



Moving to Work

Annual MTW Plan- FY2017

San Antonio Housing Authority | 818 S. Flores | San Antonio, TX 78204 | www.saha.org

DRAFT
2016

Submitted April 20, 2016; revisions submitted August 19, 2016 and September 22,

SAHA Board of Commissioners

Morris Stribling, MD, Chairman
Charles Muñoz, Vice Chairman
Thomas F. Adkisson
Francesca Caballero
Charles Clack
Marie R. McClure
Jessica Weaver

SAHA Executive Staff

David Nisivoccia, Interim President and Chief Executive Officer
Tim Alcott, Development Services and Neighborhood Revitalization Officer
Ed Hinojosa, Chief Financial Officer
Muriel Rhoder, Interim Chief Administrative Officer
Jo Ana Alvarado, Director of Information Technology
David Clark, Housing Director
Deborah Kuyrkendall, Director of Assisted Housing
Diana Kollodziej Fiedler, Director of Finance and Accounting
Adrian Lopez, Director of Community Development Initiatives
Lorraine Robles, Director of Development Services and Neighborhood Revitalization

SAHA Moving to Work Staff

Richard Milk, Director of Planning and Policy
Sara Eaves, GIS & MTW Program Analyst

Contributing SAHA Staff

Gary Baxter, Madlyn Bowen, David Casso, Roman Castorena, Lori Hall, Aiyana Longoria, Silvia Lozano, Ramiro Maldonado, Brandee Perez, Rosario Plascencia, Katherine Ramirez, Roberto Ramirez, Thomas Roth, Joanne Saucedo, Susan Ramos-Sossaman, and Jacquelyn Smith.

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| I. Introduction | 4 |
| A. FY2017 Update Summary | 4 |
| B. Overview of Short and Long-term MTW goals and objectives | 4 |
| C. Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information | 10 |
| II. General Housing Authority Operating Information | 17 |
| A. Housing Stock Information | 17 |
| B. General Description of All Planned Capital Expenditures During the Plan Year | 20 |
| C. Leasing Information | 20 |
| D. Waiting List Information | 20 |
| E. Tables from 50900 | 21 |
| III. Proposed MTW Activities | 30 |
| A. FY2017-1: Time-limited Working Household Referral Program | 30 |
| B. FY2017-2: Restorative Housing Pilot Program | 38 |
| IV. Approved MTW Activities | 46 |
| A. Implemented Activities | 46 |
| B. Activities On Hold | 104 |
| C. Closed Out Activities | 105 |
| V. Sources and Uses of Funds | 109 |
| Activities that Will Use Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility | 111 |
| VI. Administrative | 116 |
| Appendix 1: Resolutions and Certifications | 119 |
| Appendix 2: Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report (HUD 50075.1) and Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Plan - 2014/2015 | 123 |
| Appendix 3: Preservation and Expansion of Affordable Housing Policy | 124 |

I. Introduction

The San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) provides housing to 65,000 children, adults, and seniors through three housing programs – Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers, and mixed-income housing programs. SAHA employs approximately 500 people and has an annual operating budget of \$186 million. Existing real estate assets are valued at over \$500 million.

SAHA's involvement with Moving to Work (MTW) dates back to May 2000, when SAHA implemented its initial MTW demonstration program in three Public Housing communities: Mission Park Apartments, Wheatley Courts, and Lincoln Heights Courts. In 2009, SAHA signed an amended and restated agreement with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to make the MTW demonstration an agency-wide program.

The MTW designation provides SAHA with the flexibility to design and test innovative approaches to enhance the agency's programs. The MTW designation also provides funding flexibility by combining Public Housing operating subsidy, capital fund program (CFP) grants, and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program subsidies into a single fund block grant. The MTW program focuses on three goals:

- **to reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures**
- **to 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**
- **to increase housing choices for low-income families**

A. FY2017 Update Summary

This year's MTW Plan proposes two new activities, removes two activities, and makes minor updates to existing activities to facilitate implementation, measurement, and/or reporting.

B. Overview of Short and Long-term MTW goals and objectives

On June 25, 2012, the Board of Commissioners formally approved SAHA's new Strategic Plan. Three elements comprise the core of the plan: a new vision for the agency, a new mission statement, and a set of six strategic goals.

Vision: **Create dynamic communities where people thrive.**

Mission: **Provide quality affordable housing that is well-integrated into the fabric of neighborhoods and serves as a foundation to improve lives and advance resident independence.**

Strategic Goals

- 1) Empower and equip families to improve their quality of life and achieve economic stability.
- 2) Invest in our greatest resource – our employees – and establish a track record for integrity, accountability, collaboration and strong customer service.
- 3) Preserve and improve existing affordable housing resources and opportunities.
- 4) Strategically expand the supply of affordable housing.
- 5) Transform core operations to be a high performing and financially strong organization.
- 6) Develop a local and national reputation for being an effective leader, partner, and advocate for affordable housing and its residents.

The Agency's MTW Plan and Strategic Plan are closely integrated. The Strategic Plan goals articulate and reinforce the three statutory MTW goals. Each MTW Activity is directly incorporated into the Strategic Plan as a specific action item. Because of the tight integration between the plans, progress in any MTW Activity is captured in Strategic Plan progress reports.

