



# **Housing Authority of the City of Reno**



## **Moving to Work Annual Report**

**Fiscal Year 2015**

**July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015**

**Submitted to HUD on September 30, 2015**



## Table of Contents

- I. Introduction ..... 3
- II. General Housing Authority Operating Information ..... 9
  - A. Housing Stock Information ..... 9
  - B. Leasing Information ..... 12
  - C. Wait List Information ..... 17
- III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested..... 19
- IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted ..... 20
  - A. Implemented Activities ..... 20
    - 2015-01: Elimination of all negative rents & simplification of HCV utility allowances..... 22
    - 2015-02: Allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units ..... 27
    - 2015-03: Assign PBVs to up to 100% of units in non-Public Housing RHA-owned properties ..... 30
    - 2015-04: Required Savings Plan for Earned Income Disallowance (EID) PH residents..... 32
    - 2014-01: Assign PBVs to RHA owned/controlled units without competitive process..... 35
    - 2014-02: Mobility Demonstration ..... 37
    - 2014-03: Rent Reform Study ..... 47
    - 2014-04: Expand self-sufficiency activities ..... 59
    - 2014-05: Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent..... 64
    - 2014-06: Triennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes..... 72
    - 2014-07: Alternate HQS verification policy ..... 75
    - 2014-08: Partner with local nonprofits to provide housing to at risk families ..... 77
  - B. Not Yet Implemented Activities ..... 81
  - C. Activities on Hold ..... 81
  - D. Closed Activities ..... 81
- V. Sources and Uses of Funds..... 82
  - A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds ..... 82
  - B. Local Asset Management Plan ..... 82
  - C. Commitment of Unspent Funds ..... 83
- VI. Administrative ..... 84
- VII. Attachments ..... 85



## I. Introduction

### **What is MTW?**

Moving to Work (MTW) is a demonstration program, established by Congress in 1996, that offers a limited number of Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) the opportunity to propose and test innovative, locally-designed approaches to administering housing programs and self-sufficiency strategies. These policy changes address challenges for low-income families that are unique to local needs. The program also permits PHAs to combine Federal Funds from the Public Housing (PH) operating fund, Capital Fund Program (CFP) and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program into a single, agency-wide funding source known as a "block grant." With the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) approval, PHAs can waive certain statutes and regulations in order to explore different and creative ways to improve their housing programs. However, each of the proposed activities must address at least one of three MTW statutory objectives:

- Increase housing choices for low-income families.
- Give incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.
- Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

After a national competition was held in 2012, the Housing Authority of the City of Reno (RHA) was selected and designated as one of four new MTW agencies in 2013. The MTW agreement between RHA and HUD was executed on June 27, 2013 and remains effective through RHA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2018.

### **What is the purpose of RHA's MTW Annual Report?**

RHA's FY 2015 MTW Annual Report highlights and details each of the implemented activities as approved by HUD on August 6, 2014, as well as, the ongoing FY 2014 MTW activities approved on July 25, 2013. The report discusses RHA's accomplishments in the areas of housing choice, self-sufficiency and cost effectiveness, and follows the required outline and format established in Attachment B of RHA's executed MTW agreement with HUD.

Activities approved in RHA's FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan included:

- Elimination of all negative rents and the simplification of HCV utility allowances.
- Implementation of a required savings plan for PH residents participating in Earned Income Disallowance (EID).
- Authorization to allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units.
- Ability to assign Project Based Vouchers (PBVs) to 100% of the units in a RHA-owned non-PH complex/building.



## **Overview of RHA's short and long term MTW goals and objectives**

RHA's mission is to provide fair, sustainable, quality housing in diverse neighborhoods throughout Reno, Sparks and Washoe County that offers a stable foundation for low-income families to pursue economic opportunities, become self-sufficient and improve their quality of life. In doing so, RHA will continue to cultivate strong community partnerships, promote fiscal responsibility, and administer all of its programs and activities in an efficient, ethical, and professional manner.

In carrying out its mission, RHA staff continue to learn from the experiences and expertise of other MTW agencies as well as through the ongoing review and evaluation of each of the activities being implemented locally. Mobility Demonstration and Rent Reform participants continue to be tracked by the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), who will determine the overall effectiveness of the programs. These evaluations will assist RHA in achieving its goal of providing a higher level of opportunity to participants and staff.

RHA aspires to become a model agency providing housing choice, resident self-sufficiency and cost effectiveness within the Reno, Sparks and Washoe County community. Following is a brief overview of RHA's accomplishments and actions as they relate to each of the three statutory objectives of the MTW demonstration program.

### ***Increase housing choices for low-income families***

Upon approval of RHA's FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, RHA immediately began assigning PBVs to RHA owned/controlled single family homes, duplexes and condominiums in low poverty areas without a competitive process. By eliminating the competitive process, RHA was able to move families out of high poverty areas quickly. In addition, the assignment of PBVs to these units continues to increase housing choices for low-income families.

In FY 2014, RHA began a Mobility Demonstration that offers qualified PH families, who otherwise lack mobility options, the opportunity to move to low poverty neighborhoods throughout Reno, Sparks and Washoe County with higher economic opportunities. RHA's goal was to purchase up to 50 foreclosed or vacant single family homes, duplexes or condominiums. As of June 30, 2015, 34 properties have been identified for use in the Mobility Demonstration and 32 former PH families have been able to move to low poverty neighborhoods; effectively increasing their housing choice and economic opportunities.

On April 6, 2015, the first Mobility Demonstration family successfully moved off the program after they purchased their own home. On April 30, 2015, a second family moved off of the program after successfully increasing their income. Once the family increased their income, they could afford to pay the full rent for the unit they leased under the Mobility Demonstration.

To provide further housing choices for low-income households, RHA began assigning PBVs to additional RHA owned/controlled non-PH units. As of June 30, 2015, 27 single family homes, duplexes and/or condominiums have been identified for this purpose. Of these 27 units, 16 have been approved by HUD and 9 were leased and occupied with a PBV at the end of FY 2015.

Due to the restrictions of 24 C.F.R. 983.56, the number of PBVs within each building is limited to 25%, however staff recognized that assistance could be provided to more low-income families if this limitation was lifted. In FY 2015, RHA requested and received a waiver to assign PBVs to up



to 100% of units in non-PH RHA owned multi-family properties. Once the units become vacant, RHA evaluates how the vacancy can fulfill the needs of the community before a PBV is assigned. RHA plans to request a waiver to also lift the 20% limit on the amount of voucher funding that may be utilized under the PBV program.

PBVs have also been assigned to RHA owned multi-family properties and scattered site properties to assist local nonprofits with housing their high risk families who have immediate housing needs. Collaborative partnership agreements were established with the Committee to Aid Abused Women (CAAW) and Casa de Vida. CAAW provides services for women and children experiencing family violence and domestic violence. They connect individuals and families in Washoe County with the essential resources to help them restore safety and reclaim their lives. Casa de Vida provides supportive services to pregnant young women and their babies. On April 27, 2015, an agreement was established with Washoe County Department of Social Services aimed at reunifying families with their children. On June 22, 2015, an agreement was established with Safe Embrace, a local nonprofit who offers shelter for victims of domestic violence and their children.

Through a formalized partnership with each agency, RHA is able to offer their clients a safe and stable place to call home during a time they are faced with a very challenging situation. While these agencies have the ability to provide the necessary supportive services, they lack the funding to provide stable long term housing to their families.

On May 7, 2015, HUD approved RHA to assign 5 PBVs to a property located at 435 Moran Street through a partnership with Silver Sage Manor, Inc. This property was completely rehabilitated using NSP3 funds provided by the City of Reno and houses 8 elderly individuals who are, or may soon become, homeless. RHA will continue to reach out to additional nonprofit community partners.

***Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work***

A Rent Reform Study was implemented in FY 2014 that includes a study group and a control group. The rent for the study group is a set amount based on FMRs and it does not change based on income or family size. The rent for the control group is calculated using the standard HCV guidelines. The Rent Reform Study was developed to determine if self-sufficiency is created when rents are not tied directly to income levels. Families in the study group are provided two strong incentives to become self-sufficient: (1) the motivation to increase household income when income no longer affects rent and (2) the awareness that their housing assistance will end after 5 years. Should a family's income increase for any reason and that family is participating in the Rent Reform Study group, the extra income is considered discretionary and can be used however the family chooses. As of June 30, 2015, 223 vouchers had been issued under the Rent Reform Study, 160 had been leased and 10 families moved off of assistance for various reasons.

In order to assist Rent Reform Study participants in achieving their self-sufficiency goals, RHA's Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Coordinators develop Individual Training and Service Plans (ITSP) and meet with each family at least once annually. The FSS Coordinators offer Rent Reform participants assistance and outreach services through the FSS Lite Program. The FSS Lite Program is designed to assist participants who are working toward self-sufficiency by furthering their education, enrolling in job training programs, identifying and overcoming barriers, and obtaining employment.



As of June 30, 2015, FSS staff met with 92 Rent Reform Study participants; 52 of whom have signed FSS Lite agreements. With ITSPs in place, Rent Reform families are able to take advantage of everything the FSS Lite Program has to offer, including the Self-Sufficiency Fund. The \$50,000 Self-Sufficiency Fund was established in FY 2015 using MTW single fund flexibility and provides assistance with some of the most common barriers hindering self-sufficiency. To date, RHA has spent \$2,910 to assist FSS Lite participants with transportation costs, tuition for classes and job training efforts.

In addition, the FSS Lite Program is offered to Mobility Demonstration participants who are unemployed with no qualified exemption in place based on RHA's Admissions and Continued Occupancy of Public Housing Units (*Section 14.2.*). In FY 2014, RHA began requiring PH residents who are more than 32 hours delinquent on their required community service hours to also participate in FSS Lite.

Several other activities have been implemented by RHA that are directly aimed at increasing the self-sufficiency of PH residents and HCV participants. Exclusion of educational grant income from rent calculations continues to impact the ability of RHA's HCV participants to pursue their educational goals without having it negatively affect their portion of the rent.

PH residents, who qualify for the benefit of EID, are now required to take part in a mandatory savings plan through the Financial Guidance Center (FGC). The savings plan educates residents on how to responsibly budget discretionary income. As of June 30, 2015, 37 PH residents were referred to the FGC of which 11 started participating in the savings plan. RHA has proposed to eliminate EID in the FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan, however, current EID participants will retain their EID benefits for one full year following implementation at which point they will be transitioned off of EID.

***Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures***

RHA's Rent Reform Study is being used to explore a more cost-effective way to calculate rent. Rent calculations can be quite complex and time consuming. This activity not only allows staff to cut back on the amount of time spent calculating rent, but it also informs HCV participants in the study group what their rents will be for the next five years.

In FY 2014, RHA excluded all educational financial aid from income calculations for HCV participants, allowed self-certification and exclusion of combined assets under \$10,000, and allowed for biennial recertification for families on fixed incomes. In FY 2015, staff expanded on the success of biennial recertifications and began allowing triennial recertifications for these same families. Each of these activities was designed to save RHA staff time and money. It is important to note that staff time is saved by excluding all educational grant income from the calculations of rent; however, this activity was principally designed to encourage HCV participants to pursue educational opportunities as they move toward becoming self-sufficient.

RHA's alternate Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection policy has been extremely well-received. The policy allows a unit that passed the annual HQS inspection on the first visit to skip the inspection the following year as long as both the tenant and landlord agree. This policy



provides an incentive to participants and landlords to maintain HQS standards all year. In addition, staff time is saved by reducing the number of inspections.

In FY 2015, RHA simplified the current HCV utility allowances by creating a flat utility allowance based on 4 structure types and bedroom size. This resulted in a significant reduction in the amount of staff time spent calculating utility allowances which were previously based on over 40 different variables. Additional savings to RHA were gained by calculating a participants utility allowance based on the voucher size rather than the unit size. The change not only saves RHA staff time, but allows HCV participants to easily calculate their utility allowance thus encouraging them to seek out energy efficient units and be more mindful of energy and water conservation.

RHA completed the removal of significant areas of turf at 3 PH complexes, replacing it with water saving xeriscape landscaping. Large water wasting turf areas have been replaced with individually designed combinations of varying colored rocks, decomposed granite, boulders, bark, and drought resistant shrubs and trees more naturally appropriate for the high desert landscape in northern Nevada. With single fund flexibility allowed through RHA's participation in MTW, approximately 399,795 sq. ft. (9.5 acres) of turf has been removed and replaced with low maintenance and low water usage landscape. Each square foot of lawn area requires at least 1.25 gallons of water per week. With a typical growing season of 31 weeks, that amounts to 15,492,056 gallons of water saved per growing season. By installing xeriscape landscaping, significant management and long-term maintenance costs have also been removed and over time, substantial ongoing water savings will be achieved.

In RHA's FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan, RHA has committed to continue these energy saving improvements at its PH complexes. Plans are in place to replace 900 aluminum frame windows throughout the Mineral Manor PH complex with energy star rated, highly efficient, thermal pane windows.

### ***Progress toward long-term goals***

A questionnaire has been developed and administered to all Mobility Demonstration and Rent Reform Study participants that will provide RHA and UNR with baseline data needed to evaluate the progress of the participants over the coming years. Examples of some of the information residents provide include family history, family education and income, transportation, and neighborhood satisfaction.

RHA continues to purchase single family homes, duplexes and condominiums for the assignment of PBVs for the Mobility Demonstration. In utilizing both new purchases and the reassignment of properties from other programs, RHA now plans to lease up to 40 units rather than 50 as originally intended.

Planned partnerships with nonprofit agencies providing services to families with immediate housing needs is making progress. During the last two years, RHA partnered with CAAW and Casa De Vida to provide housing to their families and contracts with Washoe County Department of Social Services and Safe Embrace were signed. RHA staff continues to explore other possible nonprofit partners to further assist high risk families.



RHA is committed to expanding self-sufficiency activities through the FSS Lite Program and continues to have FSS Coordinators work with non-elderly and non-disabled clients in all rental assistance programs. RHA anticipates providing all FSS Program participants with the necessary guidance and support needed to increase opportunities for career placement or advancement, building a foundation for long-term success and asset development. In order to provide current staff with additional support, RHA will use single fund flexibility through MTW to hire up to 3 UNR interns. The interns will assist in providing self-sufficiency services to all FSS participants as outlined in the FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan.

With shrinking CFP budgets, single fund flexibility has proven to be vital in the improvement and conservation of RHA's PH properties. RHA will continue to use this flexibility to make additional improvements to these properties, specifically those focused on energy and water savings.



## II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

### A. Housing Stock Information

The following tables provide an overview of RHA's housing stock as of June 30, 2015.

New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year				
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project	
Mobility Demonstration and Opportunity properties	30	9	PH residents in good standing are being given the opportunity to move to RHA's scattered site rental properties on a two-year PBV. RHA plans to assign additional PBVs as properties are acquired or repurposed from other RHA programs.	
Single Family Home Project Based Vouchers	12	4	RHA acquired many single family homes under NSP2 and other programs. RHA plans to assign additional PBVs as properties are acquired or become vacant.	
Partnerships	20	7	RHA is working with CAAW, Casa de Vida, Washoe County Social Services and Safe Embrace to provide affordable housing while the nonprofit groups provide supportive services. RHA also worked with Silver Sage Manor, Inc. to assign PBVs to five of their units at 435 Moran St. for low income elderly individuals.	
Yorkshire Terrace	10	2	RHA assigned 3 PBVs to units in RHA's LIHTC project at Yorkshire Terrace in FY 2014 and 2 in FY 2015. This was quite effective, and RHA plans to expand this to include more units as they become vacant. Through activity 2015-03, PBVs may be assigned to up to 100% of these units.	
Anticipated Total # of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *		Actual Total # of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Anticipated Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year *	Anticipated Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
72		22	72	72
			Actual Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	Actual Total # of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
			61	45

\* From RHA's FY 2015 Annual MTW Plan



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

RHA continues to acquire single family homes, duplexes and condominiums for use with PBVs. Scattered site properties located in low poverty neighborhoods may be identified for use in RHA's Mobility Demonstration. All other properties acquired will be used to provide additional housing choices for low-income families and individuals through RHA's opportunity and single family home PBVs.

Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

### General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures during the Plan Year

The CFP expenditures in FY 2015 were as follows:

- A. Mineral Manor: concrete repairs and furnace replacement.  
CFP 2013 expenditures totaled \$269,462.
- B. Tom Sawyer Village: clubhouse remodel, electrical upgrades and landscape improvements.  
CFP 2013 expenditures totaled \$15,785 and CFP 2014 expenditures totaled \$43,715.
- C. Silverada Manor: landscape improvements.  
CFP 2013 expenditures totaled \$50,125.
- D. Hawk View Apartments: concrete/sidewalk replacement, asphalt repair, security camera improvements and appliance replacement.  
CFP 2013 expenditures totaled \$76,485 and CFP 2014 expenditures totaled \$5,643.
- E. Essex Manor: security camera improvements, appliance replacement and landscape improvements.  
CFP 2013 expenditures totaled \$12,588 and CFP 2014 expenditures totaled \$146,277.
- F. Myra Birch Manor: mechanical room locks and appliance replacement.  
CFP 2013 expenditures totaled \$12,540 and CFP 2014 expenditures totaled \$13,481.
- G. John McGraw Court: security camera improvements.  
CFP 2013 expenditures totaled \$3,159.

Total expenditures for all CFP work carried out in FY 2015: \$649,260.



**Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End**

Housing Program*	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Tax-Credit	30	Yorkshire Terrace is a LIHTC property which was fully conveyed to RHA from the limited partners on August 27, 2012. Five of these units have been assigned PBVs.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	16	Silver Sage Court is affordable housing for the elderly/disabled. The property was constructed using LIHTF and HOME funds through a joint venture agreement with Silver Sage Manor, Inc. The joint venture agreement was dissolved in 2014 after RHA paid off the remaining HOME loan balance.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	58	Sarrazin Arms Apartments was purchased by RHA in 1992; the down payment was funded through HOME funds.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	4	D&K Horizons was constructed in 1998 using HUD grant funds.
Non-MTW HUD Funded	165 <sup>1</sup>	RHA purchased several scattered site properties between November 25, 2008 and June 30, 2015 using NSP1, NSP2, and EDI grant funds, RHA funds, and HUD's Good Neighbor Program. Several of these properties have been assigned PBVs.
Locally Funded	156	Ala Moana Apartments was purchased by RHA in 1996 and funded by bonds.
Locally Funded	6	Carville Court was purchased in 1997 through a foreclosure sale. It is family housing.
Locally Funded	12	Colonial Court was purchased in 2008. It is family housing.
Locally Funded	34	Idlewild Apartments was a foreclosed bank owned property purchased by RHA in 2012. It is family housing. Several of these units have been assigned PBVs.
Locally Funded	16	Prater Way Apartments was a foreclosed bank owned property purchased by RHA in 2014. It is family housing.
Other (1)	7	Pilgrim Rest is owned by Pilgrim Rest Baptist Church and managed by RHA. It is affordable housing for the elderly/disabled.
Other (2)	4	Scattered site properties donated to RHA.

<sup>1</sup> In RHA's 2014 Annual MTW Report, the number reported included properties that were purchased and sold to qualified families. This number has been revised to reflect the actual number of scattered site properties owned and/or managed by RHA.

**Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed**

**508**

**If Other, please describe:**

Other (1) refers to a property owned by a non-PH entity and managed by RHA. Other (2) refers to properties which were donated to RHA.

\* 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.



**B. Leasing Information**

<b>Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year</b>		
<b>Housing Program:</b>	<b>Number of Households Served*</b>	
	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	35
<b>Total Projected and Actual Households Served</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>

\* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.

\*\* In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.

<b>Housing Program:</b>	<b>Unit Months Occupied/Leased****</b>	
	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	0	0
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	418
<b>Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>418</b>

RHA did not have anyone occupy or lease units through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs.

\*\*\* In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.

\*\*\*\* Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.

	<b>Average # of Households Served Per Month</b>	<b>Total # of Households Served During the Year</b>
<b>Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only</b>	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:

<b>Fiscal Year:</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0*	N/A	N/A	N/A

\* RHA is not providing any housing assistance that is not reported in PIC.



**Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements:  
Maintain Comparable Mix**

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

<b>Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served</b>					
<b>Family Size:</b>	<b>Occupied # of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW</b>	<b>Utilized # of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW</b>	<b>Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *</b>	<b>Baseline # of Household Sizes to be Maintained</b>	<b>Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained</b>
1 Person	284	1,307	0	1,591	50.56%
2 Person	207	433	0	640	20.34%
3 Person	115	290	0	405	12.87%
4 Person	76	192	0	268	8.52%
5 Person	40	107	0	147	4.67%
6+ Person	23	73	0	96	3.05%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>2,402</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,147</b>	<b>100%</b>

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized	<b>No baseline adjustments.</b>
--	---------------------------------

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



<b>Mix of Family Sizes Served</b>							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	50.56%	20.34%	12.87%	8.52%	4.67%	3.05%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	1,727	647	357	277	133	97	3,238
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	53.34%	19.98%	11.03%	8.55%	4.11%	3%	100%
Percentage Change	2.78%	-0.36%	-1.84%	0.03%	-0.56%	-0.05%	0
Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages	<b>No changes to baseline percentages over 5%.</b>						

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

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

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

<b>Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End</b>	
<b>Housing Program</b>	<b>Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions</b>
Public Housing	RHA did not experience any issues related to leasing of PH units.
Housing Choice Vouchers	RHA did not experience any issues related to leasing of HCV units.



<b>Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End</b>		
<b>Activity Name/#</b>	<b>Number of Households Transitioned*</b>	<b>Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency</b>
Mobility Demonstration / 2014-02	4	RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient.
Rent Reform Controlled Study / 2014-03	15	
Expand Self-Sufficiency Activities / 2014-04	3	
Simplify Rent Calculations and Increase the Minimum Rent / 2014-05	6	
<b>Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions</b>	0	
<b>ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY</b>	<b>28</b>	

\* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.



**C. 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 Family Public Housing	1,084	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site-Based Stead Manor Family Public Housing	537	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community-Wide Elderly and Disabled Housing	156	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide	2,286	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide Mod Rehab and SRO (1)	32	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units	Site-Based Project-based units owned by RHA	543	Closed	Yes

(1) This is per HUD's direction, as Mod Rehab is not HCV

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

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

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



**If Partially Open Wait List, please describe:**

N/A

**If Local, Non-Traditional Housing Program, please describe:**

N/A

**If Other Wait List Type, please describe:**

N/A

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

There are no changes to the organization structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list.



### **III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested**

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



## IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

### A. Implemented Activities

The activities discussed in this section have been previously approved by HUD and implemented by RHA. The following table provides an overview of all approved MTW activities including the year it was implemented, the primary statutory objective(s) the activity is intended to impact and the authorization(s) cited.

Approved/Implemented MTW Activities				
Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	Activity Name	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
2015-01	2015	Elimination of all negative rents and simplification of HCV utility allowances	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.2.a., and C.11.
2015-02	2015	Allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section C.9.a., and D.5.
2015-03	2015	Assign PBVs to up to 100% of units in non-Public Housing RHA-owned properties	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness <u>and</u> increase housing choices for low-income families.	Attachment C Section D.1.e., D.7., and D.7.a.
2015-04	2015	Required savings plan for Earned Income Disallowance (EID) PH residents	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section E.
2014-01	2014	Assign PBVs to RHA owned/controlled units without competitive process	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.7.a.
2014-02	2014	Mobility Demonstration	Increase housing choices for low-income families <u>and</u> create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section D.1.b., Section D.4., Section D.7.a., and Section E.
2014-03	2014	Rent Reform Study	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work <u>and</u> reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.1.b., Section D.1.c., Section D. 2. a., and Section D.4.



Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	Activity Name	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
2014-04	2014	Expand self-sufficiency activities	Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section E.
2014-05	2014	Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section C.4., Section C.11, Section D.2.a., and Section D.3.b.
2014-06	2014	Triennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section C.4., and Section D.1.c.
2014-07	2014	Alternate HQS verification policy	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness.	Attachment C Section D.5.
2014-08	2014	Partner with local nonprofits to provide housing to at risk families	Increase housing choices for low-income families <u>and</u> create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.	Attachment C Section B.4., Section D.1.b., and Section D.7.a.



**2015-01: Elimination of all negative rents & simplification of HCV utility allowances**

**MTW Statutory Objective:**

Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

**Implementation year:**

This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

**Description:**

RHA's PH residents and HCV participants no longer receive negative rents due to utility allowances. Furthermore, RHA simplified the HCV utility allowances for all units by creating a flat utility allowance schedule based on 4 structure types and authorized voucher bedroom size.

Negative rents:

Due to HUD's rules regarding the calculation of income, PHAs may pay a utility reimbursement to the participant if the utility allowance (for tenant-paid utilities) exceeds the amount of the total tenant payment. As of December 18, 2013, less than 10% of RHA's PH residents and HCV participants were receiving utility allowance reimbursements. RHA staff reviewed each of these participants and determined that the majority of these families did have enough income to cover utilities; however, based on HUD's rules regarding calculation of income, this income was excluded and the participants received a check every month for utility reimbursement payments. In FY 2015, RHA received approval and eliminated negative rents for all PH residents and HCV participants.

Utility allowance simplification:

Prior to FY 2015, RHA had a simplified utility allowance schedule for designated highly energy efficient multifamily complexes only. After the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan was approved, RHA simplified HCV utility allowances for all other units by creating a flat utility allowance based on structure type and authorized voucher bedroom size. The new allowances, as shown in the following table, are designed to cover the full cost of apartment utilities, but a lesser percentage proportionally for participants who choose single family homes, duplexes and mobile homes.

<b>Standardized HCV Utility Allowances</b>					
<b>Structure Type</b>	<b>0-BR</b>	<b>1-BR</b>	<b>2-BR</b>	<b>3-BR</b>	<b>4-BR+</b>
<b>EES</b>	N/A	56	72	87	107
<b>Apartment</b>	50	70	88	107	124
<b>House/Duplex</b>	92	113	138	162	185
<b>Mobile</b>	N/A	123	131	149	162

This simplification is a significant change from the prior utility allowance schedule which had over 40 variables and paid based on unit bedroom size rather than voucher size. The new standardized HCV utility allowance schedule allows participants to know exactly what they will receive and encourages them to seek out energy efficient units and conserve energy and water.



**Impact:**

Following HUD's approval of RHA's FY 2015 MTW Plan, RHA provided PH and HCV families with a notice regarding the elimination of all negative rents effective October 1, 2014. Once the activity was implemented in October, only 15 HCV participants continued to receive a monthly utility allowance payment, and as of June 30, 2015, one HCV participant received the payment.

RHA's simplified HCV utility allowance schedule became effective immediately for vouchers issued on or after August 7, 2014 and annuals and lease renewals on or after November 1, 2014. The new schedule allows HCV participants to know exactly what amount they will receive and encourages them to seek out units based on their authorized voucher size, water conservation and energy efficiencies. Implementation of the simplified schedule has also saved a significant amount of staff time and alleviated errors within the calculations.

To date, there have been no hardship requests related to this activity.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**C. Authorizations Related to Public Housing Only**

**C.11. *Rent Policies and Term Limits***

The Agency is authorized to determine family payment, including the total tenant payment, the minimum rent, utility reimbursements and tenant rent. The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policies for setting rents in public housing including but not limited to establishing definitions of income and adjusted income, or earned income disallowance that differ from those in current statutes or regulations. The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement term limits for its public housing assistance. Such policies must include provisions for addressing hardship cases. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 3 (a)(2), 3(a)(3)(A) and Section 6(1) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 5.603, 5.611, 5.628, 5.630, 5.632, 5.634 and 960.255 and 966 Subpart A.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.2.a. *Rent Policies and Term Limits***

The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policy to establish payment standards, rents or subsidy levels for tenant-based assistance that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policies to calculate the tenant portion of the rent that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(1), 8(0)(2), 8(0)(3), 8(0)(10) and 8(0)(13)(H)-(I) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.508, 982.503 and 982.518.*



**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

There are no changes to the Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics related to this activity.

*The following Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics relate to the elimination of negative rents:*

<b>2015-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total amount issued to PH residents in utility allowances that exceeded rent.	\$13,180 Cost incurred January 2013 - December 2013	\$660 5% of original cost based on probable hardship requests	\$1,438	No*
Total amount issued to HCV participants in utility allowances that exceeded rent.	\$198,785 Cost incurred January 2013 - December 2013	\$9,940 5% of original cost based on probable hardship requests	\$31,350	No*

\* HUD approved RHA's FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan on August 6, 2014. RHA gave 30 days' notice to PH residents and HCV participants on September 1, 2014; the elimination of negative rents became effective on October 1, 2014. RHA anticipates meeting this benchmark in future years.

<b>2015-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total PH staff hours to complete the task.	6 hours annually or 0.5 hours per month	0 hours	1.01 hours annually	No*
Total HCV staff hours to complete the task.	204 hours annually or 17 hours per month	0 hours	38.25 hours annually	No*

\* HUD approved RHA's FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan on August 6, 2014. RHA gave 30 days' notice to PH residents and HCV participants on September 1, 2014; the elimination of negative rents became effective on October 1, 2014. RHA anticipates meeting this benchmark in future years.



The following Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics relate to the simplification of HCV utility allowances:

2015-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of HCV utility allowances.	\$263,371 per month*	\$253,566 per month	\$198,400 per month*	Yes

\* RHA's baseline for this Metric was estimated based on a sample of 372 HCV participants in January 2014 and assumed 100% voucher utilization with all participants receiving a utility allowance. The actual cost in October 2014 for 2,174 HCV participants who were leased up and receiving a utility allowance that month was \$201,684. This cost included 1,353 HCV participants who were still on the old utility allowance schedule. In June 2015, RHA's actual cost for 2,135 HCV participants who received a utility allowance was \$186,934. Throughout FY 2015, RHA averaged a cost of \$198,400 per month.

2015-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total HCV staff hours to calculate utility allowances.	32.5 hours annually  Approximate amount of time RHA staff spent calculating all utility allowances.	12 hours annually  Approximate amount of time RHA staff will spend calculating all utilities under the simplified system.	20.82 hours annually	No*

\* RHA's simplified HCV utility allowances became effective for new participants immediately upon HUD's approval of the 2015 MTW Annual Plan on August 6, 2014. All HCV participants leased prior to this date were phased onto the new utility allowance schedule during their annual recertification which occurred over several months. RHA anticipates meeting this benchmark in future years.



<b>2015-01 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing the HCV utility allowances.	2.6% Average error rate in 2013.	0.5% The new HCV utility allowances are much less complex.	0.013% In FY 2015, one of 72 files audited contained an error related to the calculation of utility allowance.	Yes

<b>2015-01 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Increase in HCV rental revenue due to the simplification of utility allowances.	Current tenant contribution to rent.	\$117,760 Overall tenant contribution to rent will increase by \$9,805 per month or \$117,760 annually.	\$124,731* Between October 2014 and June 2015, tenant contribution to rent increased by \$13,859 per month or approximately \$124,731.	Yes

\* This is tenant contribution to rent, not rental income to RHA.



**2015-02: Allow RHA to inspect its own HCV units**

**MTW Statutory Objective:**

Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

**Implementation year:**

This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

**Description:**

RHA owns a significant number of units which previously had to be inspected by third party contractors due to HUD's established rules. Under HUD's rules, a unit that is owned by the PHA that administers the HCV program (including a unit owned by an entity substantially controlled by the PHA) may not be inspected for HQS compliance by PHA staff. The PHA must obtain the services of a HUD approved independent entity to perform HQS inspections, which often results in longer lead times for a unit to become available for a tenant. In FY 2015, RHA staff began conducting inspections on all HCV and PBV units rather than using a third party contractor, regardless of ownership or property management status, including properties that are owned or managed by RHA.

RHA acknowledged that the possibility of fraud increases when PHAs are allowed to inspect their own units. To address this concern, RHA's Director of Asset Management began conducting quality control checks on the units inspected by HCV staff. These inspections are done at a rate of one unit per month or 5% of the units inspected in any particular month, whichever is greater. As of June 30, 2015, the Director of Asset Management conducted 6 quality control inspections.

**Impact:**

Previously, RHA was required to hire outside inspectors to conduct inspections of RHA owned units. Scheduling these inspections with third party contractors often slowed down occupancy, which, over time, cost RHA more money due to the vacancy. Implementation of this activity has allowed RHA staff to inspect RHA owned units which has saved RHA money as well as staff time.

The following table shows the amount of RHA staff time estimated for each HQS inspection based on the bedroom size of the dwelling unit. It is important to note that this estimated time does not include travel.

