

2015 Moving-To-Work Annual Report

Portage
Metropolitan
Housing Authority

2832, State Route 59, Ravenna, OH 44266

Pam Nation-Calhoun, Acting Director
(330) 297-1489 Ext. 244

Submitted for Approval: **MARCH 16, 2016**

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Section I Overview of Short-Term and Long-Term Goals..... | 3 |
| Section II General Housing Authority Operating Information..... | 6 |
| Section III Proposed MTW Activities..... | 14 |
| Section IV Approved MTW Activities..... | 14 |
| A. Implemented Activities..... | 14 |
| B. Not Yet Implemented Activities..... | 69 |
| C. Activities on Hold..... | 70 |
| D. Closed Out Activities..... | 71 |
| Section V Sources and Uses of Funds..... | 80 |
| Section VI Administration..... | 81 |

Section I: Introduction-Short-Term and Long-Term MTW Goals

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority established the following goals and objectives for 2015:

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.

Progress and Accomplishments:

The most recent score from the Office of Public and Indian Housing Real Estate Assessment Center for Fiscal Year End December 31, 2014 was 93 out of a maximum score of 100.

On-site resident meetings were held over the summer of 2015. Public housing residents had an opportunity to rate PMHA services. A total of 29 residents participated. Responses were as follows:

Maintenance

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Ease if Contacting the Maintenance Department: | 93% felt making contact was easy |
| Response Time to Address Concerns: | 90% felt responses were timely |
| Satisfaction with Results: | 93% were satisfied |

The number of units did not expand during 2015. However, replacement plans for the two public housing units purchased by Kent State University are underway for 2016. PMHA did add 65 units of tax credit housing as part of the portfolio it is managing.

In order to expand Excellence in Property Management, the Project Manager position that oversees the Capital Funds program became more involved with the Maintenance Department with respect to providing input into Maintenance practices and policies. The result of this measure has promoted a “team spirit” between the two entities and provides for greater exchange of ideas.

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.
 - Six households will become new homeowners through the Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program in 2015.

Progress and Accomplishments:

In order to facilitate full lease-up, the PMHA eliminated “Preferences” and changed to a “No Preference” waitlist, with the exception being Veterans. The “No Preference” waitlist was approved December 2015. PMHA anticipates that the move-in process will be streamlined during 2016 resulting in occupancy expediency.

The Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program saw one new homeowner during 2015. The lower than expected number of homeowners was due to several reasons, including the number of potential homeowners in need of credit repair counseling. The organization that provided this service for several years to our clients discontinued this service. As a result, the PMHA needed to identify a new resource. As a result two new resources were found to provide this service. Additionally, Public Housing residents, which many times enter the homeownership

program, are now encouraged to seek credit repair services prior to meeting requirements for the Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program.

Homeownership is expected to increase during 2016.

3. Improve Productivity and Cost Effectiveness

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

Progress and Accomplishments:

During 2015, PMHA installed new software that streamlined the Maintenance Work Order process, which allows for repairs to be made in a shorter time period. The software allows the PMHA to expand its excellence in property management. 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.

Progress and Accomplishments:

Inter-agency cooperation and partnerships related to permanent supportive housing, homelessness, and related areas were maintained. However, no new opportunities were forthcoming.

In order to lessen barriers to community assistance for PMHA participants, an arrangement was facilitated with Family and Community Services to accept a participant's rent calculation as a form of documentation of eligibility for services which includes food pantry, school supplies, Thanksgiving and Christmas food/gift programs, home-delivered meals, counseling among others. Participants may pick-up a copy of their rent calculation at the PMHA office with identification. Participants are encouraged to remove any information not relevant to receiving the service. This has eliminated the necessity for clients to gather various sources of documentation and has decreased the waiting period to receive services.

During 2015, two new partnerships were formed to provide credit-repair counseling services to PMHA public housing residents and Section 8 tenants.

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 for 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 and removes systemic incentives for people to remain unemployed.

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. Government employees are as motivated as private sector employees to see their communities thrive; Moving to Work is critical to demonstrating and utilizing that motivation at Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority.

Progress and Accomplishments:

One measure the PMHA has taken during 2015 was to eliminate waitlist preferences, with the exception being Veteran status. By doing so, those in need of affordable housing will have less waiting time for housing.