Long-term MTW Plan

Over the course of FY2017, SAHA will develop long-term goals, objectives, metrics and targets for each of the three MTW statutory objectives. When complete, these plan elements will provide long-term guidance to facilitate short-term decision-making as well as development of new MTW activities. Starting in 2015, the MTW Advisory Committee initiated discussions to define long-term goals and objectives related to the three MTW statutory objectives. The Committee recommendations will be supplemented by feedback from SAHA staff, and ultimately taken to the Board of Commissioners for consideration. This process is anticipated to take six months to one year.

Strategic Plan

SAHA's Strategic Plan establishes six long-term strategic goals to be achieved by 2020. In order to ensure timely progress towards those goals, SAHA develops annual Strategic Implementation Plans that set out annual objectives for the fiscal year. Progress is measured by tracking key metrics for each strategic goal. The first of the following tables lists the key metrics assigned to each strategic goal. The second table shows the relationship between the long term strategic goals and annual objectives.

Key Strategic Goal Metrics

Metrics in **boldface** are MTW Standard Metrics.

| Strategic Goal | Metric | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| 1: Empower and equip families to improve their quality of life and achieve economic stability. | Education Attainment | % of 19 and older adults with an education level of 12 or more; Level 12 indicating GED/HS Diploma |
| | Employment rate of residents / participants (FT equivalent) | % of work-able adults that are employed at or above minimum FTE work level |
| | Employment rate of residents / participants (PTE and FTE) | % of work-able adults that are employed at or above minimum PTE work level |
| | Earned income | Median earned income of SAHA-assisted adults working at a full-time equivalent |
| | SS #8: Self Sufficient | Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency. |
| 2: Invest in our greatest resource – our employees – and establish a track record for integrity, accountability, collaboration and strong customer service. | Performance Evaluations Completed on time, % | Percentage of complete and correct evaluations submitted to HR within 30 days of anniversary date (hire date or promotion date) |
| | External client satisfaction, % | TBD |
| | Employee turnover rate | Number of employees that have left divided by the total number of employees (for the period) |
| | Training commitment | Ratio of dollar amount set aside for training in each department's budget (to include tuition reimbursement, professional certification activities) to dollar amount spent for training |
| | Value of benefits | \$ in medical, life insurance, disability, and dental/vision benefits, per employee |
| | Wellness programs | \$ invested in SAHA wellness programs |
| 3: Preserve and improve existing affordable housing resources and opportunities | MTW HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved | Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available |
| | Units of Housing Preserved (non-MTW) | Units of affordable housing preserved |
| | Funds expended | Amount of dollars paid in accordance with contractual obligations (versus funds obligated) |
| | Funds expended, per unit | Average amount of preservation dollars expended, per unit |
| | Work order days closed within 2 days, % | Percentage of work orders closed out within 2 days |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Emergency Work Orders completed same day, % | Percentage of emergency work orders completed the same day of being ordered |
| | | |
| 4: Strategically expand the supply of affordable housing | Units acquired or built (completed) | Total sum of all units acquired or built |
| | Funds expended on units acquired or built (completed) | Federal dollars invested |
| | Funding leveraged | Dollar value of non-federal funds invested in expansion |
| | Post-partnership units | Number of units that come back to SAHA ownership after partnership compliance period expires |
| | Voucher value | Dollar value of new vouchers secured |
| | Additional vouchers secured | Number of new, competitive vouchers secured |
| | | |
| 5: Transform core operations to be a high performing and financially strong organization. | Occupancy (%) | (Total Standing Units minus Vacant Units) divided by Total Standing Units. This measure accounts for units such as agency, litigation, fire, etc that are not occupied by a tenant but do not count against the occupancy rate. |
| | Utilization - MTW Baseline | Voucher utilization based on MTW baseline |
| | Average HAP | Average HAP per unit |
| | HCV Scorecard | Scorecard score |
| | Non-Profit DSCR | Debt service coverage ratio |
| | MTW Total # of Households Assisted | Number of MTW households assisted through MTW using the MTW baseline methodology set forth in PIH-2013-02. Includes all PH households, all MTW Voucher Households, and "Other" households defined as non-PH and Non-S8 households occupying a unit reserved for <80% AMI at any MTW funded development. |
| | PH NOI | NOI per year per unit |
| | Deferred Maintenance, PH | \$ millions (value of Categories 1, 2, and 3) |
| | Deferred Maintenance, NP | \$ millions (value of Categories 1, 2, and 3) |
| | PHAS Score | overall PHAS score for SAHA |
| | Non Profits Score | Aggregate [scorecard] score for Non Profits |
| | Partnerships Score | Aggregate [scorecard] score for Partnerships |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 6: Develop a local and national reputation for being an effective leader, partner, and advocate for affordable housing and its residents. | Agency Awards/Recognition | Number of national, state, and local awards for agency programs |
| | State and National Representation | number of state or national trade group associations (partner industries), committees or boards on which at least one SAHA representative is serving, to include presentations at conferences |
| | Local Leadership and Representation | Staff participating in external leadership programs (LSA, Masters, etc.) plus non-profit board service |
| | Positive media coverage (%) | number of positive/neutral hits divided by total (all) hits, by media outlet |
| | Policy wins (%) | Number of policies finalized in SAHA's favor divided by total number of policies engaged |