Bedroom Size	Estimated amount of staff time per inspection
0	25 minutes
1	30 minutes
2	30 minutes
3	35 minutes
4	40 minutes
5	45 minutes
6	50 minutes



**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**C. Authorizations Related to Public Housing Only**

**C.9.a. *Simplification of Property Management Practices***

The Agency is authorized to deploy a risk management approach in establishing property and system inspection protocols and frequencies in lieu of the HUD requirements of annual inspections by Agencies, as long as these protocols assure that housing units assisted under the demonstration meet housing quality standards approved or established by the Secretary. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 6 (f) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 902, Subpart B.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.5. *Ability to Certify Housing Quality Standards***

The Agency is authorized to certify that housing assisted under MTW will meet housing quality standards established or approved by HUD. The certification form will be approved or provided by HUD. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 8(0)(8) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982, Subpart I.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

**2015-02 CE #2:** In the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan, the Baseline established for the amount of staff time spent to schedule and log one inspection (conducted by a third party inspector) was estimated at 10 minutes. However the Plan also noted that an RHA staff member needed to accompany the third party inspector to fill out additional paperwork; which took approximately one hour. Therefore, according to the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan, prior to implementation of this activity, RHA's total staff time per inspection was approximately one hour and ten minutes. After implementation, it is anticipated that staff will spend approximately 45 minutes per inspection for an overall time savings of 25 minutes per inspection.

Furthermore, RHA's Baseline in the Plan for this same Metric erroneously stated that staff time would increase by approximately 35 minutes as a result of the activity when in fact, it will actually decrease. The Baselines and Benchmarks for this Metric has been updated accordingly.



2015-02 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total amount RHA incurs to have HCV units owned by RHA inspected by outside agencies.	\$4,645  In the previous year, RHA contracted out 101 HQS inspections during a 12 month period at a cost of \$35 per inspection plus mileage.	\$0	\$1,163  23 HQS inspections were contracted out at a cost of \$35 per inspection plus mileage.	No*

\* The FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan was approved by HUD on August 6, 2014. Prior to this approval, an outside agency had already conducted 6 HQS inspections for RHA and an additional 17 had already been scheduled through October 2014. RHA anticipates meeting this Benchmark in the future.

2015-02 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total amount of RHA staff hours to inspect HCV units owned by the Agency.	117.83 hours annually  10 minutes per contracted inspection to schedule and log the inspection, plus one hour for a staff member to accompany the inspector to fill out any additional paperwork for a total of 70 minutes.  $(70*101) / 60 = 117.83$	75.75 hours annually  RHA staff will spend approximately 45 minutes per inspection; a savings of 25 minutes per inspection or 42.08 hours annually.  $(45*101) / 60 = 75.75$	43.17 hours annually  RHA staff conducted 80 inspections in FY 2015. Each inspection took approximately 25 - 45 minutes based on bedroom size resulting in a savings of 50.16 staff hours.  Calculations used for the savings in staff time are based on the Baseline of 70 minutes per inspection: $(70*80) / 60 = 93.33$ $93.33 - 43.17 = 50.16$	Yes*

\* The FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan was approved by HUD on August 6, 2014. Prior to this approval, an outside agency had conducted 6 HQS inspections for RHA and an additional 17 had already been scheduled through October 2014. Had RHA conducted these 23 inspections, the total number of hours spent by staff would have been 56 hours; a savings of 64.17 hours based on RHA's Baseline of 70 minutes per inspection. Taking these 23 inspections into account, the Benchmark for the activity would still have been achieved.



**2015-03: Assign PBVs to up to 100% of units in non-Public Housing RHA-owned properties**

**MTW Statutory Objective:**

Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures *and* increase housing choices for low-income families.

**Implementation year:**

This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

**Description:**

RHA owns non-PH dwelling units and complexes which have been utilized in the Mobility Demonstration and in helping more households move off of the wait lists. Per 24 C.F.R. 983.56, PBV assistance for units in a project cannot exceed more than 25% of the number of dwelling units (assisted or unassisted) in the project. RHA recognized that assistance could be provided to more low-income families and rental revenue would increase, if the cap on the number of PBV units within each project was lifted.

In FY 2015, RHA waived the per project cap on RHA owned non-PH complexes allowing for the assignment of PBVs to up to 100% of these units; increasing both the rental revenue for RHA and housing choices for low-income families. In future years, RHA plans to request a waiver to lift the 20% limit on the amount of voucher funding that may be utilized under the PBV program.

**Impact:**

Approval of this activity has allowed RHA to lease units at Yorkshire Terrace more easily with no additional advertising necessary as applicants are pulled from an existing PBV wait list. Prior to implementing this activity, units at Yorkshire Terrace had been hard to lease due to the LIHTC income restrictions. During FY 2014, 12 units at Yorkshire Terrace were vacant for an average of 4.79 months; however, after implementation of this activity in FY 2015, 4 units at this same complex were vacant and successfully turned in 1.90 months.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.1.e. *Operational Policies and Procedures***

The Agency is authorized to determine the percentage of housing voucher assistance that it is permitted to project-base, and criteria for expending funds for physical improvements on those units that differs from the percentage and criteria requirements currently mandated in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 8(0)(13) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 983.*



D.7. *Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 Project-Based Program*

The Agency is authorized to develop and adopt a reasonable policy and process for project-basing Section 8 tenant-based leased housing assistance.

D.7.a. *Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 Project-Based Program*

The Agency is authorized to project-base Section 8 assistance at properties owned directly or indirectly by the Agency that are not public housing, subject to HUD's requirements regarding subsidy layering. If the Agency chooses to project-base Section 8 assistance at such properties, the Agency recognizes and accepts that such units would no longer be eligible for operating subsidy provided under Section 9(e) of the 1937 Housing Act or for future capital funds provided under section 9(d) for those units if it chooses to use this authorization. Project-based assistance for such owned units does not need to be competitively bid, nor are the owned units subject to any required assessments for voluntary conversion. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(13)(B and D) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.1, 982.102 and 24 C.F.R. Part 983.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

There are no changes to the Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics related to this activity.

2015-03 HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that lost assistance or needed to move due to RHA assigning PBVs.	0	0	0	Yes*

\* RHA does not assign PBVs to any units until they are vacant; this activity will not cause displacement in any way.



**2015-04: Required Savings Plan for Earned Income Disallowance (EID) PH residents**

**MTW Statutory Objective:**

Provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

**Implementation year:**

This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2015.

**Description:**

EID allows eligible residents in the PH program to increase their incomes through employment without triggering rent increases. When any assisted participant in the PH program, who is unemployed or under-employed, obtains a job or increases their wages, they are eligible for the EID benefit. The resulting increase in income is fully excluded for 12 months and 50% excluded for an additional 12 months. The full and partial exclusion of wages must be utilized within 48 consecutive months.

While the goal of EID is to motivate people who qualify for the program to accept employment, PH EID participants are often unable to maintain steady employment and frequently have issues once the EID period runs out because they have not learned how to effectively manage their money. To encourage PH residents to think more about their finances and ultimately prepare for the end of the EID period, RHA began requiring that all EID PH residents participate in a savings plan through the FGC. The FGC is a HUD approved, consumer credit counseling agency that assists families in managing debt, increasing their credit scores, as well as providing advice on savings, money management, and homeownership preparation.

A minimum deposit of \$50 per month must be established throughout the resident's participation in EID. RHA identified the following two choices for the EID savings plan: (1) Individual Development Account, which offers matching funds through the FGC to be used for education, homeownership, or small business development or (2) a savings account with no matching funds through a lending institution. If a savings account is selected by the tenant, the account is frozen by the FGC removing the ability for the participant to withdraw funds until the FGC authorizes the withdrawal at the end of the EID period.

**Impact:**

As of June 30, 2015, 37 PH residents were referred to the FGC and 11 or 30% signed up for a savings plan. On average these 11 participants contribute \$77 per month to their required savings plans.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

The response to this activity among PH residents has been relatively minimal. As current EID regulations are cumbersome to apply and only affect approximately 3% of families in the PH and HCV programs, RHA proposed and received approval for the elimination of the HUD-mandated EID from the calculation of rent in both the HCV and PH programs in the FY 2016 MTW Annual



Plan. This activity will be discontinued in the future and current/existing EID participants will be given one year to transition/phase off of the EID benefit.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.

**E. Authorizations Related to Family Self-Sufficiency**

The Agency is authorized to operate any of its existing self-sufficiency and training programs, including its Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program and any successor programs exempt from certain HUD program requirements. These may include those requirements governing program size or participation, including whether to establish escrow accounts and other rent incentives and whether to establish mandatory self-sufficiency participation requirements. If the Agency receives dedicated funding for an FSS coordinator, such funds must be used to employ a self-sufficiency coordinator. In developing and operating such programs, the Agency is authorized to establish strategic relationships and partnerships with local private and public agencies and service providers to leverage expertise and funding. However, notwithstanding the above, any funds granted pursuant to a competition must be used in accordance with the NOFA and the approved application and work plan. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 23 of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 984.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

There are no changes to the Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics related to this activity.

2015-4 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of savings/escrow of PH households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	\$0	\$1,200  Expected household savings over the course of the two year EID eligibility period.	\$291  Average savings among 11 households.	No*

\* Of the 11 EID participants, the first began contributing to a required savings plan on November 26, 2014 and the last began on June 30, 2015. On average, these 11 participants contribute \$77 per month to their savings plans.



**2015-4 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency**

*RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient.*

<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of PH EID households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	0	0	Yes*

\* This activity is not expected to transition PH EID households to self-sufficiency.



**2014-01: Assign PBVs to RHA owned/controlled units without competitive process**

**MTW Statutory Objective:**

Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

**Implementation year:**

This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Description:**

RHA owns a number of single family homes, duplexes and condominiums throughout Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County and continues to purchase more of these scattered site units. In order to expand housing choices for low-income families, RHA requested and received approval from HUD to assign PBVs to many of these units without going through a competitive process. On November 20, 2013, RHA submitted a Technical Amendment to its FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan which allowed for initial contract rents that are at or below the applicable low HOME rents, to be set by RHA rather than contracting with a state-certified appraiser and a HUD-approved independent agency.

This activity is intended to reduce cost by eliminating the need for RHA to place legal ads to comply with the competitive process usually required before PBVs can be assigned to units. It reduces costs further by allowing RHA to set rents at or below low HOME rents, which are below market rent, rather than using a state-certified appraiser and a HUD-approved independent agency.

**Impact:**

These units are being used for several of RHA's programs and effectively increase housing choices for many low-income households. At the end of FY 2015, RHA received HUD approval to assign PBVs without a competitive process to 50 units and 18 additional units have been identified for possible submission. RHA plans to continue to utilize this flexibility in future years to further expand housing choices for RHA participants.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.7.a. *Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 Project-Based Program***

The Agency is authorized to project-base Section 8 assistance at properties owned directly or indirectly by the Agency that are not public housing, subject to HUD's requirements regarding subsidy layering. If the Agency chooses to project-base Section 8 assistance at such properties, the Agency recognizes and accepts that such units would no longer be eligible for operating subsidy provided under Section 9(e) of the 1937 Housing Act or for future capital funds provided under section 9(d) for those units if it chooses to use this authorization. Project-based assistance for such owned units does not



need to be competitively bid, nor are the owned units subject to any required assessments for voluntary conversion. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(13)(B and D) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.1, 982.102 and 24 C.F.R. Part 983.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

There are no changes to the Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics related to this activity.

2014-01 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of assigning PBVs to RHA owned/controlled unit without competitive process.	\$720/property Cost incurred for a three-day legal advertisement.	\$0	\$0	Yes*

\* In FY 2015, RHA submitted and received HUD approval to assign 17 additional PBVs without having to incur the three-day legal advertisement fee; an overall savings to the agency of \$12,240.

2014-01 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total amount of RHA staff hours required to complete the task.	.25 hours or 15 minutes per property Staff take approximately 15 minutes to write and place a legal advertisement.	0 hours	0 hours	Yes*

\* In FY 2015, RHA submitted and received HUD approval to assign 17 additional PBVs without having to place a legal advertisement; saving 4.25 hours of staff time annually.



## **2014-02: Mobility Demonstration**

### **MTW Statutory Objective:**

Increase housing choices for low-income families *and* provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

### **Implementation year:**

This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

### **Description:**

RHA is issuing PBVs for single family homes, duplexes and condominiums in low-poverty census tracts to PH families with children who meet the established requirements to participate in the Mobility Demonstration. RHA anticipates that the activity will (1) provide mobility options for families with children living in PH who otherwise lack mobility options, (2) enable families to move to neighborhoods with lower crime rates, (3) improve the poverty level of the surrounding area for these families, and (4) yield a valuable demonstration to augment current knowledge regarding the impact of increased mobility and living in more poverty deconcentrated neighborhoods. In order to determine whether moving from a high poverty census tract to a low poverty census tract ultimately changes the outcomes for these families, UNR is conducting a longitudinal study.

Each time a unit identified for the Mobility Demonstration is ready for occupancy, a family is chosen from a pool of qualified and interested PH families based on the family's approved voucher size. The family is then given the opportunity to move into a newly renovated home in a low-poverty area. Participation in the Mobility Demonstration is completely voluntary; should a family refuse one of the available units, they are simply placed back into the lottery pool for that bedroom size.

If a tenant is unemployed at the time of lease up or becomes unemployed at any time during their participation in the Mobility Demonstration, they are given 120 days to obtain employment. If employment is not secured within 120 days, they are required to participate in the FSS Lite Program unless they are otherwise determined to be exempt. RHA has established a criteria for exemption based on the same criteria for exemption from Community Service for PH residents. More specifically, a Mobility Demonstration tenant who would otherwise qualify for an exemption from required Community Service hours based on the exemptions established in RHA's Admissions and Continued Occupancy of Public Housing Units (*Section 14.2.*) will also be exempt from the required FSS Lite Program component of the Mobility Demonstration.

### **Impact:**

At the end of FY 2015, 32 former RHA PH families with children have moved to properties in low-poverty census tracts.

In FY 2015, two of these Mobility Demonstration families became completely self-sufficient and moved off of housing assistance. On April 6, 2015, the first Mobility Demonstration family moved



off of assistance after purchasing their own home, located less than 8 miles from the unit they leased under the Demonstration. A second Mobility Demonstration family gave up their housing assistance on April 30, 2015 after paying full rent for the unit they currently lease under the Demonstration for 6 consecutive months. There are currently 31 families participating in the Mobility Demonstration program.

To date, there have been no hardship requests related to this activity.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.1.b. *Operational Policies and Procedures***

The Agency is authorized to determine the length of the lease period, when vouchers expire and when vouchers will be reissued. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(7)(a), 8(0)(J3)(F) and 8(0)(J3)(G) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.303, 982.309 and 983 Subpart F.*

**D.4. *Waiting List Policies***

The Agency is authorized to determine waiting list procedures, tenant selection procedures and criteria and preferences, including authorizing vouchers for relocation of witnesses and victims of crime that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(6), 8(0)(13)(J) and 8(0)(16) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982 Subpart E, 982.305 and 983 Subpart F.*

**D.7.a. *Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 Project-Based Program***

The Agency is authorized to project-base Section 8 assistance at properties owned directly or indirectly by the Agency that are not public housing, subject to HUD's requirements regarding subsidy layering. If the Agency chooses to project-base Section 8 assistance at such properties, the Agency recognizes and accepts that such units would no longer be eligible for operating subsidy provided under Section 9(e) of the 1937 Housing Act or for future capital funds provided under section 9(d) for those units if it chooses to use this authorization. Project-based assistance for such owned units does not need to be competitively bid, nor are the owned units subject to any required assessments for voluntary conversion. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(13)(B and D) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.1, 982.102 and 24 C.F.R. Part 983.*



**E. Authorizations Related to Family Self-Sufficiency**

The Agency is authorized to operate any of its existing self-sufficiency and training programs, including its Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program and any successor programs exempt from certain HUD program requirements. These may include those requirements governing program size or participation, including whether to establish escrow accounts and other rent incentives and whether to establish mandatory self-sufficiency participation requirements. If the Agency receives dedicated funding for an FSS coordinator, such funds must be used to employ a self-sufficiency coordinator. In developing and operating such programs, the Agency is authorized to establish strategic relationships and partnerships with local private and public agencies and service providers to leverage expertise and funding. However, notwithstanding the above, any funds granted pursuant to a competition must be used in accordance with the NOFA and the approved application and work plan. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 23 of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 984.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

In the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report and FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan, RHA revised its MTW Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics for consistency with the established HUD Standard Metrics and revised MTW reporting requirements. As a result of this requirement, several Baselines and Benchmarks were not set. The tables below provide revised Baselines and Benchmarks for this activity based on all Mobility Demonstration participants. Where applicable, Baselines have been set to reflect all participants at the time they leased up under the program. In some instances, they have been revised to include all households rather than just those who are/were unemployed at the time of admission.