A long-time partnership with the City of Kent has resulted in the implementation of the Good Neighbor program for public housing residents and Section 8 residents living in PMHA Kent properties. The Good Neighbor Program promotes a partnership among Kent Police, PMHA residents, and PMHA staff. Residents at each Kent site have an opportunity to meet with a Kent Officer and ask questions about safety issues. The Kent grant also allows for the purchase of cleaning and school supplies which are distributed to attending resident adults and their children. Over the course of almost a decade, evictions due to criminal activity and housekeeping issues have decreased.

In order to realize long-term MTW goals and objectives, the PMHA maintains a high level of visibility in Portage County among local governments and community resources dedicated to serving low-income individuals and families.

Section II: General Housing Authority Operating Information
Pre-formatted Table Included Below:

II.4.Report.HousingStock

A. MTW Report: Housing Stock Information

New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year

| Property Name | Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based * | Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based | |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| Harvest Rose | 30 | 20 | Two-bedroom apartments in Ravenna for Senior Citizens |
| Phoenix | 8 | 10 | One-bedroom apartments in Ravenna for persons with mental illness |
| Maple Brook | 30 | 0 | One and two bedroom apartments for seniors in Kent |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year * | Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year * |
| | Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based * | Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based | 180 | 158 |
| | 68 | 30 | Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year | Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year |
| | | | 173 | 152 |

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

There were no other changes to the Housing Stock that occurred during 2015

| General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year |
|---|
| AMP1-Preparations made to begin flooring replacement at Renaissance Place-\$45,913: AMP 1-Preparations made to begin parking lot repairs/replacement at Renaissance Place-\$110,000: AMP 1-Preparations made to begin flooring at Walnut House-\$27,500 |

| Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End | | |
|--|--|--|
| Housing Program * | Total Units | Overview of the Program |
| Portage Landings | 24 | Market Renters and Section 8 Voucher holders |
| 616 Virginia Ave | 1 | Market Renters and Section 8 Voucher holders |
| PMHA Admin Building | 1 | Home for office and maintenance employees |
| Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed | 26 | |
| <small>* Select Housing Program from: Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.</small> | | |
| If Other, please describe: | See attachment Appendix 1: Total Other Housing Owned | |

Section II-Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority at 2014 Fiscal Year End

Appendix I

614, 614 ½ Virginia Ave: Leased to Family and Community Services for short-term transitional housing

Commercial Properties:

219 and 223 West Main Street, Ravenna: This property is currently leased to Triangle Pharmacy, a for-profit entity not affiliated with PMHA except through the lease of the property.

6592 Cleveland Avenue, Ravenna: This property is known as the Opportunity Resource Center which is used by Maplewood Career Center for adult education activities.

Terrill Suites 858 ½ Cleveland Road, Ravenna: PMHA serves as the Management Agent for the 65 unit property.

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-75 actual; VASH 40-37 actual; Enhanced 18-3 actual | 132 | 115 |
| ModRehab2 75 planned-50 actual; ModRehab3 91-87 actual; ShelterPlus 50-49 actual | 216 | 186 |
| Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed) | N/A | 0 |
| Total Projected and Actual Households Served | 348 | 301 |

| Housing Program: | Unit Months Occupied/Leased**** | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------|
| | Planned | Actual |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs *** | N/A | 0 |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs *** | 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

| | Average Number of Households Served Per Month | Total Number of Households Served During the Year |
|---|---|---|
| Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only | 0 | 0 |

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income

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

| Fiscal Year: | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted | 24 | 29 | 38 | 37 | 49 | X | X | X |
| Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income | 24 | 29 | 38 | 37 | 49 | X | X | x |
| Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 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 the demonstration" is being achieved, the PHA will provide information in the following formats:

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

| Family Size: | Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW | Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW | Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes * | Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained | Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained |
|--------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| 1 Person | 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 Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized

Beginning, March 1999 and since, the Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority did not determine number of Households occupied by Household Size. Thus, this information is lacking from 1999 through 2012. However, PMHA determined such information beginning in 2013.