I. Long-term Strategic Goals and Short-term (Annual) Objectives

| Strategic Goals (Long-term 2020) | Objectives (Short-term FY2016) |
|---|--|
| 1: Empower and equip families to improve their quality of life and achieve economic stability. | Increase the number of residents achieving self-sufficiency |
| | Increase the Earned income of adults |
| | Increase the employment rate of residents |
| | Improve education outcomes |
| | Expand the number of residents that complete homeownership readiness program |
| | Increase residents' access to resources |
| | Improve Wheatley Court residents' health outcomes |
| 2: Invest in our greatest resource – our employees – and establish a track record for integrity, accountability, collaboration and strong customer service. | Reduce and stabilize employee Turnover Rate |
| | Increase External client satisfaction rate |
| | Increase performance evaluations completed on time |
| | Increase training commitments |
| | Develop metrics and implement wellness initiatives that impact long-term medical costs (ROI) |
| 3: Preserve and improve existing affordable housing resources and opportunities | Improve work order outcomes |
| | Meet capital fund expenditure targets (public housing) |
| | Adhere to Beacon 5-year plan |
| | Complete Energy Performance Contract Project |
| 4: Strategically expand the | Ensure units are constructed or acquired according to schedules |

| | |
|---|--|
| supply of affordable housing | Complete Choice Neighborhood public infrastructure improvements to benefit neighborhood |
| | Secure additional funds for new development and acquisition |
| | Ensure favorable terms for MTW Extension |
| | Change TDHCA QAP to support a more balanced range of projects |
| | Draft final policy to increase number of residents living in |
| | Neighborhoods of Opportunity |
| | |
| 5: Transform core operations to be a high performing and financially strong organization. | Increase Occupancy |
| | Increase MTW Total # households assisted |
| | Improve NP Debt Service Coverage Ratio |
| | Improve PH Net Operating Income per unit |
| | Increase PHAS score |
| | Increase HCV Scorecard score |
| | Increase Performance score for partnership portfolio |
| | Create performance metric for Beacon Portfolio |
| | Maintain adequate MTW working capital |
| | Develop and propose visioning process for agency, including long-term MTW goals (Looking forward 3-5 years) |
| 6: Develop a local and national reputation for being an effective leader, partner, and advocate for affordable housing and its residents. | Develop SOPs for utilization of grant funds |
| | Organize, review, and understand all partnership agreement, and establish timeline for implementing all requirements |
| | Increase # of agency awards |
| | Increase local, state and national representation] / Expand SAHA Leadership Pool |
| | Increase positive media coverage |
| | Increase SAHA policy engagement and wins |

C. Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information

I. Supportive Housing

In addition to MTW housing programs, SAHA offers affordable housing linked to accessible supportive services, including mental health, substance addiction, unemployment, and other support services that provide assistance for families and individuals to live more stable, productive lives. Supportive housing works particularly well for those facing complex life challenges, such as homelessness, HIV/AIDS, prison or jail release, and/or mental illness.

SAHA is committed to reducing homelessness in San Antonio through programs that provide affordable quality housing for homeless individuals and families. In an effort to provide quality assistance, the agency works with non-profit organizations and Continuum of Care (CoC) partners that offer services to address issues that affect client quality of life.

Below is a brief description of the agency's non-MTW supportive housing programs:

Moderate Rehabilitation (Mod-Rehab) Program: provides rent subsidy payments to private property landlords for select rental units that have been rehabilitated under this program. Subsidies provide housing assistance to homeless families and individuals as they transition into affordable housing. There are a total of 267 vouchers for families.

Shelter Plus Care (S+C) and Special Needs Assistance Program (SNAP): provides rental assistance and supportive services for homeless families and individuals with disabilities, primarily those with serious mental illnesses, chronic problems due to alcohol or drug dependencies, and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) or related diseases. There are 101 vouchers committed to S+C.

Mainstream: provides rental assistance for elderly and disabled households. Currently, there are 100 vouchers authorized for this program.

HUD-VASH: serves homeless veterans by combining the HCV rental assistance program with case management and clinical services provided by Veterans Affairs medical centers. There are presently 460 families authorized for assistance under this program.

II. Section 32, HOPE VI Mirasol / Westside Housing Reinvestment Initiative

In February 2015, SAHA staff met with local, regional and national HUD officials to discuss a proposed Plan for the rebuild of four Mirasol neighborhoods – Blueridge, Villas de Fortuna, Sunflower, and Palm Lake. Staff previously submitted a demolition/disposition application to HUD for Blueridge. This application process was not a good “fit” for the rebuild of these neighborhoods as the system/process does not lend itself to the demolition of single family developments. SAHA engaged a HUD consultant to assist with the development of a solution for this project.

The research to determine an appropriate rebuild plan expanded to cover the rebuild of all four Mirasol single family neighborhoods for homeownership. The proposed Plan involved the use of a Middle Income Homeownership Program, a “Nehemiah-like” homeownership program that was in effect at the time that SAHA received the HOPE VI Mirasol Grant. While the initial focus of the rebuild was the Blueridge neighborhood, additional home assessments were performed in other three neighborhoods. The Plan’s most basic elements are:

- a) The demolition of 67 vacant homes and remnants on 1 lot in the Blueridge and Villas de Fortuna neighborhoods;
- b) Substantial rehabilitation of 19 vacant homes in the Palm Lake and Sunflower Neighborhoods;
- c) New construction of 69 single-family homes in those neighborhoods; and
- d) Use of the Middle-Income Homeownership Program (MIHP) to sell the newly-available homes to low and moderate-income homebuyers.