<b>2014-02 SS #1: Increase in Household Income</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of earned income of participating Mobility Demonstration households.	\$15,007 Average earned income of households at time of admission to the Mobility Demonstration.	5% increase in earned income or approximately \$750 in FY 2015.	\$16,733	Yes



2014-02 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of savings/escrow of participating Mobility Demonstration households.	\$231*  Average savings account balance of households at time of admission to the Mobility Demonstration is \$124; average checking account balance is \$107.	Increase household savings by \$25 per month or \$300 per year.	\$410  22 Mobility Demonstration participants have a savings account with an average balance of \$191 and a checking account with an average balance of \$219.	No

\* Baseline information is based on first year data received from UNR's survey/questionnaire administered to Mobility Demonstration participants.

2014-02 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark <sup>1</sup>	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Mobility Demonstration</b> <b>Report the following information separately for each category:</b>				
	Head(s) of households prior to implementation of the activity (number). Number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Employed Full-Time	8 or 25%  8 of 32 head(s) of households employed full-time at time of admission.	14 or 34% <sup>1</sup>	10 or 31%  10 of 32 head(s) of households employed full-time.	No
Employed Part-Time	9 or 28%  9 of 32 head(s) of households employed part-time at time of admission.	24 or 61% <sup>1</sup>	8 or 25%  8 of 32 head(s) of households are employed part-time.	No

<sup>1</sup> Benchmarks were originally set to reflect only the first year of lease ups; they have been updated to reflect the 2014 MTW Annual Plan percentages based on the total number of 40 Mobility Demonstration participants expected.



Enrolled in an Educational Program	0 or 0% 0 of 32 head(s) of households enrolled in an educational program at time of admission.	0 or 0% <sup>1</sup>	1 or 3% 1 of 32 head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.	Yes
Enrolled in Job Training Program	0 or 0% 0 of 32 head(s) of households enrolled in job training program at time of admission.	0 or 0% <sup>1</sup>	12 or 38% 12 of 32 head(s) of households have enrolled or previously been enrolled in a job training program.	Yes <sup>2</sup>
Unemployed	14 or 44% 14 of 32 head(s) of households unemployed at time of admission.	2 or 5% <sup>1</sup>	13 or 41% 13 of 32 head(s) of households are unemployed.	No <sup>3</sup>
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

- <sup>1</sup> Benchmarks were originally set to reflect only the first year of lease ups; they have been updated to reflect the 2014 MTW Annual Plan percentages based on the total number of 40 Mobility Demonstration participants expected.
- <sup>2</sup> Outcome information is based on first year data received from UNR's survey/questionnaire administered to Mobility Demonstration participants and includes a count of those participants who have participated in some form of job training program. These participants are not all currently enrolled in such a program.
- <sup>3</sup> Currently 13 heads of households are unemployed, however 7 are exempt from participating in FSS Lite based on RHA's established criteria for Community Service which has been extended to Mobility Demonstration participants. While the number of unemployed heads of households is decreasing, 6 remain unemployed who could otherwise gain employment.

<b>2014-02 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of Mobility Demonstration households receiving TANF assistance.	2 2 Mobility Demonstration households were receiving TANF at time of admission.	2	4	No



2014-02 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 (increase).	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of Mobility Demonstration households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	0	2	9 9 Mobility Demonstration households have signed an FSS Lite Agreement and are receiving self-sufficiency services.	Yes

2014-02 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per Mobility Demonstration household.	\$269,280  Baseline has been calculated based on the average ceiling rent for each PH complex (\$776) less the average TTP at each PH complex based on the bedroom size (\$235) of current Mobility Demonstration households at time of admission.  (796-235 = 561) (561*40*12 = 269,280)	\$266,251  RHA anticipates the average monthly HAP payment to decrease to \$554.69. This is a decrease of 1.125% or \$6.31 per family, per month for 40 Mobility Demonstration households.  (561*1.125% = 6.31) (561-6.31 = 554.69) (554.69*40*12 = 266,251.20)	\$167,424*  On average, RHA paid \$436/per family in HAP payments or \$13,952 per month for 32 families who participated in the Mobility Demonstration in FY 2015.  (436*32*12 = 167,424)	Yes  This is due in part to the program not being 100% leased up as of the end of FY 2015.

\* On average, the 32 families who participated in the Mobility Demonstration paid \$396 per month for rent. The 49 families with children who opted not to participate in the Mobility Demonstration but rather stay in one of RHA's PH complexes pay an average of \$366 per month towards rent. When comparing the two groups, the 32 Mobility Demonstration participants paid approximately \$30 more per month towards rent and utilities.



2014-02 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Increase in RHA rental revenue.	\$0	<p>\$347,534</p> <p>On average, RHA receives rental revenue of \$724 per Mobility Demonstration property leased or \$23,169 per month for 32 properties.</p> <p>This Benchmark has been set using the total # of Mobility Demonstration properties expected overall, or 40.</p> <p><math>(724.03 * 40 * 12 = 347,534.40)</math></p>	<p>\$245,553</p> <p>As of June 30, 2015, RHA has 28 of 31 occupied Mobility Demonstration properties leased with a PBV and three families paying full rent, increasing rental revenues to \$245,553.</p>	<p>No*</p> <p>This is due in part to the program not being 100% leased up as of June 30, 2015.</p>

\* 32 properties were occupied under the Mobility Demonstration during FY 2015 and two additional properties have been identified for use under this program. RHA continues to identify properties in low poverty census tracts that can be used for the Mobility Demonstration as they are purchased or become vacant. RHA anticipates meeting this benchmark in the future once 40 properties are leased up under the program.



2014-02 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<i>RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient.</i>				
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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of Mobility Demonstration households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	2	4*	Yes

\* Per RHA's definition of self-sufficiency, 4 Mobility Demonstration households transitioned to self-sufficiency based on income earned from employment only.

2014-02 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of Mobility Demonstration households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity.	0	40 <sup>1</sup> Benchmark was set at 21 in the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan; total # of Mobility Demonstration participants expected overall is 40.	32	No

<sup>1</sup> RHA originally planned to designate 50 single family homes, duplexes and/or condominiums for the Mobility Demonstration, but now has plans to cap the program at 40 units. Depending on real estate market conditions and the pool of qualified PH families willing to participate in the Demonstration, this number may be increased in the future.



<b>2014-02 HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of Mobility Demonstration households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice.	0	40 <sup>1</sup>  Benchmark was set at 21 in the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan; total # of Mobility Demonstration participants expected overall is 40.	32  32 former PH households were provided with housing choice when they previously had none.	Yes

<sup>1</sup> RHA originally planned to designate 50 single family homes, duplexes and/or condominiums for the Mobility Demonstration, but now has plans to cap the program at 40 units. Depending on real estate market conditions and the pool of qualified PH families willing to participate in the Demonstration, this number may be increased in the future.

<b>2014-02 RHA Local Metric: Improvement in poverty level of census tract</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Improvement in poverty level of census tract for families participating in the Mobility Demonstration.	31.72%  Average percentage of people in the census tracts below the poverty line where RHA's PH complexes are located.  This ranges from a low of 11.46% of people in the census tract below the poverty line to a high of 42.73%.	Every family moving into a Mobility Demonstration property will also be moving into a census tract with a lower percentage of people below the poverty line.	4.90%  Average percentage of people in the census tracts below the poverty line where Demonstration properties are located.  This ranges from a low of 1.43% of people in the census tract below the poverty line to a high of 8.91%.	Yes



The following table provides the actual percentage of people living below the poverty line for each census tract where RHA's PH family complexes are located. It also provides the number of residents from each complex who are participating in the Mobility Demonstration and the improvement in percentage of households below the poverty line within the new neighborhoods chosen by Mobility Demonstration participants.

<b>Improvement in neighborhood poverty lines for Mobility Demonstration participants</b>			
PH complex	# of families in Mobility Demonstration from PH complex	% of people below poverty line in census tracts where PH complexes are located	% of people below poverty line in census tracts chosen by Mobility Demonstration participants from each PH complex
Essex Manor	6	11.46	4.06, 4.06, 6.01, 6.38, 7.23, 8.91
Hawk View Apartments	10	39.97	2.71, 2.71, 2.71, 2.71, 3.73, 4.06, 4.06, 6.29, 6.29, 6.38
Mineral Manor	7	29.93	1.43, 2.71, 2.71, 6.01, 6.19, 7.12, 7.42
Myra Birch Manor	2	42.73	2.71, 6.38
Stead Manor	7	34.50	1.43, 3.73, 4.06, 4.06, 6.01, 7.42, 7.42



## **2014-03: Rent Reform Study**

### **MTW Statutory Objective:**

Provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient *and* reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

### **Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

### **Description:**

This activity's main objective is to rigorously promote self-sufficiency through a rent reform program that provides strong incentives to adult household members to seek and obtain employment. The Rent Reform Study is being tested by bringing at least 150 families with children off of the HCV waiting list, assigning them to one of two groups of participants based on when their name is pulled from the waiting list, and issuing them vouchers limited to five years. This activity does include elderly/disabled families with children.

For half of the families participating the Rent Reform Study, rent is calculated as a standard HCV subject to the same policies and procedures as all other HCV participants. This group, also known as the control group, has rents set using RHA's current HCV policy, 30% of adjusted monthly income.

The Rent Reform Study is designed to test two of the strongest incentives for HCV participants to become self-sufficient: (1) the ability to increase income without affecting rent and (2) the knowledge that housing assistance will end after five years. These two incentives are given to the study group participants, the other half of the Rent Reform Study. Participants in this group have rents set in advance which do not change based on income or household size. Rents for the study group will only change if the required bedroom size of the unit changes based on additional members being added to the household which then require the family to move to a larger unit. As a result, the disincentive for obtaining new income is removed for these participants as families are allowed to keep any increase in earned income without worrying that 30% of this increased income will be calculated by RHA for rent.

For the first two years, rent has been set for the study group at 95% of the average Total Tenant Payment (TTP) with no negative rents. After the second year, the family's rent automatically increases to 105% of the same measure, again with no negative rents. This rent level will remain in effect until the family has been on the program for five full years. The following table shows current rents for study group participants:



<b>Total Tenant Payment (TTP)*</b>			
	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms
Average TTP	\$363	\$406	\$453
95% (Years 1-2)	\$345	\$386	\$430
105% (Years 3-5)	\$381	\$426	\$476

\* These figures are valid from January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

All families participating in the Rent Reform Study are required to meet with an FSS Coordinator on an annual basis, at minimum. RHA offers supportive services to help guide families toward self-sufficiency through the FSS Lite Program and through several community partnerships already in place which include Charles Schwab Bank, Healthy Families Foundation, Women and Children's Center of the Sierra, and the Children's Cabinet. FSS also has a strong partnership with FGC, a HUD approved consumer credit counseling agency that helps families increase their credit scores and provides advice on savings, money management, and access to zero percent interest loans.

**Impact:**

At the end of FY 2015, 223 vouchers had been issued for this activity and 160 of these had been leased up. Throughout the year, 6 participants in the study group and 4 participants in the control group were removed from the program for reasons that include family violations, skips, evictions and voluntary move offs.

One hardship request was received and reviewed by the established Rent Reform Hardship Committee. After reviewing and discussing the request, the committee unanimously chose to deny the request for hardship. The participant, leased up under the study group, skipped one day prior to the Committee's review of the hardship request.

UNR continues to track families participating in both groups of the Rent Reform Study in order to identify any differences between the two groups.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

While no challenges have been identified for this activity, one potential new strategy has been identified and discussed which affects study group participants. RHA has determined that should a child in the household become an adult during the family's five-year voucher and they are leased up under the study group, the family will continue to receive a subsidy amount based on the voucher size when they entered the program.



**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.1.b. *Operational Policies and Procedures***

The Agency is authorized to determine the length of the lease period, when vouchers expire and when vouchers will be reissued. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(7)(a), 8(0)(J3)(F) and 8(0)(J3)(G) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.303, 982.309 and 983 Subpart F.*

**D.1.c. *Operational Policies and Procedures***

The Agency is authorized to define, adopt and implement a reexamination program that differs from the reexamination program currently mandated in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 8(0)(5) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.516.*

**D.2.a. *Rent Policies and Term Limits***

The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policy to establish payment standards, rents or subsidy levels for tenant-based assistance that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policies to calculate the tenant portion of the rent that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(1), 8(0)(2), 8(0)(3), 8(0)(10) and 8(0)(13)(H)-(I) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.508, 982.503 and 982.518.*

**D.4. *Waiting List Policies***

The Agency is authorized to determine waiting list procedures, tenant selection procedures and criteria and preferences, including authorizing vouchers for relocation of witnesses and victims of crime that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(6), 8(0)(13)(J) and 8(0)(16) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982 Subpart E, 982.305 and 983 Subpart F.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

In the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report and the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan, RHA revised its MTW Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics for consistency with the established HUD Standard Metrics and revised MTW reporting requirements. As a result of this new requirement, several Baselines and Benchmarks were not set. The tables below provide revised Baselines and Benchmarks for this activity based on all Rent Reform Study participants when they entered the program and reflects the entire population participating in the program, not just those who leased up during the first year.



2014-03 SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of households participating in the Rent Reform Study.	Control Group \$15,258*	\$600 annual increase	Control Group \$15,192	Benchmark was not achieved for the Control Group participants, but was achieved for Study Group participants.
	Study Group \$17,494*		Study Group \$20,999	

\* Income on file for Rent Reform Study participants at time of admission to the program.

2014-03 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of savings/escrow of households participating in the Rent Reform Study.	Control Group \$43*	\$50 annual increase	Control Group \$267  Control Group participants have an average savings account balance of \$122 and an average checking account balance of \$145.	Yes
	Study Group \$118*		Study Group \$380  Study Group participants have an average savings account balance of \$130 and an average checking account balance of \$250.	

\* This number is based on first year data received from UNR's survey/questionnaire administered to Rent Reform Study participants.



**2014-03 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status**

*Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.*

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Rent Reform Study</b> <b>Report the following information separately for each category:</b>				
	Head(s) of households prior to implementation of the activity (number). Number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Employed Full-Time	Control Group 25 or 30%  25 of 82 head(s) of households were employed full-time at time of admission.	Control Group 25 or 33%  25 of 75 head(s) of households employed full-time.	Control Group 20 or 26%  20 of 78 current head(s) of households are employed full-time.	No
	Study Group 27 or 35%  27 of 78 head(s) of households were employed full-time at time of admission.	Study Group 25 or 33%  25 of 75 head(s) of households employed full-time.	Study Group 23 or 32%  23 of 72 current head(s) of households are employed full-time.	
Employed Part-Time	Control Group 16 or 20%  16 of 82 head(s) of households employed part-time at time of admission.	Control Group 44 or 58%  44 of 75 head(s) of households employed part-time.	Control Group 18 or 23%  18 of 78 current head(s) of households are employed part-time.	No
	Study Group 19 or 24%  19 of 78 head(s) of households employed part-time at time of admission.	Study Group 44 or 58%  44 of 75 head(s) of households employed part-time.	Study Group 19 or 26%  19 of 72 current head(s) of households are employed part-time.	



Enrolled in an Educational Program	Control Group 0 or 0%	Control Group 0	Control Group 1 or 1%	Yes
	0 of 82 head(s) of households enrolled in an educational program at time of admission.	1 of 78 current head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.		
Enrolled in Job Training Program	Study Group 0 or 0%	Study Group 0	Study Group 0 or 0%	Yes
	0 of 78 head(s) of households enrolled in an educational program at time of admission.	0 of 72 current head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.		
Enrolled in Job Training Program	Control Group 0 or 0 %	Control Group 0	Control Group* 24 or 31%	Yes
	0 of 82 head(s) of households enrolled in job training program at time of admission.	24 of 78 current head(s) of households have been enrolled in some form of job training.		
Unemployed	Study Group 0 or 0%	Study Group 0	Study Group* 24 or 33%	No
	0 of 78 head(s) of households enrolled in job training program at time of admission.	24 of 72 current head(s) of households have been enrolled in some form of job training.		
Unemployed	Control Group 41 or 50%	Control Group 24 or 32%	Control Group 39 or 50%	No
	41 of 82 head(s) of households unemployed at time of admission.	24 of 75 head(s) of households unemployed.	39 of 78 current head(s) of households are unemployed.	
Other	Study Group 32 or 41%	Study Group 24 or 32%	Study Group 30 or 42%	N/A
	32 of 78 head(s) of households unemployed at time of admission.	24 of 75 head(s) of households unemployed.	30 of 72 current head(s) of households are unemployed.	
Other	Control Group 0	Control Group 0	Control Group 0	N/A
	Study Group 0	Study Group 0	Study Group 0	

\* Outcome information is based on first year data received from UNR's survey/questionnaire administered to all Rent Reform Study participants and includes a count of those participants who have participated in some form of job training program. These participants are not all currently enrolled in such a program.