| 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 2015 | 827 | 425 | 370 | 205 | 95 | 47 | 1969 |
| Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year 2015 | 42% | 22% | 19% | 10% | 5% | 2% | 100% |
| Percentage Change | INA | INA | INA | INA | INA | INA | INA |
| Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages | Family size will vary year to year based on waitlist applications for the HCV program. With reference to the Public Housing program, family size variation do not exceed 5% when compared to previous years. | | | | | | |

| 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 | No 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 |
| Section8 Households w/Wages | 542 | Households With Wage Income |
| Section8 Family Self-Sufficiency Program | 23 | Section 8 FSS Participation |
| Homeownership Program | 27 | Homeownership Program Participation |
| Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions | 5 | |
| ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY | 714 | |

| 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 | 1,793 | Open | Yes |
| Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program | Community-Wide | 290 | Closed | no |
| Local Non-MTW Voucher Programs (Mod-Rehab) | Community-Wide | 1,730 | Open | no |

| |
|--|
| PH: AmInd=0.3%; Asian=0.1%; Black=35.2%; Nat.HI=0.2%; White=57.7%; Multiple=1.8%; Unknown=4.7% |
| Section8: AmInd=0%; Asian=0.7%; Black=44.8%; NatHI=0%; White=49.7%; Multiple=1.0%; Unknown=3.8% |
| Mod-Rehab: Amind=0.1%; Asian=0.2%; Black=35.5%; NatHI=0.2%=White=58.5%; Multiple=1.3%;Unknown=4.3% |

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 | 2 households \$239 | Cost savings per household decreased to \$120 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 | 52 households purchased homes between 2001-2015 2015-1 household became a homeowner | Benchmarks have traditionally been met or exceeded over the course of 14 years. |

| 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 | 0 household received service during 2015 | Benchmark unmet for 2015. Foreclosure prevention services were not requested during 2015. |

Description of detailed information on activity impact: The PMHA Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program has been assisting, at minimum, 20 households per year, since its implementation. Over the course of 14 years, a total of 52 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. However, during 2015, there were no requests for this service.

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. Approximately 25 Public Housing residents are pursuing homeownership through the PMHA Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership program. Service received include first time homeownership education classes and credit repair services, which are first steps to the achievement of 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: 2014

| HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available | | | | |
|---|----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark 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) | 21 (15%) of 142 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 | Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity | Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of | Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| result of the activity (increase) | (number). This number may be zero. | the activity (number) | the activity (number) | |
| | 0 | 15 households or (6 per 5 months) | 21 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 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 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: 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 | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|-----|--------------------|
| or others in need of social services) at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). | number may be zero. | the activity (number) | | |
| | 0 | 50 | 173 | 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 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 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 Section D. Closed Out Activities

**HCV-6 Time Limits for Housing Choice Voucher Participants Plan Year: 2013
Implemented: 2014 Planning Phase with resident impact beginning May 1, 2015**

PMHA has established time limits for the Housing Choice Voucher program. Participants who are able to work (i.e., not considered elderly or disabled, or are a parent of a child under age 1) are expected to work or attend an approved school program, or they will lose a month of eligibility of HCV assistance. Each individual is granted 36 months of unemployment/non-participation in education. When an individual reaches the end of their 36 months, they will be considered ineligible for housing assistance for no less than one year, and all rent calculations for the household will be calculated on a pro-ration basis similar to the treatment given to other households with ineligible members.

Implementation of activity is less than 1 year. Thus, 2015 data may be statistically insignificant since a 12 month period will not be realized until April 2016.

| <i>SS #1 Increase in Household Income</i> | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | | | | Pending |

| <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 |
| | | | | Pending |
| 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 |
| | | | | Pending |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 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 |
| | | | | Pending |
| Employed Part-time | Percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time | Expected percentage of total work-able households | Actual percentage of total work-able households Employed Part-Time | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---------|
| | prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | after implementation of the activity (percentage) | |
| | | | | Pending |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 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 |
| | | | | Pending |
| 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 (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | | | | Pending |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 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 programs |
| 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 programs |
|--|-----|-----|-----|--|

| 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 |
| | | | | Pending |
| 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 |
| | | | | Pending |

| <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 |
| | | | | Pending |

| <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 | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | | the activity (number) | the activity (number) | |
| | | | | Pending |

| <i>SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 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 |
| | | | | Pending |

| <i>SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i> | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase) | PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of 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 |
| Not Applicable to HCV Program | | | | |

| <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 at least 1 year before outcome can be evaluated for impact |

| <i>HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i> | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| | | | | |

| Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease) | Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months) | Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months) | Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | Pending |

Description of detailed information on its impact: Not applicable for 2015.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Not applicable for 2015.