The MIH Program allows sale of homes to families earning up to 100% of the area median income and 15% of the homes may be sold to families earning up to 115% of the area median income.

Several units burned down in the past. On those vacant lots, new homes will be constructed. Homes will range from \$90,000 to \$140,000 and from three bedroom/two bath to five bedroom/three baths. New floor plans are complete for the newly constructed units. A demolition contractor was approved by the Board of Directors in January 2015. An organization was hired to provide programs and services to residents.

Local market reports suggest that these homes will be in demand; however, lending requirements remain stringent. Only 10% of builders in San Antonio are building homes less than \$150,000. There is less than a three month inventory of homes available on the market. Working families do not have sufficient choices for home buying and rents remain high.

In March 2015, HUD contacted SAHA staff and provided a process for rebuilding all neighborhoods. Staff will submit a Disposition Application, authorized by BOC on April 2, 2015, to the HUD Special

Applications Center. HUD approval is expected in approximately 120 days. Following HUD approval of the Disposition Application, SAHA will resubmit a Proposed Plan for rebuilding all neighborhoods as outlined previously. Staff will seek quick approval of this plan. Meanwhile, staff will proceed with the selection of builders and developing a pipeline of buyers for future homes.

III. "J" Street Properties (526, 614, 622 "J" Street)

As per Section 32 guidelines, the properties must be repaired to local code requirements and to first time home buyers. Staff is working to find eligible home buyers who can qualify for home mortgage and who want to buy these homes. The homes will be repaired once we have interested and qualified buyers.

IV. Sale of Other SpringView Section 32 Scattered Sites

Staff is working to find ready and qualified buyers through various means including SAHA's new Home Buyer Readiness Program, realtors, lending institutions, etc. to buy these homes. The home ownership division will repair the homes to local standards prior to sale.

V. Sale of Excess Assets

SAHA is considering the sale of excess assets from its property inventory. SAHA is evaluating the benefit of potential sales from the property list upon staff recommendation and SAHA Board of Commissioner approval. Potential homes, lots and large parcels under consideration include those in the *SAHA Large Parcel Property inventory* and *SAHA Non-PIC Scattered Sites Inventory* detailed below:

SAHA Large Parcel Property inventory

| Vacant Parcels for Development | Council | Owner | Acreage | Area (sf) | Value *Estimate | Comment |
|-------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|-----------|-----------------|---|
| Victoria St. @ Chavez | 1 | SAHA | 2.388 | 104,021 | \$4,162,070.00 | BCAD Value V. Commons Master Plan |
| 800 E. Chavez at Labor St. | 1 | SAHA | .9717 Acre | 42,327 | \$1,365,000.00 | Transfer from CoSA Park, May 2015 |
| Labor St. @ Refugio | 1 | SAHA | 0.5 | 21,780 | \$348,607.00 | V. Commons Master Plan |
| 400 Labor St. | 1 | SAHA | 2 | 87,120 | \$1,360,000.00 | V. Commons Master Plan, vacant admin. bldg. |
| Santa Clar, Peyton Place & McMillan | 1 | APLLC | 7.052 | 307,185 | \$1,592,000.00 | V. Commons Master Plan (TH's) |
| 550 Brooklyn | 1 | SAHA | 2.58 | 112,384 | \$7,870,000.00 | 2015 appraised value |
| Sutton 909 Runnels | 2 | SAHA | 1.945 | 84,724 | \$233,000.00 | Wheatley Choice |
| SpringView 2730 E. Commerce | 2 | SAHFC | 1.3 | 56,628 | \$118,919.00 | land |
| SpringView 2830 E. Commerce | 2 | SAHFC | 2.4 | 104,544 | \$219,542.00 | land' |
| SpringView 2944 E. Commerce | 2 | SAHFC | 2.4 | 104,544 | \$219,542.00 | land |
| SpringView 700 Garcia St. | 2 | SAHA | 3.3 | 143,748 | \$270,000.00 | Vacant Admin Bldg. |
| SpringView Garcia @ R.R. Track | 2 | SAHA | 3 | 130,680 | \$210,000.00 | land |
| SpringView 903-937 Hedges | 2 | SAHA | 1.9 | 82,764 | \$140,000.00 | land |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------|-------|---------|----------------|---|
| SpringView 651 S. Rio Grande | 2 | SAHA | 3.1 | 217,800 | \$220,000.00 | land |
| SpringView 200 S. Rio Grande | 2 | SAHA | 2.5 | 104,544 | \$215,000.00 | land |
| 200 Tampico | 5 | SAHA | 3.763 | 163,916 | \$1,025,000.00 | 11.25.13 Appraisal, vacant warehouse |
| 1310 S. Brazos | 5 | SAHFC | 5.01 | 218,255 | \$2,000,000.00 | 10.17.13 Appraisal, semi-vacant warehouse |
| 3940 San Fernando | 5 | SAHA | 9.68 | 421,660 | \$843,322.00 | VCP w/TCEQ environmental |
| 7770 Ingram Rd. | 6 | SAHDC | 8.92 | 388,555 | \$780,000.00 | land |
| 5700 Culebra Rd. | 7 | SAHDC | 12.56 | 547,113 | \$1,094,227.00 | 2008 appraised @\$1.4M |
| 1706 Cincinnati | 7 | SAHDC | 0.54 | 23,522 | \$43,250.00 | 4.4.08 Appraisal - LURA? |
| 7223 Snowden Rd. | 8 | SAHFC | 6.97 | 303,613 | \$1,200,000.00 | land |