<b>2014-03 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of Rent Reform Study households receiving TANF assistance.	Control Group 14 or 17%  14 of 82 households were receiving TANF at time of admission.	Control Group 5 or 7%  5 of 75 households receiving TANF.	Control Group 14 or 18%  14 of 78 current households are receiving TANF.	No
	Study Group 13 or 17%  13 of 78 households were receiving TANF at time of admission.	Study Group 5 or 7%  5 of 75 households receiving TANF.	Study Group 6 or 8%  6 of 72 current households are receiving TANF.	



2014-03 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per Rent Reform Study household.	<p>Control Group \$517,500</p> <p>On average RHA paid \$43,125 per month in HAP payments for Control Group households at lease up or \$575 per family, per month.</p> <p>(575*75*12 = 517,500)</p>	<p>Control Group \$512,100</p> <p>RHA expects the average monthly HAP payment to decrease to \$568.53. This is a decrease of 1.125% or \$6.47 per family, per month for 75 households.</p> <p>(575*1.125% = 6.47) (569*75*12 = 512,100)</p>	<p>Control Group \$546,624</p> <p>On average RHA paid \$45,552 per month in HAP payments for the 78 Control Group households or \$584 per family, per month.</p> <p>(584*78*12 = 546,624)</p>	No*
	<p>Study Group \$553,500</p> <p>On average RHA paid \$46,125 per month in HAP payments for Study Group households at lease up or \$615 per family, per month.</p> <p>(615*75*12 = 553,500)</p>	<p>Study Group \$547,200</p> <p>RHA expects the average monthly HAP payment to decrease to \$608.08. This is a decrease of 1.125% or \$6.92 per family, per month for 75 households.</p> <p>(615*1.125% = 6.92) (608*75*12 = 547,200)</p>	<p>Study Group \$559,872</p> <p>On average RHA pays \$46,656 per month in HAP payments for the 72 Study Group households or \$648 per family, per month.</p> <p>(648*72*12 = 559,872)</p>	

\* RHA anticipates that the Benchmarks for this activity will be achieved in future years as Rent Reform Study participants begin to reach their self-sufficiency goals prior to the expiration of their five-year voucher. The average amount of subsidy for the Rent Reform Study group will also decrease in FY 2016 as participating families who have been on the program for two years, experience a rent increase from 95% TTP to 105% TTP.



**2014-03 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	<p>Control Group \$324,900</p> <p>On average Control Group households pay \$27,075 per month towards rent and utilities or \$361 per family at time of admission.</p> <p>(361*75*12 = 324,900)</p>	<p>Control Group \$328,500</p> <p>RHA anticipates the average monthly TTP to increase to \$365.06. This is an increase of 1.125% or \$4.06 per family, per month for 75 households.</p> <p>(361*1.125% = 4.06) (365*75*12 = 328,500)</p>	<p>Control Group \$358,488*</p> <p>On average the 78 Control Group households pay \$29,874 per month towards rent and utilities or \$383 per family.</p> <p>(383*78*12 = 358,488)</p>	<p>Benchmark was achieved for Control Group participants, but was not achieved for Study Group participants. This is due in part to more Control Group participants and fewer Study Group participants leased on the program at the end of FY 2015. Furthermore, the Study Group participants' rent has remained the same during the first two years.</p>
	<p>Study Group \$294,300</p> <p>On average Study Group households pay \$24,525 per month towards rent and utilities or \$327 per family.</p> <p>(327*75*12 = 294,300)</p>	<p>Study Group \$297,900</p> <p>RHA anticipates the average monthly TTP of Study Group participants to increase to \$24,825. This is an increase of 1.125% or \$3.68 per family, per month for 75 households.</p> <p>(327*1.125% = 3.68) (331*75*12 = 297,900)</p>	<p>Study Group \$284,256*</p> <p>On average the 72 Study Group households pay \$23,688 per month towards rent and utilities or \$329 per family.</p> <p>(329*72*12 = 284,256)</p>	

\* This is tenant contribution to rent, not rental income to RHA.



2014-03 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<i>RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient.</i>				
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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of Rent Reform Study households transitioned to self-sufficiency.	Control Group 0	Control Group 5	Control Group 3*	Benchmark for Control Group participants was not achieved, but it was achieved for Study Group participants.
	Study Group 0	Study Group 5	Study Group 12*	

\* Per RHA's definition of self-sufficiency, 15 Rent Reform Study households transitioned to self-sufficiency based on income earned from employment only.

2014-03 HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average Rent Reform Study applicant time on wait list.	15.45 months	No change.	29.08 months  Applicants leased up on the Rent Reform Study in FY 2015 averaged 29.08 months on the wait list. In 2014, the average wait list time was 29.51 months.	No*

\* There are several factors that influence the length of time an applicant will remain on the wait list which should be noted including sequestration, local preferences, the closure of the wait list, etc.



2014-03 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task in dollars.	\$8,445  Average cost of an HCV interim (\$33) * expected number of interims required to be processed (10% of 150, or 15) + average cost of an annual (\$53) * 150  (33*15 = 495) (53*150 = 7950)	\$4,470*  Interims will no longer be processed saving approximately \$495; and 75 of the annuals will no longer be necessary.  (33*15 = 495) (53*75 = \$3,975)	\$10,673  Interims were logged and tracked for 105 participants and 136 annuals were completed.  (33*105 = 3,465) (53*136 = 7,208)	No*

\* This Benchmark was set erroneously in RHA's FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. While interims are no longer being fully processed for Study Group participants, any change in employment and income continues to be tracked and logged in order to accurately assess the overall effectiveness of the Rent Reform Study. This tracking takes approximately the same amount of staff time and varies annually based on the status of each of the participants. If RHA should realize any cost savings on interims it would be completely negligible. Relatively, annuals are also being processed for all Rent Reform Study participants. In the future, this Benchmark will be updated to reflect no change.



2014-03 CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours.	445.5 hours  Prior to implementation staff spent 1.7 hours for an interim and 2.8 hours for each annual.  $(1.7*15 = 25.5)$ $(2.8*150 = 445.5)$ $(25.5+420 = 445.5)$	210 hours*  Interims no longer need to be processed saving approximately 25.5 hours and an annual should only require half of the amount of staff time  $(1.4*150 = 210)$	559.3 hours  Interims were logged and tracked for 105 participants and 136 annuals were completed.  $(1.7*105 = 178.5)$ $(2.8*136 = 380.8)$	No*

\* This Benchmark was set erroneously in RHA's FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. While interims are no longer being fully processed for Study Group participants, any change in employment and income continues to be tracked and logged in order to accurately assess the overall effectiveness of the Rent Reform Study. This tracking takes approximately the same amount of staff time and varies annually based on the status of each of the participants. If RHA should realize any staff time savings on interims it would be completely negligible. Relatively, annuals are also being processed for all Rent Reform Study participants. In the future, this Benchmark will be updated to reflect no change.

2014-03 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a task.	6%  On average 4 of 72 HCV files audited contained errors related to the processing of files under the HCV program.	0%	0%	Yes*

\* Study group participants have rents set for 5 years based on voucher size rather than household income. Rents for this group will only change if the family size increases resulting in the requirement of a larger unit. Implementation of set rents for the study group renders the overall error rate for this activity as negligible. Interims and annuals are no longer being processed to determine rent, but rather tracked for reporting purposes only.



## **2014-04: Expand self-sufficiency activities**

### **MTW Statutory Objective:**

Provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

### **Implementation year:**

This activity was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

### **Description:**

In FY 2014, RHA created the FSS Lite Program which is similar to the traditional FSS Program, however the FSS Lite Program does not include an escrow account. The FSS Lite Program, designed to promote resident self-sufficiency through streamlined FSS service delivery, is mandatory for PH residents who are not completing their Community Service hours. These PH residents are required to meet with one of the FSS Coordinators on a quarterly basis until their hours are brought current. All of the residents who are required to complete delinquent Community Service hours must meet with an FSS Coordinator to map out goals, be informed of various community resources and educational opportunities, and sign an FSS Lite agreement. During the initial assessment, the FSS Coordinator identifies barriers preventing the household member from working or participating in a self-sufficiency program and establishes ITSPs to assist the participant in meeting their goals.

In FY 2015, RHA expanded the FSS Lite Program further to include the use of single fund flexibility to create a \$50,000 Self-Sufficiency Fund. The fund was established to assist families in overcoming some of the most common barriers to becoming self-sufficient. The FSS Lite Program is also available to all Mobility Demonstration, Rent Reform Study and traditional FSS clients.

### **Impact:**

At the end of FY 2015, 90 families had been assisted through the FSS Lite Program. This includes 52 Rent Reform Study participants, 9 Mobility Demonstration residents, and 29 families who are/were delinquent on their community service hours.

### **Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity; however, recently HUD issued Notice PIH-2015-12 (HA). Within this notice, HUD determined that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) qualifies as a welfare program of the state. If a resident is a member of a family who receives assistance under SNAP, and has been found by the administering State to be in compliance with the program requirements, that resident is exempt from the Community Service and Self-Sufficiency Requirement. As many of the PH residents who owe community service hours also receive SNAP benefits, this may result in this portion of the activity being closed/discontinued. The FSS Lite Program will, however, continue to assist Rent Reform Study participants, Mobility Demonstration residents, traditional FSS clients, and all new non-elderly, non-disabled HCV participants on five-year time limited vouchers as proposed in RHA's FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan.



**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**E. Authorizations Related to Family Self-Sufficiency**

The Agency is authorized to operate any of its existing self-sufficiency and training programs, including its Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program and any successor programs exempt from certain HUD program requirements. These may include those requirements governing program size or participation, including whether to establish escrow accounts and other rent incentives and whether to establish mandatory self-sufficiency participation requirements. If the Agency receives dedicated funding for an FSS coordinator, such funds must be used to employ a self-sufficiency coordinator. In developing and operating such programs, the Agency is authorized to establish strategic relationships and partnerships with local private and public agencies and service providers to leverage expertise and funding. However, notwithstanding the above, any funds granted pursuant to a competition must be used in accordance with the NOFA and the approved application and work plan. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 23 of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 984.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

In the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report and FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan, RHA revised its MTW Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics for consistency with the established HUD Standard Metrics and revised MTW reporting requirements. As a result of this requirement, several Baselines and Benchmarks were not set. The tables below provide revised Baselines and Benchmarks for this MTW activity based on all participating households when they signed a contract for participation in the FSS Lite Program.

<b>2014-04 SS #1: Increase in Household Income</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of earned income of households owing Community Service.	\$337 per month or \$4,404 annually	\$200 increase in household earned income per year	\$612 per month or \$7,347 annually	Yes



<b>2014-04 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of savings/escrow of households owing Community Service.	\$0	\$25 increase in household savings per year	\$0	No

<b>2014-04 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>FSS Lite Program participants with delinquent Community Service hours</b>				
<b>Report the following information separately for each category:</b>				
	Head(s) of households prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Employed Full-Time	1 or 3% 1 of 29 head(s) of households are employed full-time.	7% 7% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will become employed full-time.	1 or 3% 1 of 29 head(s) of households are employed full-time.	No
Employed Part-Time	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are employed part-time.	7% 7% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours become employed part-time.	4 or 14% 4 of 29 head(s) of households are employed part-time.	Yes



Enrolled in an Educational Program	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.	3% 3% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will enroll in an educational program.	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are enrolled in an educational program.	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are enrolled in a job training program.	3% 3% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will enroll in a job training program.	0 or 0% 0 of 29 head(s) of households are enrolled in a job training program.	No
Unemployed	28 or 97% 28 of 29 head(s) of households are unemployed.	83% 83% of head(s) of households with delinquent Community Service hours will be unemployed.	23 or 79% 23 of 29 head(s) of households are unemployed.	Yes
Other	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	0 or 0%	N/A

**2014-04 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households with delinquent Community Service hours who are receiving TANF assistance.	1 One household was receiving TANF when they signed an FSS Lite Agreement due to delinquent Community Service Hours.	No change.	1	Yes



<b>2014-04 SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	0	51 families will take part in the FSS Lite Program during the first year.	90 families have signed FSS Lite agreements.*	Yes

\* This number includes 52 Rent Reform Study participants, 9 Mobility Demonstration residents, and 29 families who are/were delinquent on their community service hours.

<b>2014-04 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<i>RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient.</i>				
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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households with delinquent Community Service hours who have transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	4	3 3 of 29 families who are/were delinquent in their community service hours have transitioned to self-sufficiency.	No



## ***2014-05: Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent***

### **MTW Statutory Objective:**

Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

### **Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

### **Description:**

In order to reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness, RHA began excluding all educational financial aid from income calculations and allowing self-certification of assets under \$10,000.

The full amount of student financial assistance paid directly to the student or to the educational institution is now excluded from income calculations for HCV participants. RHA's HCV participants can now benefit from being able to attend an institution of higher education without being penalized with an increase in rent due to any financial assistance that they may secure. Furthermore, households with assets less than \$10,000 can now submit a self-certification as to the value of the asset and the amount of expected income. At the time of application, applicants are asked to provide a well-documented baseline asset value. RHA staff only calculate income on assets if the value of the assets total more than \$10,000.

In FY 2014, RHA also raised the minimum rent from \$50 to \$75 to not only save significant HCV and PH operating subsidy, but provide an incentive to participants to seek employment due to the higher participant contribution to rent.

### **Impact:**

The number of HCV participants and PH residents paying the minimum rent has decreased dramatically over the past two years. In FY 2013, 270 HCV participants and 109 PH residents were paying the minimum rent. In contrast, 133 HCV participants and 84 PH residents were paying minimum rent in FY 2015. It is important to note that the number of HCV participants paying minimum rent in FY 2015 does not include VASH clients.

As of June 30, 2015, 9 HCV participants were paying zero rent due to a hardship. While each of these participants has an approved hardship, it is not known whether or not this hardship is directly related to RHA's increase in the minimum rent. There were no hardship requests from PH residents as a result of this activity.

### **Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.



**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**C. Authorizations Related to Public Housing Only**

**C.4. *Initial, Annual and Interim Income Review Process***

The Agency is authorized to restructure the initial, annual and interim review process in the public housing program in order to affect the frequency of the reviews and the methods and process used to establish the integrity of the income information provided. In addition, the Agency is expressly authorized to adopt a local system of income verification in lieu of the current HUD system. For example, the Agency may implement alternate time frames for validity of verification or adopt policies for verification of income and assets through sources other than those currently allowed under the 1937 Act. *This authorization waives certain provisions of sections 3(a)(1) and 3(a)(2) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 966.4 and 960.257.*

**C.11. *Rent Policies and Term Limits***

The Agency is authorized to determine family payment, including the total tenant payment, the minimum rent, utility reimbursements and tenant rent. The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policies for setting rents in public housing including but not limited to establishing definitions of income and adjusted income, or earned income disallowance that differ from those in current statutes or regulations. The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement term limits for its public housing assistance. Such policies must include provisions for addressing hardship cases. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 3(a)(2), 3(a)(3)(A) and Section 6(1) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 5.603, 5.611, 5.628, 5.630, 5.632, 5.634 and 960.255 and 966 Subpart A.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.2.a. *Rent Policies and Term Limits***

The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policy to establish payment standards, rents or subsidy levels for tenant-based assistance that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policies to calculate the tenant portion of the rent that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(1), 8(0)(2), 8(0)(3), 8(0)(10) and 8(0)(13)(H)-(I) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.508, 982.503 and 982.518.*

**D.3.b. *Eligibility of Participants***

The Agency is authorized to adopt and implement any reasonable policy for verifying family income and composition and for determining resident eligibility that differ from the currently mandated program requirements in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of 24 C.F.R. 982.516 and 982 Subpart E.*



**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

In the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report and the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan, RHA revised its MTW Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics for consistency with the established HUD Standard Metrics and revised MTW reporting requirements. As a result of this requirement, several Baselines and Benchmarks were not set. Furthermore, the Baselines and Benchmarks for 2014-05 CE#1 and 2014-05 CE#2 have been revised to include both methods of simplifying rent calculations (exclusion of all educational financial aid from income calculations and self-certification of assets under \$10,000) implemented under the activity. The tables below provide revised Baselines and Benchmarks for this MTW activity.