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 36 month 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-7 Capped Utility Reimbursement Checks

Plan Year 2012 Approved: 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.

| 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 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 | | | | |

| SS #5 Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency | Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number) | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark <i>There were zero households participating in 2015</i> |
| | 0 | 1 per year | 0 | |
| 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. | | | | |

| 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) 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 <i>There were zero households participating in 2015</i> |
| | 0 | 1 | 0 | |

| |
|--|
| 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 (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 <i>There were zero households participating in 2015</i> |
| | 0 | 1 | 0 | |

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, however, Family and Community Services was not able to accept new program families during 2015.

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 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 Implementation: May 1, 2015

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.

Data reflected is for period May 1-December 31, 2015

| <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 |
| | \$527 per unit per month | \$509 per unit per month | \$1,584 (88 units per month x \$18 savings per unit) | Benchmark 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 |
| | 5 hours per household/7,730 hours annually | 30 minutes/773 hours annually | 264 hours annually (.5 hrs. x 1056 re-certs divided by 2) | Baseline and Benchmark were over-estimated due to the implementation of biennial re-certs |

| <i>CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i> | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of 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 |
| | 90% (prior to review of QC staff) | 98% (decrease, or 2% error rate) | To be determined during 2016 due to May 2015 implementation | Not applicable for 2015 |

| <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 | Not applicable to HCV program |

| <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 | \$15,678 | Benchmark exceeded |

| <i>SS#2: Increase in Household Savings</i> | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | \$140 | \$250 | \$547 | Benchmark met |

| <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 | 166 (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2015) | Data reflected is less than 12 month, thus, impact on benchmark will be determined in 2016 |
| 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% | 45% (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2015) | Benchmark met |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | 165 (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2015) | Data reflected is less than 12 month, thus, impact on benchmark will be determined in 2016 |
| 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% | 45% (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2015) | Benchmark met |

| 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 |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |
| 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 (percentage) | Actual percentage of total work-able households enrolled in an educational program after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | | | | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |

| 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 |
| 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 |

| 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 | 5 | Benchmark met |
| 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 |
| | 20% | 15% | 2% | Benchmark met |

| <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 | 31 (actual HCV Households impacted by activity in 2015) | Households receiving TANF were greater than originally anticipated. |

| <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 | Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of | Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| | the activity (number) | the activity (number) | the activity (number) | |
| | 0 | 357 | 367 | Benchmark met |

| <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 after implementation of the activity (number) | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |
| | 531 | 600 | 331 | Outcome reflects partial year data due to mid-year implementation |

Description of detailed information on its impact: The elimination of deductions streamlines the rent calculation process by reducing the need for verifications and lessening the potential for errors.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: The activity was implemented May 2015, thus reflected data is less than one year for review purposes. Baseline and benchmarks were originally based on ALL HCV participants, but the implementation of biennial and triennial reviews lessened the number of re-certification impacted by this activity. Baseline, benchmarks, etc. will be reviewed and revised, if needed, during 2016.

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: Baseline, benchmarks, etc. will be reviewed and revised, if needed, during 2016, or after at least 12 months of impact.

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

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority will 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”.

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.

Plan Year: 2014 Implemented: August 2014 On-Hold: May 2015

Refer to Section C: Activities on Hold

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

| <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 |
| | \$3,360 | \$420 Decrease | \$491 (2 hrs. per 21 households) | Benchmark met |

| <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 | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| | | implementation of the activity | the activity (in hours) | |
| | 40 hours per year | 5 hours per year | 2 hrs. per 21 households per year | 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. Benchmarks were met.

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 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 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 year 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 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.

| 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 exceed the benchmark Note: This activity is not expected to affect household income |
| | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$35,761 | Benchmark exceeded |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 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 | 13 | 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% | 62% | 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 | 2 | Benchmark met |
| Employed Part-time | Percentage of work-able households Employed Part-Time | Expected percentage of work-able households | Actual percentage of total work-abled households | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|
| | prior to implementation of the activity (percentage) | Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | Employed Part-Time after implementation of the activity (percentage) | |
| | 8% | 8% | 10% | 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 (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 |
| | Not Applicable | | | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |
| 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 |
| | | | | PMHA does not verify education program enrollment |

| SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 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 |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | PMHA does not verify enrollment in job training programs |
| 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 programs |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 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 met |

| 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 | 21 | 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 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: 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 Family Self-Sufficiency Program Plan Year: 2014 Implemented: 2015

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.

| 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 |
| | \$700 Annually | \$0 | \$0 | Benchmark met |

| CE#2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete task in staff hours (decrease) | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceed the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| | the activity (in dollars) | the activity (in hours) | the activity (in hours) | |
| | 12 Annually | 0 | 0 | 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

