing Plan Year: 1999 Implementation: 1999

This activity ended in 2012 as specified in the 2012 Annual MTW Plan.

Comment

Up to 42 units of transitional housing will be set aside for previously homeless families at Renaissance Place and Community Estates. Through partnership with Family and Community Services and its Portage Area Transitional Housing (PATH) program, residents receive on-site intensified case management services as they move toward self-sufficiency.

i Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

During 2012, the long-standing partnership with Family and Community Services and its Portage Area Transitional Housing (PATH) program evolved to address a more permanent supportive housing program as defined by HUD. It was determined that a public housing format was ineffective for the operation of a supportive housing program. Because of the change from a two-year Transitional Housing program to a one-year supportive housing program with the emphasis on transitioning in place, the PMHA found the number and cost of unit turnovers increasing, since not all participants were able and willing to transition in place. Renaissance Place consists of three and four bedroom units. Many of the PATH families required two-bedroom units. With HUD new program guidelines, the landscape of the PATH program changed. PMHA opened its entire housing stock to PATH participants with the emphasis on moving participants into the units with the needed number of bedrooms. However, this approach diluted the relationship between participants and PATH staff. Thus, because of programmatic changes, it became necessary to phase-out the Transitional Housing program by the end of 2012. No future PATH families will be added or moved-in public housing units.

ii There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity

iii Summary Table:

HC #6: 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)	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	There was no transitional housing program prior to the implementation of this activity	Minimum of 42 households per year participating in the program	2010-64 2011-64 2012-44	Benchmark met
HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Unit of	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark

Measurement				Achieved?
Number of previously homeless households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease)	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	There was no transitional housing program prior to the implementation of this activity	24 households per year since households could stay a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 4 years in transitional housing or lose assistance due to non-compliance	2010-22 2011-22 2012-44	Outcomes were met however, in 2012 the transitional housing program was phased out due to new HUD guidelines
HC #6: 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)	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	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)	Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark
	There was no transitional housing program prior to the implementation of this activity	10 per year	2010-11 2011-22 2012-13	Benchmark met

iv Additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table

While the activity met the projected benchmarks and the program proved to transition previously homeless families into permanent housing, the revised HUD regulations made it economically unfeasible to continue this program as public housing. As a result it was incorporated into the Section 8 Voucher program.

PH-11 Deduction for Absent Child

This activity will not be implemented. Plan Year: 2009 Closed Out: 2012

i. Discuss the final outcome and lessons learned

A decision was reached after reviewing the documentation and work efforts needed to verify circumstances involved, the documentation and work efforts needed to verify

circumstances involved, the resulting impact on households and further policy discussion relating to desired results on low-income and participating households.

- ii. **There were no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibility that might have provided additional benefit for this activity**
- iii. **Provide Summary Table**-not applicable
- iv. **Provide a narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table**-not applicable

B-6 Employment and education deductions:

Plan Year: 1999 Implementation: 2000

PMHA discontinued this activity April 2012 for public housing residents. Replacing this activity was the implementation of a 4% deduction on all earned income and an income exclusion for new earnings until annual re-certification.

- i. Discuss the final outcome and lessons learned
 This activity was implemented to reward work; however, effective April 2012 this activity was replaced with providing a 4% deduction on earned income and an exclusion of all new income until annual re-certification. This was done with the expectation that households will reap a greater reward for achieving earned income. Also, was anticipated that staff time would be saved by the elimination of having to secure third-party documentation for the education deduction which was tedious and time consuming for staff.
 Refer to PH-4; PH-6; and PH-7.
- ii. There are no statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity.
- iii. Summary Table Follows:

Public Housing Program

SS #2 Increase in Household Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars)	Outcome meets or exceeds benchmark
	\$0.0	\$12.50 per month for each	Employment Deduction of \$500=	Benchmark met

		participating household	\$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2010-60 HH 2011-59 HH Education Deduction of \$500= \$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2010-17 HH 2011-18 HH	
--	--	-------------------------	--	--

- iv Provide a narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table
 With the replacement of 4% exclusion of wages, the average savings of families is \$18.00 per month.

Authorization(s):

Attachment C, Part D, Section 2.a This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(o)(1), 8(o)(2), 8(o)(3), 8(o)(10) and 8(o)(13)(H)-(I) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.508, 982.503 and 982.518, as necessary to Implement the Agency's Annual MTW Plan. PMHA expects that the deductions offered could be provided within the discretionary rent policies available to any housing authority, and will seek to eliminate these features in exchange for lower percentage of income rates for employment.

Section V: Sources and Uses of 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			
Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility			
PHAs shall provide a thorough narrative of each activity that used only the Single Fund Flexibility in the body of the Report. In the narrative, PHAs			

V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan			
B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan			
Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?	<input type="button" value="Yes"/>	or	<input type="button" value="No"/>
Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?			
If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD			
Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?	<input type="button" value=""/>	or	<input type="button" value="NA"/>
In the body of the Report, PHAs should provide a narrative updating the progress of implementing and operating the Local Asset Management Plan during the fiscal			

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
Total Obligated or Committed Funds:		0	0
In the body of the Report, PHAs shall provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds, including what			
<i>Note: Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of</i>			

Section VI: Administrative

Certification of Meeting the MTW Statutory Requirements Submittal

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority certifies that it has met the MTW statutory requirements for 2014.