<b>2014-05 SS #1: Increase in Household Income</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of households affected by increasing the minimum rent.	<p>\$7,450</p> <p>\$7,450 is the average earned income for all 379 HCV and PH participants paying minimum rent in FY 2013. It is important to note that this number also includes the average earned income of families on EID who are paying the minimum rent.</p> <p>Average earned income of 270 HCV participants paying minimum rent is \$5,014; average earned income of 109 PH residents is \$9,886.</p>	<p>\$500 annual increase</p> <p>In FY 2014, RHA raised the minimum rent by \$25. This \$500 expected increase in average earned income is set to reflect half of the annual amount of income needed to compensate for the \$25/month increase.</p>	<p>\$3,804</p> <p>\$3,804 is the average earned income for all 217 HCV and PH participants currently paying minimum rent.</p> <p>Average earned income of 133 HCV participants who are currently paying minimum rent is \$2,599; average earned income of 84 PH residents is \$4,682.</p>	No



**2014-05 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status**

*Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.*

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Increase in the minimum rent from \$50 to \$75</b>				
<b>Report the following information separately for each category:</b>				
	Head(s) of households prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Employed Full-Time	20 or 5%  20 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are employed full-time.  (10 HCV participants and 10 PH residents)	7% of head(s) of households paying the minimum rent will be employed full-time.	6 or 3%  6 of 217 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are employed full-time.  (3 HCV participants and 3 PH residents)	No*
Employed Part-Time	37 or 10%  37 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are employed part-time.  (16 HCV participants and 21 PH residents)	7% of head(s) of households paying the minimum rent will be employed part-time.	34 or 16%  34 of 217 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are employed part-time; two are also enrolled in an educational program.  (16 HCV participants and 18 PH residents)	Yes*
Enrolled in an Educational Program	13 or 3%  13 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are enrolled in an educational program.  (7 HCV participants and 6 PH residents)	3% of head(s) of households paying the minimum rent will enroll in an educational program.	4 or 2%  4 of 217 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are enrolled in an educational program; two are also employed part-time.  (4 PH residents)	No

\* In its FY 2016 MTW Annual Plan, RHA proposed and received approval to eliminate EID in both the HCV and PH programs. As a result, current EID households will be phased off of the EID program and their income will be updated accordingly. The elimination of EID will result in many of the households who are paying minimum rent and employed either full-time or part-time to be rendered virtually non-existent. Consequently, RHA may adjust the Baselines and Benchmarks for employment status under this activity to more accurately reflect those households who are paying minimum rent, but not participating in EID.



Enrolled in Job Training Program	0	0	0 or 0%	Yes
Unemployed	309 or 82% 309 of 379 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are unemployed. (237 HCV participants and 72 PH residents)	No change.	175 or 81% 175 of 217 head(s) of households paying minimum rent are unemployed. (114 HCV participants and 61 PH residents)	Yes
Other	0	0	0 or 0%	N/A

<b>2014-05 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households paying minimum rent who are receiving TANF assistance.	25 or 7% 25 of 379 households paying minimum rent are receiving TANF assistance. (18 HCV participants and 7 PH residents)	No change.	15 or 7% 15 of 217 households paying minimum rent are receiving TANF assistance. (3 HCV participants and 12 PH residents)	Yes



2014-05 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<i>RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family will be employed and will earn 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) based on family size. The family may be receiving other state benefits such as childcare subsidies, medical assistance and/or food stamps and be considered self-sufficient.</i>				
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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households paying minimum rent who have transitioned to self-sufficiency.	0	4	6 6 PH residents who were paying minimum rent in FY 2014 transitioned to self-sufficiency; 2 are no longer on assistance.	Yes

\* Per RHA's definition of self-sufficiency, 6 PH households who had previously been paying minimum rent transitioned to self-sufficiency based on income earned from employment only.

2014-05 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of rent simplification tasks (student status verifications).	\$2,997  On average 370 student status verifications were sent for 336 individuals; a total cost to the agency of \$8.10 per HCV participant.  (8.10*370 = 2997)	\$875  Student status verifications will be sent out for dependents only; approximately 108 households.  (8.10*108 = 874.80)	\$1,126  Student status verifications were sent out for 139 dependents of HCV participants.  (8.10*139 = 1125.90)	No*

\* Actual cost of this rent simplification tasks is expected to vary on an annual basis due to the overall household status of RHA's HCV participants.



<p>Total cost of rent simplification tasks (self-certification of assets).</p>	<p>\$28,265</p> <p>Verification/processing of assets cost RHA approximately \$20,044.80 for 1,440 HCV households and \$8,220 for 750 PH households.</p> <p>(13.92*1,440 = 20,044.80) (10.96*750 = 8,220)</p>	<p>\$1,076</p> <p>Total cost to verify/process approximately 60 HCV households and 22 PH households with assets over \$10,000.</p> <p>(13.92*60 = 835.20) (10.96*22 = 241.12)</p>	<p>\$821</p> <p>Total cost to verify/process 44 HCV households and 19 PH households with assets over \$10,000.</p> <p>(13.92*44 = 612.48) (10.96*19 = 208.24)</p>	<p>Yes*</p>
--	--	---	---	-------------

\* Actual cost of this rent simplification task is expected to vary on an annual basis due to the overall status and assets of RHA's HCV and PH households.

<p><b>2014-05 CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b></p>				
<p><b>Unit of Measurement</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Benchmark</b></p>	<p><b>Outcome</b></p>	<p><b>Benchmark Achieved?</b></p>
<p>Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).</p>	<p>Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).</p>	<p>Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).</p>	<p>Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).</p>	<p>Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.</p>
<p>Total staff hours to complete the rent simplification tasks.*</p>	<p>134.4 hours</p> <p>On average staff spend 0.4 hours per student status verification.</p> <p>(0.4*336 = 134.4)</p>	<p>43.2 hours</p> <p>Student status verifications sent for dependents only.</p> <p>(0.4*108 = 43.2)</p>	<p>55.6 hours</p> <p>Student status verifications were sent for 139 dependents of HCV participants.</p> <p>(0.4*139 = 55.6)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Total staff hours to complete the rent simplification tasks.*</p>	<p>1,323.3 hours</p> <p>On average staff spend 0.695 hours to process and verify assets in the HCV program and 0.43 hours in the PH program.</p> <p>(0.695*1,440 = 1,000.8) (0.43*750 = 322.50)</p>	<p>51.16 hours</p> <p>Verifications will need to be sent to 60 HCV participants and 22 PH residents with assets over \$10,000.</p> <p>(0.695*60 = 41.7) (0.43*22 = 9.46)</p>	<p>38.75 hours</p> <p>Verifications were sent to 44 HCV participants and 19 PH residents with assets over \$10,000.</p> <p>(0.695*44 = 30.58) (0.43*19 = 8.17)</p>	<p>Yes</p>

\* Actual staff time savings of the rent simplification tasks are expected to vary on an annual basis due to the overall status and assets of RHA's HCV and PH households.



2014-05 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing rent simplification tasks.	6% - HCV 3% - PH  On average 4 of 72 HCV files audited contained errors related to the processing of files.  Furthermore, 7 of 217 or 3% of audited PH resident files contained problems related to the processing of assets.	0.5%	0% - HCV 0% - PH  During FY 2015, no audited files contained problems related to the processing of assets.	Yes

2014-05 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Increase in rental revenue in dollars due to excluding financial aid from income calculations and increasing the minimum rent.	\$0	(\$7,274)	The estimate of (\$7,274) is reasonable. <sup>1</sup>	Yes
	\$0	\$154,200	\$252,984  HCV: \$13,668 per month (TTP for 133 HCV participants who are currently paying minimum rent.) <sup>2</sup>  PH: \$7,414 per month (TTP for 84 PH residents who are currently paying minimum rent.)	Yes

<sup>1</sup> RHA's software system cannot calculate the exact cost amount due to student status income being excluded. Therefore, each file would have to be tracked and calculated outside of the system on a case by case basis. In FY 2015, RHA began an upgrade to its software system and will calculate the amount of tenant contribution to rent that is being excluded based on this activity in the future.

<sup>2</sup> This is tenant contribution to rent, not rental income to RHA.



## ***2014-06: Triennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes***

### **MTW Statutory Objective:**

Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

### **Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented as a biennial activity in FY 2014; it was expanded as a triennial activity in FY 2015.

### **Description:**

Elderly and disabled PH residents and HCV participants on fixed incomes now have recertifications on a triennial schedule rather than annually as the amount of rent RHA receives from these households on stable income is completely negligible. Cost of Living (COLA) increases for certain programs are automatically applied.

An elderly household is defined by HUD as a family whose head (including co-head), spouse, or sole member is a person who is at least 62 years of age; or two or more persons who are at least 62 years of age living together; or one or more persons who are at least 62 years of age living with one or more live-in aides. A disabled family is defined as a family whose head (including co-head), spouse, or sole member is a person with disabilities; or two or more persons with disabilities living together; or one or more persons with disabilities living with one or more live-in aides.

Stable income sources include and are limited to: Social Security benefits, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security Disability (SSD), and pensions. There can be no earned income in the household.

If a participant meets both the elderly or disabled definition *and* the stable income definition, RHA performs a triennial recertification rather than an annual recertification; if not, the participant remains under the regular recertification process. For those years when a triennial recertification is not processed, RHA will automatically increase tenant rent based on the COLA.

Any elderly/disabled household with additional income sources other than the above-defined stable income sources, or households with minors (even if the head of household is elderly or disabled), will not be considered to have only stable income; these households will be required to have annual recertifications.

### **Impact:**

RHA realized staff time savings and cost savings as the number of recertifications decreased. These savings are even more significant as elderly/disabled households with stable income transitioned to a triennial recertification schedule.

### **Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.



**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**C. Authorizations Related to Public Housing Only**

**C.4. *Initial, Annual and Interim Income Review Process***

The Agency is authorized to restructure the initial, annual and interim review process in the public housing program in order to affect the frequency of the reviews and the methods and process used to establish the integrity of the income information provided. In addition, the Agency is expressly authorized to adopt a local system of income verification in lieu of the current HUD system. For example, the Agency may implement alternate time frames for validity of verification or adopt policies for verification of income and assets through sources other than those currently allowed under the 1937 Act. *This authorization waives certain provisions of sections 3(a)(1) and 3(a)(2) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 966.4 and 960.257.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.1.c. *Operational Policies and Procedures***

The Agency is authorized to define, adopt and implement a reexamination program that differs from the reexamination program currently mandated in the 1937 Act and its implementing regulations. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 8(0)(5) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.516.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

In the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report, RHA revised its MTW Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics for consistency with the established HUD Standard Metrics and revised MTW reporting requirements. As a result of this requirement, several Baselines and Benchmarks were not set. Furthermore, in the FY 2015 Annual MTW Plan, the Baseline and Benchmark for 2014-06 CE#2 was erroneously set. The tables below provide revised Baselines and Benchmarks for this MTW activity.

2014-06 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost for recertification of elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes.	\$140,933 HCV: \$112,291 PH: \$28,642	\$113,887 HCV: \$91,989 PH: \$21,898 Total savings: \$27,046 annually	\$113,713 HCV: \$91,736 PH: \$21,977 Total savings: \$27,221 annually	Yes



**2014-06 CE #2: Staff Time Savings**

<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total amount of staff time to complete recertification of elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes.	6,726.23 hours HCV: 468.02 hours per month or 5,616.23 hours annually PH: 92.5 hours per month or 1,110 hours annually	5,625.94 hours HCV: 401.49 hours per month or 4,817.86 hours annually PH: 67.34 hours per month or 808.08 hours annually Total savings of 91.69 hours per month or 1,100.28 hours annually	3,323.28 hours HCV: 209.78 hours per month or 2,517.3 hours annually PH: 67.17 hours per month or 805.98 hours annually Total savings of 283.57 hours per month or 3,402.84 hours annually	Yes

**2014-06 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue**

<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	\$0	No change	No change	Yes



## 2014-07: Alternate HQS verification policy

**MTW Statutory Objective:**

Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Description:**

HCV units that pass the HQS inspection on the first visit will not be inspected until two years following the passed inspection, as long as both the landlord and HCV participant sign a certification that the unit is in good repair. If the landlord and HCV participant do not each certify or agree on the condition of the unit, an annual HQS inspection is conducted. The year following a successful self-certification, RHA will conduct a standard HQS inspection.

**Impact:**

As the number of HQS inspections decreased, RHA realized staff time savings and cost savings. Overall, 49.15% of eligible HCV participants and landlords chose to sign a certification that the unit was in good shape and opt-out of their annual HQS inspection.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

No challenges or new strategies have been identified for this activity.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only****D.5 *Ability to Certify Housing Quality Standards***

The Agency is authorized to certify that housing assisted under MTW will meet housing quality standards established or approved by HUD. The certification form will be approved or provided by HUD. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Section 8(0)(8) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982, Subpart I.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

There are no changes to the Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics related to this activity.



**2014-07 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of completing HQS inspections.	\$169,213.76 annually  2,656 (# of annual inspections) * \$63.71 (RHA's cost to complete an inspection)	\$80,019.76 annually  1,256 annual inspections will be completed at a cost of \$63.71 per inspection  1,256*63.71 = 80,019.76	\$80,975.41 annually  1,271 annual inspections were completed at a cost of \$63.71 per inspection  1,271*63.71 = 80,975.41	No

**2014-07 CE #2: Staff Time Savings**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total amount of staff time to complete HQS inspections.	2,656 hours	1,256 hours	1,271 hours	No

**2014-07 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in conducting an HQS inspection as a percentage.	0%	No change	No change	Yes



**2014-08: Partner with local nonprofits to provide housing to at risk families**

**MTW Statutory Objective:**

Increase housing choices for low-income families *and* provide incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Description:**

RHA is providing PBV units to clients of its nonprofit partners including CAAW, Casa de Vida, Washoe County Department of Social Services and Safe Embrace. These PBVs are for two years and each of the nonprofit partners provide supportive services.

RHA also worked with Silver Sage Manor, Inc. to assign 5 PBVs for units at their NSP3 property located at 435 Moran Street. This property was completely rehabilitated using NSP3 funds provided by the City of Reno. Although Silver Sage Manor, Inc. does not provide any supportive services, their property houses elderly individuals in the Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County community who are, or may soon become, homeless.

**Impact:**

As of the end of FY 2015, the impact of this activity overall has been minimal. One family, who had been referred by CAAW, was removed from the program after the household failed to pay rent and remain in compliance with the program by meeting with their case manager on a monthly basis. RHA remains committed to each of the existing partnerships and continues to work with each of them. RHA has also increased efforts to identify other nonprofit agencies within the community that could benefit from similar agreements.

**Challenges/Potential New Strategies:**

To date, the number of referrals from RHA's 4 partnering agencies has been slow. Through extensive community outreach, RHA hopes to expand the number of agencies participating in this activity in future years.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

*All references to authorizations are to the section and paragraph citation of Attachment C of the Standard MTW Agreement.*

**B. Authorizations Related to Both Public Housing and Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers**

**B.4. *Transitional/Conditional Housing Program***

The Agency may develop and adopt new short-term transitional housing programs, consistent with an eligible use of section 8 and 9 funds, with supportive services in one or more buildings in collaboration with local community-based organizations and government agencies. Successful participants in these programs will be eligible for transfer to the Agency's public housing or housing choice voucher programs. The



Agency will ensure that these programs do not have a disparate impact on protected classes, and will be operated in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. More specifically, under no circumstances will residents of such programs be required to participate in supportive services that are targeted at persons with disabilities in general, or persons with any specific disability. In addition, admission to any of the programs developed under this section will not be conditioned on the presence of a disability or a particular disability. This section is not intended to govern the designation of housing that is subject to Section 7 of the 1937 Act. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 941, and 960 Subpart B.*

**D. Authorizations Related to Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers Only**

**D.1.b. *Operational Policies and Procedures***

The Agency is authorized to determine the length of the lease period, when vouchers expire and when vouchers will be reissued. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(7)(a), 8(0)(J3)(F) and 8(0)(J3)(G) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.303, 982.309 and 983 Subpart F.*

**D.7.a. *Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 Project-Based Program***

The Agency is authorized to project-base Section 8 assistance at properties owned directly or indirectly by the Agency that are not public housing, subject to HUD's requirements regarding subsidy layering. If the Agency chooses to project-base Section 8 assistance at such properties, the Agency recognizes and accepts that such units would no longer be eligible for operating subsidy provided under Section 9(e) of the 1937 Housing Act or for future capital funds provided under section 9(d) for those units if it chooses to use this authorization. Project-based assistance for such owned units does not need to be competitively bid, nor are the owned units subject to any required assessments for voluntary conversion. *This authorization waives certain provisions of Sections 8(0)(13)(B and D) of the 1937 Act and 24 C.F.R. 982.1, 982.102 and 24 C.F.R. Part 983.*

**Changes to Baselines, Benchmarks and/or Metrics:**

In the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report and the FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan, RHA revised its MTW Baselines, Benchmarks and Metrics for consistency with the established HUD Standard Metrics and revised MTW reporting requirements. As a result of this new requirement, several Baselines and Benchmarks were not set. The tables below provide revised Baselines and Benchmarks for this MTW activity.