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 | \$38,219 | Benchmark met |

| 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) | The number of households receiving TANF decreased by 77% when comparing 2008 and 2015 data |
| | 22 | 10 | 5 | Benchmark met |

| 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 | \$59,266 (2015) | 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 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) | Benchmark was exceeded during 2015 |
| | 0 | 27 | 34 | Benchmark met |

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

Plan Year: 1999 Implemented: 1999

This activity was re-posed in Plan Year 2014 to Re-Certification of Elderly and Disabled to Every Three Years for both Public Housing residents and Section 8 Tenants.

Refer to B-10.

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 \$19.36 (current hourly rate)= \$2,091 | 36 residents x 1 hour x \$19.36 (current hourly rate)= \$697 | 2015=40 residents x 1 hour x \$19.36 (current hourly rate)= \$774 | Benchmark met |
|--|---|---|--|---------------|

| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours | 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 |
| | 36 residents x 3 hours= 108 hours | 36 residents x 1 hour= 36 hours | 2015= 40 residents x 1 hour= 40 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) | 2015- \$38,010* monthly rent (December) *Excludes Elderly/ | Benchmark met |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| | | | Disabled HHs | |
|--|--|--|--------------|--|

| 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 | \$20,592 | Benchmark 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 | 2015-79 Employed Full-Time | The number of households employed full time increased when compared to both the baseline and benchmark |
| Percentage | 60% | 60% | 62% | 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 | 48 | The number of households employed part-time decreased when compared to both baseline and |

| | | | | |
|------------|-----|-----|-----|---|
| | | | | benchmark due to increase of full-time employment |
| Percentage | 40% | 40% | 38% | Benchmark met |

| 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 | Expected head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of | Actual Head(s) of Households unemployed after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| | of the activity (number) | the activity (number) | the activity (number) | |
| | 103 | 97 | 44 | Benchmark met |
| Percentage | 47% | 40% | 23% | |

| 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 (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% | |

| 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 | 5 | 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 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 it 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 | Expected cost of task after implementation of | Actual cost of task after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | the activity (in dollars) | the activity (in dollars) | the activity (in dollars) | |
| | 3 hours x \$19.36-current hourly rate per 6 recertification= \$349 | 0 residents x 3 hours x \$19.36-current hourly rate =\$0 | 6 residents x 3 hours x \$19.36-current hourly rate =\$349 | 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 | 18 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 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 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

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) | 2015- (127 households) x 1.5 hours x \$19.36 \$3,688 | Benchmark met |

| SS #1: Increase in Household Income | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Average earned income of households affected by this | Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation | Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation | Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |

| policy in dollars (increase) | of the activity (in dollars) | of the activity (in dollars) | to implementation (in dollars) | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | \$14,000 | \$15,000 | 2015-\$18,765 | 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 | \$705 | Benchmark 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 | 2015-79 | The number of households employed full time increased when compared to both the baseline and benchmark |
| Percentage | 60% | 60% | 62% | 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 | Expected head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of | Actual Head(s) of Households Employed Part-Time after implementation of | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| | the activity (number) | the activity (number) | the activity (number) | |
| | 48 | 48 | 48 | |
| Percentage | 40% | 40% | 38% | Benchmark met |

| 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 | 44 | Benchmark met |
| Percentage | 47% | 40% | 23% | |

| 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 (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 2015.

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 if 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 it possible, identify 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 Cap on Dependent Child Deduction

The Public Housing Program 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 originally related to both Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs. However, due to a revision of rent reform activities for the HCV program in 2014, this activity was no longer relative to the HCV program.

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 |

| | | | | |
|--|----------|--|---|--------------------|
| | \$18,240 | \$18,000 (varying on the composition of families at any one time | 2015-44 Households-58 children x \$480= \$27,840 | 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, 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: Authorization is necessary under MTW as there is no provision for capping dependent deductions within current law or regulation.

PH-13 Residents paying ceiling rents may self-certify income

Refer to Section B: Not Yet Implemented Activities Plan Year: 2015

BOTH HOUSING VOUCHER and PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS

B-1 Exclusions of Overtime, Bonuses and Income from Assets

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

Note: This activity was modified in 2012 for the Public Housing program to exclude income from “new” employment until annual re-certification. For reporting purposes this exclusion is reflected along with income from overtime and bonuses.