SAHA Non-PIC Scattered Sites Inventory

| SCATTERED SITES VACANT-LOTS (5) | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------|----------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|---|
| PROPERTY ADDRESS | OWNER | COUNCIL DISTRICT | STATUS | ACERAGE | SQ. FT | BCAD VALUE | APPRAISAL AMOUNT | DATE LAST APPRAISAL | C A N # | COMMENT |
| 7250 GLEN MIST | SAN ANTONIO HOMEOWNERSHIP OPP CORP | | RTC VAC-LOT | 0.056 | 1,069.00 | \$ 19,500.00 | \$ 2,300.00 | 3/17/2006 | 05703-102-0540 | AUCTION LOT NO SELL |
| 517 GRIMES | SAN ANTONIO FACILITY CORP | 2 | SPRINGVIEW VAC-LOT | 0.1066 | 4,682.00 | \$ 25,300.00 | \$ 5,500.00 | 2/19/2007 | 01518-002-0130 | AUCTION LOT NO SELL |
| 515 SAN GABRIEL | SAN ANTONIO HOUSING FINANCE CORP | 5 | RTC VAC-LOT | 0.1354 | 5,900.00 | \$ 21,500.00 | \$ 5,500.00 | 5/6/2005 | 08860-008-0280 | AUCTION LOT NO SELL |
| 635 CORLISS | SAN ANTONIO HOUSING | 2 | VACANT LOT | 0.1403 | 6,111.00 | \$ 9,780.00 | | | 10682-005-0080 | AUCTION PROP NO SELL SPRINGVIEW HOPE VI |
| 1011 YUCCA | SAHA | 2 | SPRINGVIEW VAC-LOT | 0.1779 | 7,750.00 | \$ 6,300.00 | | | 10710-029-0160 | AUCTION LOT NO SELL |
| SCATTERED SITES VACANT-HOUSES (2) | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROPERTY ADDRESS | OWNER | COUNCIL DISTRICT | STATUS | ACERAGE | SQ. FT | BCAD VALUE | APPRAISAL AMOUNT | DATE LAST APPRAISAL | C A N # | COMMENT |
| 6211 BROWNLEAF | SAN ANTONIO HOMEOWNERSHIP OPP CORP | 6 | VACANT HM | 0.1263 | 5,500.00 | | \$ 66,000.00 | 2012 | 15405-001-0270 | |
| 1071 POINSETTIA ST | SAHA | 2 | VACANT HM | 0.1607 | 7,000.00 | \$ 27,440.00 | | | 09545-004-0040 | AUCTION PROP NO SELL SPRINGVIEW HOPE VI NEED TO CLEAR TITLE |
| ARTISAN PARK TOWN HOMES (3) | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROPERTY ADDRESS | OWNER | COUNCIL DISTRICT | STATUS | ACERAGE | SQ. FT | BCAD VALUE | APPRAISAL AMOUNT | DATE LAST APPRAISAL | C A N # | COMMENT |
| 512 REFUGIO | LAS VARAS PUBLIC FAC. CORP | 1 | VACANT HM | 0.0395 | 1,720.62 | \$169,110.00 | | | 00866-003-0060 | AFFORDABLE |
| 530 REFUGIO | LAS VARAS PUBLIC FAC. CORP | 1 | VACANT HM | 0.0386 | 1,681.42 | \$164,480.00 | | | 00866-003-0150 | AFFORDABLE |
| 411 SANTA CLARA | LAS VARAS PUBLIC FAC. CORP | 1 | VACANT HM | 0.0329 | 1,433.12 | \$221,620.00 | | | 00866-002-0050 | MARKET |
| Rental Properties | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4846 MELVIN | SAN ANTONIO HOUSING FIN | 2 | OCCUPIED | 0.1205 | 5,250.00 | \$ 66,240.00 | | | 12880-003-0121 | NEED UPDATED CONTRACTS FOR |
| 9411 STRECH | SAN ANTONIO HOMEOWNERSHIP | 4 | OCCUPIED | 0.1435 | 6,250.00 | \$ 86,150.00 | | | 11132-033-3313 | NEED UPDATED CONTRACTS FOR |
| 211 E THEO | SAN ANTONIO HOUSING FIN CORP | 3 | OCCUPIED | 0.1917 | 8,350.00 | \$ 24,150.00 | | | 03225-011-0120 | NEED UPDATED CONTRACTS FOR LEASE/RENTAL |

vi. Sale of Tampico Site

The Tampico Warehouse is located at 200 Tampico Street and is included in the HUD AMP which includes the Alazan/Apache courts public housing development. The site area is 3.763 acres or 163,916 square feet. However, a portion of the property is located in the 100 year flood plain, so the usable area is 3.624 acres or 157,853 square feet. The site is improved with a 9,600 square foot office/warehouse. However, the building has been severely vandalized and was given no value in the appraisal report dated June 6, 2012 which valued the site at \$1,025,000.