**2014-08 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars by partnering with local non-profits.	\$0	\$13,260 <sup>1</sup>  CAAW estimated approximately \$221 per month per client in additional resources.	\$1,105 <sup>2</sup>	No

- <sup>1</sup> RHA expects this Benchmark to change as new agreements are signed with nonprofit partners in the Reno, Sparks and Washoe County community. Furthermore, each agency provides different levels of supportive services which will also cause the expected amount leveraged to vary. The current Benchmark is set assuming full lease up of 5 units with CAAW, RHA's longest partnership. In the future, this Benchmark will be adjusted to reflect full lease up with all of RHA's nonprofit partners.
- <sup>2</sup> One family who was referred by CAAW, vacated the unit on January 27, 2015. Prior to the family vacating, they had received approximately 5 months of case management services.

**2014-08 HC #4: Displacement Prevention**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	0	0	0	Yes



<b>2014-08 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of partnership.	0	2	0	No

<b>2014-08 HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase 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).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice due to partnership.	0	2	0	No



**B. Not Yet Implemented Activities**

Not applicable. RHA has implemented all planned activities for FY 2015.

**C. Activities on Hold**

Not applicable. RHA is in process with all activities for FY 2015.

**D. Closed Activities**

Not applicable. All of RHA's activities for FY 2015 are in process.



## V. Sources and Uses of Funds

### A. Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

#### Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

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

#### Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

RHA completed its xeriscaping efforts at 3 PH complexes, removing 399,795 sq. ft. (9.5 acres) of turf and replacing it with low maintenance and low water usage landscape. The total expenditure for this water savings measure was \$709,655.

Following is a list of expenditures by complex:

- Mineral Manor \$411,144
- Essex Manor \$270,500
- Hawk View Apartments \$28,011

### B. Local Asset Management Plan

Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?

**YES**

No

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

Yes

or

**NO**

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

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

Yes

or

**NO**

RHA is not implementing a LAMP so the narrative is not required.



**C. 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.

<b>Account</b>	<b>Planned Expenditure</b>	<b>Obligated Funds</b>	<b>Committed Funds</b>
CFP 2014	Electrical upgrade at Tom Sawyer Village	\$22,390	\$22,390
CFP 2014	Landscape improvements at Tom Sawyer Village	\$21,325	\$21,325
MTW PH improvement	Window replacement at Mineral Manor	\$0	\$500,000
MTW evaluation	Payment to UNR for FY 2016	\$0	\$12,000
MTW agreement	Payment to FGC	\$0	\$32,000
Personnel	Salaries and benefits	\$274,000	\$274,000
<b>Total Obligated or Committed Funds:</b>		<b>\$ 317,715</b>	<b>\$861,715</b>

RHA will be utilizing flexibility of funds to replace 900 existing windows at Mineral Manor, a family PH complex, with energy star rated, highly efficient, thermal pane windows at an approximate cost of \$500,000.

An agreement with UNR to conduct ongoing data analysis of both the Mobility Demonstration participants and the Rent Reform Study participants is in place. The cost of this agreement is \$12,000 per year.

RHA will formalize an agreement with the FGC to conduct an in depth, 8 hour financial literacy class for all non-elderly and non-disabled HCV participants prior to the issuance of a time limited voucher. The cost of this educational agreement is \$32,000 annually and will cover the cost of conducting 16 Financial Literacy classes (12 English, 4 Spanish).

Personnel expenditures include the MTW Coordinator, up to three UNR interns who will provide self-sufficiency centered services and other members of RHA staff who assist with the MTW Program overall.

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



## VI. Administrative

A. General description of any HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue;

There are no actions required from any reviews, audits, or physical inspections.

B. Results of latest PHA-directed evaluations of the demonstration, as applicable; and

RHA is working with UNR to administer and conduct an annual analysis for Rent Reform and Mobility Demonstration participants. This questionnaire began being administered in September 2014. Please refer to Attachment A for UNR's profiles of clients participating in these programs based on the first year data.

C. Certification that the PHA has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; 2) continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and 3) maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

- 1) At the end of FY 2015, 3,038 households out of a total of 3,238 households or 93.82% were very low-income (<50% AMI).
  - a) Public Housing: 696 out of 743 or 93.67%
  - b) Housing Choice Vouchers: 2,342 out of 2,495 or 93.87%
- 2) Baseline numbers show total households served were 3,127; as of June 30, 2015, 3,238 households were served or 103% of baseline.
- 3) RHA is maintaining a comparable mix of families by family size, as seen below; all changes were under 5%.

Mix of Family Sizes Served							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained	50.56%	20.34%	12.87%	8.52%	4.67%	3.05%	<b>100%</b>
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year	1,727	647	357	277	133	97	<b>3,238</b>
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year	53.34%	19.98%	11.03%	8.55%	4.11%	3%	<b>100%</b>
Percentage Change	2.78%	-0.36%	-1.84%	0.03%	-0.56%	-0.05%	<b>0</b>



## VII. Attachments

- A. Profiles of clients participating in Housing Authority of the City of Reno's (RHA) Moving to Work Mobility Demonstration and Rent Reform Controlled Study programs, based on the first year data from a questionnaire designed to develop metrics for evaluating these programs.

*Prepared by Professor Kimberly Rollins, Department of Economics, University of Nevada, Reno*

# Attachment A

# Profiles of clients participating in Housing Authority of the City of Reno's (RHA) Moving to Work Mobility Demonstration and Rent Reform Controlled Study programs, based on the first year data from a questionnaire designed to develop metrics for evaluating these programs

Prepared by Professor Kimberly Rollins, Department of Economics, University of Nevada, Reno  
[krollins@unr.edu](mailto:krollins@unr.edu); (775) 784-1677

## I. Background

### 1. Brief description of the two RHA mobility programs:

In FY 2014, RHA began a Mobility Demonstration that enables qualified Public Housing families, who otherwise lack mobility options, to move to de-concentrated settings with more economic opportunities throughout the neighborhood and surrounding areas. The program allows these Public Housing households to reside in low-poverty census tracts, effectively increasing the availability of higher-income positions in the neighborhood and surrounding areas. The number of families in the Mobility Demonstration Program is limited by the number of residential units that Reno Housing Authority has available. Currently, RHA plans to designate 40 properties for use in this program; however this number may be increased in the future. As of June 30, 2015, 34 properties had been identified for this program and 31 were occupied. The control group for the Mobility Demonstration consists of qualified families with children who opted not to participate in the Mobility Demonstration but rather stay in one of RHA's Public Housing complexes. (Activity 2014-02: Mobility Demonstration, pgs. 37-46 of the FY 2015 MTW Annual Report).

A Rent Reform Controlled Study was also implemented in FY 2014 that includes a study group with a set rent, and a control group with rent calculated under standard Housing Choice Voucher guidelines. The Rent Reform Controlled Study was put in place to determine the incentive for self-sufficiency created when rents are not tied directly to income levels. RHA began providing families in the study group with two of the strongest incentives in becoming self-sufficient: (1) the motivation to increase household income when income no longer affects rent and (2) the awareness that their housing assistance will end after five years. (Activity 2014-03: Rent Reform Controlled Study, pgs. 47-58 of the FY 2015 MTW Annual Report).

More information about RHA's Moving to Work program and activities is available at:  
<http://www.renoha.org/index.php?id=MTW>.

### 2. Purpose of the questionnaire and data collection:

This document summarizes the first year of five years of questionnaire data associated with the two programs at the start of the programs. The study is designed to track outcomes of the two programs, based on data from four groups: these are the complete set of clients in each of the programs (the experimental treatment groups) and a control group for each of the treatment groups, which consist of client households who would have qualified to be in the treatment groups, but are not. Ideally, the control groups should be statistically similar to their corresponding treatment groups at the outset of the five year observation period. The questionnaire will be repeated annually over five years. Deviations between the treatment and control groups will be evaluated to determine whether they are statistically significant and can be attributed to the programs. While the overall purpose of this study is to compare deviations between control and treatment groups over the five years, this report uses the first year of data to provide profiles of each group.

The questionnaire is as extensive as it is with many questions being intensely personal for two main reasons. First, the sample sizes are small – the number of participants in the Mobility Demonstration is restricted by the numbers of houses purchased and renovated by RHA for use in this program. Small sample sizes pose issues for statistical estimation. While there may be anecdotal evidence that clients in these programs transfer out of

subsidized housing faster rather than those not in the programs, it is likely that the small sample sizes and random 'noise' from variations among different people's circumstances, experiences, abilities, and backgrounds may result in insufficient statistical power to make a case that program participation was the cause. Taking into account the likely reduced statistical power for what would seem to be an obvious metric for evaluating the programs (rate of transferring out of subsidized housing, for example), it was decided that a comprehensive set of metrics would be developed to generate a combined 'picture' to describe observable differences over 5 years among treatment and control groups. For example, the broader literature suggests that the differences produced by these alternatives may be more evident in the children of the participating families – therefore the questionnaire emphasizes quality of life information for the minors of the households.

Secondly, underlying differences among clients (e.g. education, work experience, mental health problems, numbers and ages of children) may vary to such an extent that they mask what may be systematic relationships between participation in these programs and outcomes. The questionnaire collects a large number of variables that will be used to control for these variations, to reduce the impact of these to be able to better focus on the effects of the programs on quality of life outcomes.

### 3. Steps and timeline developing the data set, metrics, and evaluation:

- Year One – develop a set of variables that will be used to create metrics to evaluate outcomes of the programs, and to control for variation among participant households. Create a draft questionnaire that would deliver these variables. Pretest and pilot the questionnaire with RHA clients. Omit questions that relate to data that could be obtained from RHA records. Program the final questionnaire into Qualtrics on-line survey software for which the UNR College of Business has a license. The clients themselves do not enter their answers on their own – rather employees of RHA sit with the clients to assist them with the questionnaire.
- Year Two – the last of the houses and vouchers available for these programs are allocated to RHA clients. All of the first year data for each household is recorded.
- Years Three to Five - each year, every client repeats filling out the questionnaire. In each year, participants in both treatment groups and both control groups may leave RHA housing - when this occurs, new participants are brought into the program – and questionnaires filled out. Additionally, as control group participants leave, new members are brought into the study – to keep the numbers balanced for analysis.
- Final year (Five/Six) - Analysis using the full data set: create indices (metrics) for evaluating deviations between treatment and control groups using variables from the data that capture hypothesized changes (e.g. children's performance in schools, encounters with illegal activities, comfort with making friends, friends that parents are comfortable with; adult propensity to enter career-training programs, complete educational programs and certifications, income, probability of leaving subsidized housing). Create variables to control for differences among participants that might systematically affect how much they may have benefitted from the program. Final analysis and reporting.

## II. Profiles of client groups entering the two programs, and control groups

An appendix includes the questionnaire and responses to each question, tabulated by the four groups (Mobility Demonstration, Mobility Demonstration control group, Rent Reform and Rent Reform control group). The profiles below are drawn from a subset of these data. University of Nevada faculty and research assistants, nor employees of Qualtrics, are not at any time able to identify any participant. RHA provides a unique identification codes for each participant to match responses of the same individuals over the years.

For ease of exposition, the following abbreviations are used: The **Mobility Demonstration is referred to as MOB** and the control for this group is **MOB-C**; the **Rent Reform group is abbreviated RR** and the control for this group is **RR-C**. Because of the small sample sizes, all data below are reported in numbers, not percentages. No data is provided so that anyone familiar with RHA clients would be able to identify any individuals. The profiles below are described using only a representative portion of the data.

## 1. Numbers of participants

A total of 197 participants completed the questionnaire, broken down as follows:

MOB	30	RR	73
MOB-C	22	RR-C	72

## 2. Demographics

Of those who filled out the questionnaire (head of household):

	female	male	married	divorced	widowed	single	Unmarried living with partner	Latino or Hispanic
MOB	26	4	6	6	1	15	2	8
MOB-C	19	3	8	2	1	9	2	13
RR	60	13	15	17	1	38	2	14
RR-C	65	7	9	17	2	39	5	24

In the participants' past or while growing up:

	Any time in JV?	Suspended from school	Ever in foster care or removed from home	CPS involved with family	Lived in Public Housing/ voucher before age 18	Ever convicted of a crime other than a traffic violation?	Ever in rehab for drugs or alcohol
MOB	4	6	2	4	6	5	1
MOB-C	2	0	2	0	1	1	1
RR	8	25	16	12	12	18	6
RR-C	14	20	10	14	5	12	4

## 3. Familiarity and affiliation with the Reno / Sparks area

When did you come to the Reno /Sparks area?

	I was born here	I moved here as a child (under 18)	I moved here as an adult
MOB	1	7	12
MOB-C	0	5	17
RR	10	21	42
RR-C	13	19	40

Of those participants who moved to the Reno / Sparks area as adults, the number of individuals who indicated that their **Most Important** (a 5 on a 1 to 5 scale) reasons for moving here included:

	Family in the area	Job offer	Looking for work	Educational opportunities	For the good of the family
MOB	6	1	4	3	9
MOB-C	10	1	5	2	8
RR	21	5	14	9	31
RR-C	22	9	11	12	26

... and their **Least Important** (a 1 on a 1 to 5 scale) reasons for moving here included the following:

	Family in the area	Job offer	Looking for work	Educational opportunities	For the good of the family
MOB	4	5	3	4	1
MOB-C	1	6	4	9	1
RR	10	14	10	11	5
RR-C	5	18	11	12	44

The number of participants who indicated that their **Most Important** (a 1 on a 1 to 5 scale) reasons for staying in the Reno/Sparks included the following:

	This is home	Family	Friends	Job	Other people who depend on me here	Cannot afford to move	Educational opportunities	Quality of Life
MOB	17	27	8	15	16	10	8	12
MOB-C	16	14	7	7	9	9	3	8
RR	32	46	15	25	19	20	18	22
RR-C	27	45	11	27	20	33	25	26

#### 4. Education, Training and Employment of Respondents

Highest level of education completed by Respondents:

	In school now	Highest level of education completed							
		8 <sup>th</sup> grade or less	Some HS, not complete	HS graduate	GED	Community college, not completed	University, not completed	Associate degree	Bachelor's degree
MOB	5	4	3	5	3	5	1	4	1
MOB-C	0	8	4	5	1	2	0	0	1
RR	9	5	15	22	7	9	2	4	2
RR-C	9	6	17	15	3	9	3	4	5

Ever participate in the following training programs?

	Job Connect	TMCC re-entry Center	Internship or Apprenticeship	RHA Family self-sufficiency	Other RHA program	Welfare (Neon, SNAPNET)	Other Washoe Co	Other non-Washoe Co
MOB	7	0	0	3	0	4	1	1
MOB-C	1	1	0	2	0	3	2	0
RR	15	3	2	1	0	7	6	4
RR-C	17	1	1	2	0	12	4	3

When asked about current employment status, participants reported:

	Currently employed	Not employed and not looking for work	Not employed and looking for work
MOB	16	8	5
MOB-C	9	10	3
RR	37	19	17
RR-C	44	12	16

The participants' employers (top ten by category – several other categories are in the full dataset):

	Warehousing, Distribution	Restaurant, fast food	Health-care	Casino	Wholesale / Retail	Hotel motel	Education academia	Landscaping and construction	Communications	Spa, Salon, Beauty
MOB	4	4	7	2	2	2	1	3	0	1
MOB-C	4	1	1	4	3	2	1	3	1	1
RR	16	13	10	8	7	12	6	1	7	5
RR-C	10	16	11	10	9	3	4	5	3	1

The type of work the participants do (top ten by category – several other categories in full dataset):

	Customer service	Food prep, server	Admin	Laborer	Sales	Maintenance cleaning	Skilled worker	Management	Professional	Technician
MOB	13	5	5	3	4	1	1	2	3	0
MOB-C	5	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	0	1
RR	37	9	8	10	10	11	6	4	5	4
RR-C	28	11	13	7	6	5	6	5	5	7

Of those who are employed, those who report they are **highly satisfied** or **satisfied** (indicated a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not satisfied and 5 being highly satisfied) with various aspects of their jobs:

	Recognition and appreciation at work	Opportunity to use talents and skills	People they work with	People they meet through work	Rate of pay	Opportunity for promotion	Opportunity to increase skills	Opportunity to increase pay
MOB	12	13	14	12	8	6	10	6
MOB-C	5	5	6	5	2	1	3	2
RR	16	27	27	25	13	16	17	17
RR-C	11	29	33	29	16	14	23	25

Of those who are employed, those who report they are **not satisfied** (indicated a 1 or a 2 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not satisfied and 5 being highly satisfied) with various aspects of their jobs:

	Recognition and appreciation at work	Opportunity to use talents and skills	People they work with	People they meet through work	Rate of pay	Opportunity for promotion	Opportunity to increase skills	Opportunity to increase pay
MOB	1	0	1	2	4	4	3	5
MOB-C	2	0	1	1	4	4	3	4
RR	7	10	5	11	13	16	11	13
RR-C	13	7	4	5	16	16	10	17

## 5. Indicators of Respondents' Self Sufficiency

Asked if they had a bank account, 19 of the 29 MOB respondents who answered this question said yes; for the, 10 of the MOB-C 22 respondents said yes. For the RR group, 36 of 71 said yes; while for the RR-C group, 45 of 72 said yes.