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 (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | 2015-45 HH \$5,681 | 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 | 2015-Average- \$555-138 HH | Benchmark met |
| Average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From 4 % Wage Exclusions | Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From 4% Wage Exclusions | Expected average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From 4% Wage Exclusions | Actual average savings amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From 4% Wage Exclusions | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$500 | \$500 | 2015-119 HH \$705 | Benchmark exceeded |

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |
| Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Wage Exclusions (includes overtime, bonuses, and income from wage increases) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 20 residents x 3 hours x \$13 or current hourly rate= \$780 | 20 residents x 3 hours x \$13 or current hourly rate= \$780 | 2015= 45 residents x 3 hours x \$19.36= \$2,614 | 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 | 2015-138 residents x 3 hours x \$19.36= \$8,014 | Benchmark exceeded |
| Total Cost of task in dollars (decrease) From 4 % Wage Exclusions | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) From 4 % Wage Exclusions | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From 4 % Wage Exclusions | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From 4 % Wage Exclusions | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | 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 | 2015-119 residents x 3 hours x \$19.36= \$6,912 | 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 | Average savings amount of households affected | Expected average savings amount of households affected | Actual average savings amount of households affected | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|
| affected by this policy in dollars (increases) From Income from Bank Assets | by this policy prior to implementation of the activity From Income from Bank Assets | by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) From Income from Bank Assets | |
| | \$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, 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

B-2 Cap on dependent child deduction

Plan Year: 1999 Implemented: 2000

This activity was discontinued for the Housing Choice Voucher Program in 2014 (***Refer to Closed-Out Activities B-2***). The Public Housing Program continues to implement this activity (***Refer to PH-12***).

B-3 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

| <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 amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) | Outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
| | \$0.0 | \$5,300 | 2015-59 households repaid \$7,149 | 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 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 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-4 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 | \$31,668 | \$31,668 | 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.

PMHA reserves the right to pro-rate the utility allowance schedule for Housing Choice Vouchers in response to pro-rated funding from appropriations by Congress to HUD. However, implementation date for the HCV program has not been determined.

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: 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-5 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-6 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-7 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. Plan Year: 1999 Implementation: 2000.

Note: This activity was closed out for Public Housing program in 2012 and for HCV in 2015. See D. Closed Out Activities.

B-8 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

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

B-9 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 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 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: During 2015 no Public Housing or HCV households were impacted by this feature. Verifications on hand were more current than indicated by this activity.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: For Public Housing and HCV programs, there were no need to reap the benefits of this feature since verifications were more current than indicated by this activity.

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: The effectiveness of this activity will yield gains when utilized.

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-10 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 | \$5,600 | \$5,600 | 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 | 400 hours annually | 400 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% | 2% | 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 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-11 Elderly and Disabled Rent Re-certifications Every Three Years

Plan Year: 2014 Implemented: 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-year 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 | Data reflects partial participation during 2015 |

| 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 | Data reflects partial participation during 2015 |

| 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 | 38 residents x \$19.36 x 3 hours = \$2,207 | Cost saving was achieved |

| 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 | 114 | Staff Times Saving was achieved |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------------|

| 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-There is no rent increase or substantial loss of rent revenue to PMHA |

Description of detailed information on its impact: This activity reduces the number of re-certifications taking place each year which results in an agency cost savings as well as a staff-time savings. Since income increases, when occurring, are miniscule, there is not substantial loss or rent revenue with regard to public housing residents and no impact whatsoever for Section 8 tenants since they do not pay rent to the PMHA.

Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule: Outcomes will vary due to occupancy rates of the elderly/disabled population in PMHA housing and the number of eligible residents choosing the Triennial re-certification option. However, a savings of agency costs and staff time will result each time this feature is selected.

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

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

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 2016.

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

This activity has not been implemented. It is unclear if this activity will be implemented in 2016 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.

PH-13 Residents paying ceiling rents may self-certify income. Plan Year: 2015

This activity allows residents who are paying ceiling rents to self-certify their income for the purposes of the re-verification process. These households would be paying the same rental amount regardless of the amount of their income. Thus, there is no financial incentive to deceive PMHA regarding their income.
This activity will be implemented during 2016.

B-4 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 2016 for the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

B-6 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 2016 if renewed discussions yield a positive result.