The intent is to liquidate this excess property that is not critical to the implementation of SAHA's Strategic Plan. The disposition application states that net sale proceeds will be leveraged to sustain

existing Public Housing units and/or develop new affordable housing for low-income households over the coming years.

vii. Public Housing Scattered Sites

SAHA currently operates 163 single family housing units at 163 scattered sites throughout the city of San Antonio. SAHA is currently evaluating a possible disposition of all or a portion of this portfolio due to the high cost of managing and maintaining these units. If a disposition strategy is pursued and approved by HUD, net sale proceeds will either be invested in capital repair/replacement projects for other public housing assets or used to acquire additional affordable housing units that complement SAHA's 2020 Strategic plan.

viii. Former Springview Administration Building and adjacent land parcels

The subject assemblage consists of three distinct sections; together they equal the total area of the subject property, approximately 7.3641 acres or 320,780 square feet of land. Property 1 is located on the northern boundary of the larger parent tract along East Commerce Street and consists of approximately 1.3698 acres or 59,668 square feet of vacant land. Abutting Property 1 to the south, Property 2 contains 4.5693 acres or 199,039 square feet of vacant land. The western boundary of Property 2 follows the Garcia Street right-of-way south, except where Property 3 fronts Garcia Street, and terminates approximately 270 feet south of the Rosary Street and Garcia Street intersection. The eastern boundary of Property 2 is the Onslow Drive right-of-way, which is unimproved as of the effective date of this appraisal. Property 3 is a 1.4250 acre or 62,073 square feet tract of land improved with a freestanding office building of 9,309 square feet, bounded to the west by Garcia Street and by Property 2 to the north, south, and east.

ix. The Convent property and surrounding land

Preliminary discussions have taken place with a tax credit development firm concerning potential redevelopment of the historic convent property, two multifamily buildings, an abandoned former school building and 2.4 acres of vacant land. The property is located at 210 S Grimes and is bordered by Montana, Rio Grande, and the Springview Senior Public Housing Development.

x. 440 Labor Street

The property contains a 12,100 sf single story building located on 1.3 acres of land. The property is currently occupied by a day care facility.

XI. Choice Planning and Action Grant Application

In the event of a successful award of a Choice Planning Grant for Alazan Courts staff will coordinate the planning grant requirement efforts in the forthcoming 24-36 month planning period for the Transformation Plan for implementation for this property.

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

A. Housing Stock Information

As detailed in the tables below, during plan year 2016-17 SAHA anticipates adding 71 and removing 87 Public Housing units.

SAHA anticipates project-basing eight (8) new housing choice vouchers in FY2017. Thirty-one (31) vouchers project-based two years ago remain at San Juan. If opportunities to project-base housing choice vouchers at additional properties do arise during FY2017, SAHA will report on any actions taken in a subsequent MTW Report. No other housing stock changes are anticipated during the 2016-17 fiscal year. Further details are provided below.

Wheatley / East Meadows Choice Neighborhood Initiative

The San Antonio Housing Authority was awarded a \$29.7 million Choice Neighborhood Implementation grant on December 13, 2012 for the revitalization of Wheatley Courts and the surrounding neighborhood. The housing redevelopment plan is to demolish Wheatley Courts, a 246-unit obsolete, inefficient, inaccessible, and unsafe public housing site, into a 412-unit, high quality, mixed-income community. The revitalization plan will result in one-for-one replacement of the public housing units and will ensure long-term affordability in a diverse, mixed-income community.

The first on-site phase, which was awarded a 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits on July 30, 2014, will include 215 mixed income family units on three and one half blocks consisting of one, two, three and four bedroom garden apartments, and two, three and four bedroom townhouse apartments with related exterior site amenities. This phase will also include a BiblioTech, a digital library, for the residents and community to use. The second on-site phase, which also received a 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credit on September 14, 2015 will include a 3 story, 80 unit apartment complex with affordable units for seniors with incomes that are 30% to 60% of AMI. The third on-site phase, for which a 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credit is being sought, will include 117 multi-family units consisting of one, two, three and four bedroom garden apartments, and two and three bedroom townhouse apartments with related exterior site amenities.

The types of units provided by this project include:

- Wheatley Courts Phase I (Wheatley Courts CNI Phase II) 215 units:
 - Market rate: 59
 - Tax Credit only 60% or below: 77
 - Tax Credit PBV: 8
 - Tax Credit HOME: 0
 - Tax Credit PHU: 71

- Wheatley Courts Phase II(Wheatley Courts CNI Phase III) 80 units:
 - Market rate: 0
 - Tax Credit only 60% or below: 4
 - Tax Credit PBV: 28
 - Tax Credit HOME: 0
 - Tax Credit PHU: 48
- Wheatley Courts Phase III (Wheatley Courts CNI Phase IV) 117 units:
 - Market Rate: 29
 - Tax Credit only 60% or below: 46
 - Tax Credit PBV: 8
 - Tax Credit HOME: 0
 - Tax Credit PHU: 34

The total number units at the property, by Phase, are:

- 208 Units The Park at Sutton Oaks (Wheatley Courts CNI Phase I)
- Wheatley Courts Phase I = 215 Units (Wheatley Courts CNI Phase II)
- Wheatley Courts Phase II = 80 Units (Wheatley Courts CNI Phase III)
- Wheatley Courts Phase III= 117 (Wheatley Courts CNI Phase IV)

Wheatley Courts is located in San Antonio's eastside neighborhood. There are several revitalization efforts underway in this area. Collectively, these initiatives are coordinated by the EastPoint Coordinating Committee, chaired by Mayor Ivy Taylor. EastPoint encompasses three program areas: 1) the Wheatley Courts Choice Neighborhood, 2) the EastPoint Promise Zone, and 3) the Eastside Promise Neighborhood.