Savings and non-income sources of support for basic needs:

	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev	Number of respondents who over the last 12 months used ...			
					FSS or FSS lite	Food stamps	TANF	Other support for food and basic needs
MOB	\$ 0	\$ 54,256	\$ 1,937	\$ 9,884	7	23	4	6
MOB-C	\$ 0	\$ 6,070	\$ 279	\$ 1,060	2	15	3	5
RR	\$ 0	\$ 6,021	\$ 253	\$ 821	2	68	14	24
RR-C	-\$ 150	\$ 1,150	\$ 55	\$ 166	5	61	15	30

Other basic needs include communications and transportation:

	Participants with these types of phone service:				Type of Transportation used by respondents						
	landline	Cell with contract	Month-to-month cell	Gov't assistance phone	Own car	bus	Friends family	taxi	Car-pool	bicycle	Do not own a car
MOB	9	11	11	5	26	4	3	1	1	0	3
MOB-C	8	6	8	8	17	3	2	0	0	0	6
RR	15	25	29	14	38	24	17	2	5	4	33
RR-C	12	22	36	19	45	18	15	2	0	2	25

Asked whether they have a difficult time paying for the following basic needs, respondents answered on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is "almost never" and 5 is "always". The numbers of respondents who indicated a 4 or 5, indicating **they had little difficulty in meeting payments** for the following categories are:

	Medical insurance	utilities	School supplies	Car payments	Car insurance	Medical bills	Credit cards	Cable, internet	Payday loans	Vet pet bills
MOB	12	10	12	10	11	6	6	10	6	5
MOB-C	10	9	10	6	9	9	7	9	6	10
RR	28	25	26	18	18	18	15	19	16	15
RR-C	29	24	24	15	17	26	13	20	11	17

The numbers of respondents who indicated a 1 or 2, indicating that **they always or often have difficulty in meeting payments** for the following categories are:

	Medical insurance	utilities	School supplies	Car payments	Car insurance	Medical bills	Credit cards	Cable, internet	Payday loans	Vet pet bills
MOB	5	13	11	5	12	10	5	9	3	1
MOB-C	3	7	4	2	5	5	1	4	3	2
RR	8	29	21	12	20	21	8	22	7	3
RR-C	9	32	27	9	22	17	9	25	10	5

Self-sufficiency goes beyond meeting the basic needs. Participants were asked about when they have money left over after meeting basic needs, how often they spend on the following recreational activities and additional items for their families, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'almost never' and 5 is 'always'. The numbers of times that respondents indicated **always or often** (4 or 5) are:

	vacations	Eating out	entertainment	Electronic games	Salon services	clothing	Kids' toys	RVs, dirt bikes	Car
MOB	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	2
MOB-C	1	4	2	2	2	7	6	0	2
RR	0	2	1	0	2	14	8	2	9
RR-C	0	3	2	0	3	11	3	0	7

Participants were asked about when they have money left over after meeting basic needs, how often they spend on the following recreational activities and additional items for their families, the numbers of times that respondents indicated **that this seldom occurs** (1 or 2) are:

	vacations	Eating out	entertainment	Electronic games	Salon services	clothing	Kids' toys	RVs, dirt bikes	Car
MOB	20	21	23	21	22	15	21	17	12
MOB-C	13	9	10	22	14	9	9	8	8
RR	57	48	59	55	54	35	38	46	35
RR-C	44	49	51	45	40	36	42	36	35

## 6. Satisfaction with Residence, Neighborhood and Neighbors as Examples for Children

Several sets of questions about their satisfaction with the residence and property they live in, as well as their neighborhood, and immediate relationships use a 5-point satisfaction scale where 1 is not satisfied and 5 is highly satisfied. The tables below report “not satisfied” as ratings of 1 or 2; and “satisfied” as ratings of 4 or 5.

Regarding the **property and residential units,**

the numbers of participants who indicated being **not satisfied:**

	Size of residence	Appearance of the property	Your safety in the home	Cost of utilities	parking	Availability of outdoor space	Cleanliness of property	Maintenance of property
MOB	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	1
MOB-C	2	1	3	3	2	6	0	1
RR	12	13	11	16	13	14	10	16
RR-C	10	8	3	20	12	16	10	12

... and the numbers of participants who indicated being **satisfied:**

	Size of residence	Appearance of the property	Your safety in the home	Cost of utilities	parking	Availability of outdoor space	Cleanliness of property	Maintenance of property
MOB	28	28	28	22	25	25	28	28
MOB-C	17	16	15	14	14	11	20	20
RR	51	47	51	32	54	32	53	49
RR-C	43	52	56	40	46	42	53	53

Regarding the **neighborhood that they live in,**

the numbers of participants who indicated being **not satisfied:**

	Location of stores, services	Availability of entertainment	Sidewalk, road conditions	Availability of public transit	Local schools	Outdoor rec. options for children, families	Cleanliness
MOB	3	3	0	4	3	2	0
MOB-C	2	4	2	2	7	8	3
RR	6	15	7	8	11	12	10
RR-C	3	14	3	11	8	10	7

... and the numbers of participants who indicated being **satisfied:**

	Location of stores, services	Availability of entertainment	Sidewalk, road conditions	Availability of public transit	Local schools	Outdoor rec. options for children, families	Cleanliness
MOB	25	17	27	21	23	22	27
MOB-C	15	12	17	17	14	10	17
RR	55	39	55	53	50	42	50
RR-C	63	35	62	47	52	40	54

Regarding **safety and influence of other people in their neighborhood**,

the numbers of participants who were **not satisfied**:

	Safety walking during days	Safety walking at night	Your children's safety at school	Children in the neighborhood	Behavior of people you see in the street	Your neighbors	Neighbors as examples for children
MOB	1	1	0	0	0	2	2
MOB-C	2	8	2	5	5	4	7
RR	4	18	6	11	14	14	15
RR-C	4	19	1	9	13	18	18

... and the numbers of participants who indicated being **satisfied**:

	Safety walking during days	Safety walking at night	Your children's safety at school	Children in the neighborhood	Behavior of people you see in the street	Your neighbors	Neighbors as examples for children
MOB	28	21	25	22	26	23	21
MOB-C	17	9	16	14	14	9	10
RR	64	40	55	42	45	43	40
RR-C	60	47	49	44	43	51	35

Participants were asked to indicate on a five point scale **how strongly they agreed or disagreed** (where 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree) with a set of statements that could be used **to describe the neighborhood they live in**. The tables below report combined scores of 1 and 2 as 'disagree'; and combined scores of 4 or a 5 as 'agree'.

The numbers of participants who **disagreed** that the following statements described their neighborhoods are:

	This is a good place to live	I would recommend it to others with children	I would recommend it to others without children	There are many people living near me who are my close friends	I know many neighbors by name	It can take a long time to feel at home here	It has been difficult to fit in here
MOB	0	1	1	14	13	20	19
MOB-C	5	5	6	15	12	9	11
RR	13	17	15	43	43	37	46
RR-C	11	14	10	46	38	18	27

... and those who **agreed** with how well these statements described their neighborhoods are ...

	This is a good place to live	I would recommend it to others with children	I would recommend it to others without children	There are many people living near me who are my close friends	I know many neighbors by name	It can take a long time to feel at home here	It has been difficult to fit in here
MOB	29	27	28	8	9	4	5
MOB-C	10	11	11	6	8	11	9
RR	43	40	46	15	22	19	13
RR-C	49	46	48	16	14	24	17

Participants were asked to rank how often these events occur in the neighborhood that they live in, using a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being 'never' and 5 being 'very often.' The tables below combine ranks of 1 and 2 to express **seldom** and 4 and 5 to express **often**.

Participants indicate that these events **seldom** occur in their neighborhoods ...

	I see hostile and aggressive behavior here	I see people being rude for no reason	I see kids looking for trouble here	Neighbors here do social things together	Neighbors help each other with childcare	Neighbors can be counted on to help with transportation
MOB	28	27	28	20	23	25
MOB-C	11	11	12	12	13	13
RR	56	50	46	48	57	67
RR-C	51	50	55	48	57	59

Participants indicate that these events **often** occur in their neighborhoods ...

	I see hostile and aggressive behavior here	I see people being rude for no reason	I see kids looking for trouble here	Neighbors here do social things together	Neighbors help each other with childcare	Neighbors can be counted on to help with transportation
MOB	0	1	0	2	2	1
MOB-C	8	6	7	5	5	8
RR	7	12	15	11	7	6
RR-C	11	13	8	9	5	4

## 7. Family Life and Health

A battery of questions focuses on health, living situations, satisfaction with family and friends, exposure to trauma and other indicators of quality of life.

	Participants were asked to rate their own health as ...				And to rate how stressful or tense their household is			
	excellent	good	fair	poor	very	somewhat	Not very	Not at all
MOB	2	15	9	3	12	12	13	2
MOB-C	3	8	8	3	1	11	7	3
RR	9	41	16	7	9	28	27	9
RR-C	11	32	25	4	9	31	22	10

Participants asked about their lives and interpersonal relationships using a 5-point scale where 1 is not satisfied and 5 is highly satisfied. The tables below report “not satisfied” as ratings of 1 or 2; and “satisfied” as 4 or 5.

The numbers of participants who indicated being **not satisfied** with ....

	Your life as a whole	Marriage or relationship	Your Children’s situations	Your Friends	Your children’s friends	Your health	Your Neighborhood
MOB	0	2	0	0	0	5	1
MOB-C	0	1	2	2	2	5	3
RR	11	11	6	6	6	13	8
RR-C	5	12	5	13	3	13	7

... and the numbers of participants who indicated being **satisfied**:

	Your life as a whole	Marriage or relationship	Your Children’s situations	Your Friends	Your children’s friends	Your health	Your Neighborhood
MOB	28	12	27	15	25	21	25
MOB-C	21	14	16	17	17	13	14
RR	50	24	53	32	49	47	50
RR-C	56	26	62	50	49	49	50

Participants' experience with family violence may influence the type of response they may have to their participation in the RHA programs. Participants were asked to "check all that apply" to the following questions.

	Not experienced family violence in the past	I've had a restraining order against another person	I've had a restraining order against me	Another person in the house had a restraining order against another person	Another person in the house had a restraining order against them
MOB	24	4	1	0	0
MOB-C	17	4	0	0	0
RR	52	16	3	0	0
RR-C	55	17	4	4	3

	Members of my household have threatened to harm other members or myself	Police have been called to my house for incidents of violence	There have been incidents of violence that required medical attention	I've been fearful of violence in my house	I am fearful of violence in my house now
MOB	2	1	1	1	0
MOB-C	1	2	1	2	0
RR	3	7	1	10	2
RR-C	7	13	8	16	1

## 8. Children in the Household

When asked whether the household included children, responses were:

	Yes	No
MOB	27	2
MOB-C	22	0
RR	70	3
RR-C	72	0

Those who had at least 1 child filled out a **separate battery of questions for each child** in the household. RHA records for each ID number in the dataset record how many children are in each household, and their ages. These data will be combined with the questionnaire data during the full analysis.

This document reports only for **the first child in each household** to give a general idea for the types of data that will be tracked over time.

	Is this child enrolled in school?		Is this child currently in a daycare or baby-sitting arrangement that is <b>not</b> a before/after school program?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
MOB	21	6	7	20
MOB-C	18	4	1	21
RR	55	15	19	51
RR-C	59	13	15	57

For those children who are in school the number of respondents who indicated...

	Has this child attended an English Language Learner (ELL) program?	Do you volunteer at this child's school?	How does this child get to and from school each day?				
			Bus	I drive him/her	Rides with another family	He/she walks	Rides a bike
			MOB	1	6	8	9
MOB-C	2	3	5	9	0	3	0
RR	2	8	18	19	5	16	3
RR-C	2	8	20	19	6	19	3

	Have you or other household members attended ...		How do you monitor this child's progress at School?				
	events at this child's school?	parent teacher conferences	Check Infinite Campus weekly	Check Infinite Campus on occasion	Monitor report cards	Meet with Teacher	Check homework
MOB	12	16	7	7	14	13	16
MOB-C	8	13	6	1	10	9	13
RR	20	33	17	11	28	27	38
RR-C	33	38	13	19	36	35	43

The numbers of "yes" responses to questions regarding disability and Educational Accommodations (the full data set includes questions about levels of satisfaction with these plans and accommodations):

	This child has a disability	This child has a 504 plan	This child has an IEP
MOB	3	0	8
MOB-C	2	1	4
RR	9	0	16
RR-C	12	2	14

Several questions are asked about participants' levels of satisfaction with this child's behavior, grades and activities using a 5-point satisfaction scale where 1 is not satisfied and 5 is highly satisfied. The tables below report "not satisfied" as ratings of 1 or 2; and "satisfied" as ratings of 4 or 5.

Participants reporting that they are **satisfied** with this child's ...

	grades	Behavior at school	Behavior at home	Choice of friends	Self-esteem	Part-time work	Participation in ...		
							School activities	Community activities	sports
MOB	16	20	19	17	19	4	19	11	14
MOB-C	14	16	17	17	16	4	14	8	13
RR	47	53	51	50	50	8	48	34	35
RR-C	48	57	57	56	54	8	50	39	36

... and those reporting they are **not satisfied** with ...

	grades	Behavior at school	Behavior at home	Choice of friends	Self-esteem	Part-time work	Participation in ...		
							School activities	Community activities	sports
MOB	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4
MOB-C	3	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	0
RR	2	6	4	3	5	5	7	12	13
RR-C	5	1	0	2	1	2	4	4	6

Several questions are asked **how frequently there had been problems** with this child and a number of circumstances, using a **5-point frequency scale** where **1 is “never a problem”** and **5 is “a constant problem.”** The tables below report “seldom” as ratings of 1 or 2; and “often” as ratings of 4 or 5. In addition to those shown below, additional categories include: involvement with drugs or alcohol, involvement with gangs, Juvenile detention, detained by law enforcement, and involvement in illegal activity. These are omitted below because there were no participants who indicated that these were often a problem, for the first child listed.

The number of participants who reported that for this child there was **seldom** a problem with ...

	grades	Aggressive behavior towards others	Being bullied by others	Friends	Staying out late	Witnessing illegal activity
MOB	13	18	14	17	20	21
MOB-C	9	18	14	16	16	15
RR	39	51	42	52	53	52
RR-C	43	54	50	51	48	50

... and the number of participants who reported that for this child there was **often** a problem with ...

	grades	Aggressive behavior towards others	Being bullied by others	Friends	Staying out late	Witnessing illegal activity
MOB	3	2	4	3	0	0
MOB-C	5	2	5	1	1	1
RR	7	4	6	4	0	0
RR-C	9	5	8	2	2	1

This concludes the battery of questions for each child. At the end of the section for each child, participants are asked if there is another child in the household. If the response is “yes”, the on-line questionnaire sets up a second (third, fourth, as many as there are ‘yes’ answers) set of questions.

The numbers of participants indicating how many children in their household was tabulated using the answers to the question at the end of each child’s set of questions – is there another child in this household?

	1 or more children	2 or more children	3 or more children	4 or more children	5 or more children	6 or more children	7 or more children
MOB	27	16	10	2	1	1	0
MOB-C	22	11	8	2	1	0	0
RR	70	39	22	6	4	1	0
RR-C	72	35	13	5	1	1	0

And working backwards to determine the average numbers of children per household by group:

	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 children	7 children
MOB	11	6	8	1	0	1	0
MOB-C	11	3	6	1	1	0	0
RR	31	17	16	2	3	1	0
RR-C	37	22	8	4	0	1	0