B-8 Adoption of Local Investment Policies Plan Year: 2014

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

PMHA has not implemented the new local investment policies but expects to submit for Board approval a new policy by the end of 2016. This activity will allow PMHA to invest in a state government program for state and local governments in Ohio that permits pooled collateralized investment that obtains higher interest rates than is typically available to PMHA on its own while remaining completely liquid as an asset.

C. Activities on Hold

HCV-7 Capped Utility Reimbursement Checks: Plan Year: 2012

This activity was intended to eliminate “double dipping” for utility costs by setting utility allowance reimbursement maximums based on the State of Ohio’s PIPP Plus program, a program that subsidizes low-income households’ utilities by allowing them to pay utility bills on the basis on income, not on the amount of service used. However, these same families were eligible for and receiving utility reimbursement checks with the intention to pay off their entire month’s utility bill.

This activity is on hold as PMHA works with its software provider to ensure rent calculations and utility allowance checks are accurately performed and issued.

During 2016, this activity will be reviewed to determine if the cost for software changes is appropriate and affordable for the value gained from the activity. A decision will be reached for a final decision on this activity by July 1, 2016.

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. Households may continue to request interim reviews at any time. This activity would be applied to all MTW Vouchers held by households not considered “elderly” or “disabled”.

Plan Year: 2014 Implemented: August 2014

This activity was designated “On-Hold” as of May 2015. The monitoring of this activity proved too time consuming for staff to identify affected households because of the numerous re-certification dates assigned to non-elderly/non-disabled households.

As a result, all current eligible households will be recertified beginning May 2016 in order to implement a designated timetable for affected households.

PMHA anticipates this activity will reduce 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.

D. Closed Out Activities

HCV-5 Alternative Housing Quality Standards Compliance

Plan Year: 2011 Implemented: 2011 This activity ended in 2015

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:

| <i>HC #6: Increase in Resident Mobility</i> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | Minimum of 42 households per year | 2010-64 2011-64 2012-44 | Benchmark met |

| | implementation of this activity | participating in the program | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| HC #4: Displacement Prevention | | | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark 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-2 Cap on dependent child deduction

Plan Year: 1999 Implemented: 2000 Discontinued for HCV program: 2014

This activity was discontinued for the Housing Choice Voucher Program in 2014 due to revised rent-reform policies which included a flat 29.6% of income calculation.

i. Discuss the final outcome and lessons learned

This activity initially limited a \$480 for each child up to a maximum deduction of \$960 for two dependents. The 2014 revised rent-reform policies omitted this step from the rent calculation in an attempted to streamline the process. Advantages included a decrease in staff time and rent calculation error.

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:

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 |

Description of detailed information on its impact: The cap on dependent child deduction was no longer relevant to the revised rent reform activity. The elimination of this step in the rent calculation process is anticipated to reduce errors and result in a savings in staff time which was a primary goal of the revision.

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

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 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 have been made

iv. Provide a narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table

The results of the capped dependent child activity was successful. However, with the implemented rent reform activity, it is no longer relevant.

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.

B-7 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.

The activity was discontinued for HCV program in 2015 due to rent reform activities.

i. Discuss the final outcome and lessons learned

Public Housing Program:

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.

HCV Program:

This activity was discontinued during 2015. It was replaced with a flat deduction of 29.6% of wage income in lieu of calculation of various income deductions.

The expectation is that households will reap a greater reward for achieving earned income through a percentage of earned income rather than a flat deduction. Also, it is anticipated that staff time is saved by the elimination of having to secure third-party documentation for the education deduction which was tedious and time consuming for staff.

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 participating household | Employment Deduction of \$500= \$12.50 monthly savings per Household 2010-60 HH 2011-59 HH Education Deduction of \$500= \$12.50 monthly savings per Household | Benchmark met |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|--|
| | | | 2010-17 HH 2011-18 HH | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|--|

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 participating household | Employment Deduction of \$500= \$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 | Benchmark met |

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. However, by implementing a “percentage” of earned income as a deduction results in a greater rent savings among residents as wage income continues to increase.

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

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, 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 have been made

- iv. Provide a narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table
With the replacement of a “percentage” of earned income, the average savings for 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

(See Following Page)

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

A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority submits its unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system

Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

The PMHA does not have any activity that uses only MTW Single Fund Flexibility.

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?

Yes

Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

No

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

N/A

This section is not applicable to the Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority.

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 |

This section is Not Applicable to the Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority.

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

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 2015.