EastPoint is the only area in the United States to receive awards for three separate Federal programs under the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (NRI): it is a HUD Choice Implementation Neighborhood, a Department of Education Promise Neighborhood, and a Department of Justice Byrne grantee. The Choice Neighborhoods Initiative is a central part of the NRI, an interagency partnership between HUD and the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Justice, and Treasury to support locally driven solutions for transforming distressed neighborhoods. The NRI acknowledges the interconnectedness of many factors in revitalization, including housing, education, adequate infrastructure, economic development, and safety, and promotes breaking the Federal government "red tape" to coordinate revitalization efforts locally. The CNI funds received are one of the initial investments in the area and an early step toward revitalization.

By coupling the many NRI initiatives with local support, the City of San Antonio is orchestrating a collaborative effort aimed at de-concentrating poverty and improving the opportunities for individuals living in the eastside of San Antonio.

Supportive services being offered include:

- Intensive Case Management
- Employment & Skills Training
- Adult Education
- Children and Youth Programs
- Health Services
- Safety Program
- Re-entry services for residents on probation

Victoria Commons Chavez Multifamily

Victoria Commons is the redevelopment of the former 660-unit Victoria Courts Public Housing Development. Previous completed phases include the 210-unit mixed-income multifamily Refugio Apartments; the 245-unit mixed-income multifamily HemisView Village Apartments, the 120-unit for sale Artisan Park Townhomes (22 units completed, 98 planned for sale townhome lots), and the planned 26 single family lots for sale Leigh Street Homes. The final phase currently known as Victoria Commons Chavez Multifamily will be a 215-unit mixed-income mixed-use multifamily development.

The Victoria Commons Chavez Multifamily project will include:

- 133 market units
- 43 units at or below 60% AMI
- 28 public housing units and 11 PBV

The total number units at the property will be 215.

Victoria Commons Chavez Multifamily will be the final phase of redevelopment of the former Victoria Courts that had 660 Public Housing units. It is located in the highly desirable Lavaca Neighborhood where the real estate market has been identified as one of the hottest in the country in previous national articles. The site is part of a primarily single family residential neighborhood close to many amenities and downtown.

The final phase project will include a full time property management staff and offer supportive services for affordable residents that include after school activities, weekly exercise classes, twice a month on-site social events (i.e. potluck dinners, game night, movie nights, birthday parties, etc.) , annual income tax preparation, monthly food pantry/ common household items, annual health fairs, quarterly health and nutrition courses.

B. General Description of All Planned Capital Expenditures During the Plan Year

During the plan year (7/1/16 to 6/30/17), SAHA Plans to invest approximately \$20,179,484 of MTW funds and reserves in capital repairs, replacements and/or architectural services on public housing properties. These investments will extend the useful life expectancy and preservation of the agency's public housing inventory. The following planned projects are in various stages of scope development and implementation.

| Property Name | Budgeted Expenditure |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| H.B. Gonzalez | \$1,500,000 |
| Charles Andrews | \$2,879,484 |
| Westway Apartments | \$1,700,0000 |
| Blanco Apartments | \$400,000 |
| W.C. White Apartments | \$400,000 |
| Villa Tranchese | \$150,000 |
| Fair Avenue | \$150,000 |
| Victoria Plaza | \$13,000,000 |

C. Leasing Information

As detailed in the tables in Section D below, SAHA plans to serve **18,824 MTW households** in fiscal year 2016-17, through both public housing and MTW Housing Choice Vouchers.

SAHA has not been out of compliance with any of the required statutory MTW requirements.

SAHA does not anticipate any issues related to leasing Public Housing or Housing Choice Vouchers.

D. Waiting List Information

As detailed in the tables in Section D below, SAHA has 68,394 households on five waiting lists. Those lists will stay open during the plan year.

E. Tables from 50900

Form 50900: Elements for the Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report

Attachment B

(II) General Housing Authority Operating Information

Annual MTW Plan

II.1.Plan.Housing Stock

A. MTW Plan: Housing Stock Information

Planned New Public Housing Units to be Added During the Fiscal Year

| AMP Name and Number | Bedroom Size | | | | | | | Total Units | Populati on Type * | # of UFAS Units | |
|------------------------|--------------|---|--------|--------|---|---|--------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 + | | | Fully Accessi ble | Adaptab le |
| TX006000058 | 0 | 3 | 2 5 | 3 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 71 | Gen | 4 | 0 |
| n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 0 | 0 |
| n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 0 | 0 |
| n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 0 | 0 |

Total Public Housing Units to be Added**71**

* **Select Population Type from:** Elderly, Disabled, General, Elderly/Disabled, Other

If Other, please describe: **n/a**

Planned Public Housing Units to be Removed During the Fiscal Year

**PIC Dev. # / AMP
and PIC Dev.
Name**

**Number of
Units to be
Removed**

Explanation for Removal

TX006000036 /
BLUERIDGE/VF/SF
/PALM LAKE*

*Note that HUD
central office has
agreed to resolve
the AMP # issues
associated with
these units)

70

These units were part of litigation settlement between SAHA and KB Homes. The homes were not built properly and SAHA received numerous complaints from new homebuyers. SAHA sued and a settlement was reached approximately 3 years ago. SAHA is using the litigation to redevelop the 4 neighborhoods and specifically the 88 units that remained unsold or were bought back from home buyers by SAHA. Some homebuyers decided to keep their house and join SAHA in the litigation efforts. Those separate homeowners received a litigation settlement also. SAHA has submitted a Redevelopment Plan for all for neighborhoods and 88 units to either demolish and rebuild or substantially rehabilitate the units. HUD recently approved SAHA's expending funds to demolish units in the Blueridge neighborhood. Meanwhile, full approval of the redevelopment plan is expected by May 1, 2016.

TX006000050 /
DISPOSED OF
LAND/REMOVED
FROM
INVENTORY
(*Note that HUD
central office has
agreed to resolve
the AMP # issues
associated with
these units)

17

These units were part of litigation settlement between SAHA and KB Homes. The homes were not built properly and SAHA received numerous complaints from new homebuyers. SAHA sued and a settlement was reached approximately 3 years ago. SAHA is using the litigation to redevelop the 4 neighborhoods and specifically the 88 units that remained unsold or were bought back from home buyers by SAHA. Some homebuyers decided to keep their house and join SAHA in the litigation efforts. Those separate homeowners received a

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| | | litigation settlement also. SAHA has submitted a Redevelopment Plan for all for neighborhoods and 88 units to either demolish and rebuild or substantially rehabilitate the units. HUD recently approved SAHA's expending funds to demolish units in the Blueridge neighborhood. Meanwhile, full approval of the redevelopment plan is expected by May 1, 2016. |
| n/a n/a | 0 | n/a |

**Total Number of
Units to be
Removed**

87

New Housing Choice Vouchers to be Project-Based During the Fiscal Year

| Property Name | Anticipate d Number of New Vouchers to be Project- Based * | Description of Project |
|---|--|---|
| East Meadows (previously Wheatley Courts) | 8 | The first on-site phase, which was awarded a 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits on July 30, 2014, will include 215 mixed income family units on three and one half blocks consisting of one, two, three and four bedroom garden apartments, and two, three and four bedroom townhouse apartments with related exterior site amenities. This phase will also include a BiblioTech, a digital library, for the residents and community to use. |
| n/a | 0 | n/a |
| n/a | 0 | n/a |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| | | |
| n/a | 0 | n/a |

Anticipated Total New Vouchers to be Project-Based

8

Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year

8

Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year

39

*New refers to tenant-based vouchers that are being project-based for the first time. The count should only include agreements in which a HAP agreement will be in place by the end of the year.

Other Changes to the Housing Stock Anticipated During the Fiscal Year

n/a

n/a

n/a

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 All Planned Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

During the plan year (7/1/16 to 6/30/17), SAHA Plans to invest approximately \$20,179,484 of Capital Fund Program (CFP) grants combined with Move to Work (MTW) funds in capital repairs, replacements and/or architectural services. These investments will extend the useful life expectancy and preservation of the agency's public housing inventory, and include the following projects:

H.B. Gonzalez (\$1,500,000): Foundation-Structural repairs, stormwater-crawlspace repairs and improvements, exterior wall and foundation repairs, interior dwelling repairs and upgrades, site improvements.

Charles Andrews (\$2,879,484): Substantial Renovation: roof replacement, paint facade, upgrade/replace HVAC components, parking lot and sidewalk repairs, unit upgrades (kitchens/bath), fencing/landscaping upgrades.

Westway Apartments (\$1,700,000): Drainage improvements, replacement of sewer lines, solar lighting improvements.

Blanco Apartments (\$400,000): Basement - Maintenance area, repair distressed columns, foundation structural repairs, crawlspace repairs and improvements, exterior structural repairs, site improvements.

W.C. White Apartments (\$400,000): Basement - Maintenance area, repair distressed columns, foundation structural repairs, crawlspace repairs and improvements, exterior structural repairs, site improvements.

Villa Tranchese (\$150,000): Architectural - Engineering services for fire sprinkler system upgrades and improvements.

Fair Avenue Apartments (\$150,000): Architectural - Engineering services for fire sprinkler system upgrades and improvements.

Victoria Plaza (\$13,000,000): Comprehensive Modernization: electrical panel and service upgrades, plumbing upgrades (including installation of fire sprinkler system), replacement of HVAC systems, unit interior upgrades, climate conditioning of elevator landings, facade upgrades.

II.2.Plan.Leasing

B. MTW Plan: Leasing Information

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

| MTW Households to be Served Through: | Planned Number of Households to be Served* | Planned Number of Unit Months Occupied / Leased** * |
|---|--|--|
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units to be Leased | 6,066 | 72,792 |
| Federal MTW Voucher (HCV) Units to be Utilized | 12,758 | 153,100 |
| Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Property-Based Assistance Programs ** | n/a | n/a |
| Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ** | n/a | n/a |
| Total Households Projected to be Served | 18,824 | 225,892 |

* Calculated by dividing the planned 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 to be served, the PHA should estimate the number of households to be served.

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

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements

If the PHA has been out of compliance with any of the required statutory MTW requirements listed in Section II(C) of the Standard MTW Agreement, the PHA will provide a narrative discussion and a plan as to how it will return to compliance. If the PHA is currently in compliance, no discussion or reporting is necessary.

n/a

Description of any Anticipated Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers and/or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Possible Solutions

| Housing Program | Description of Anticipated Leasing Issues and Possible Solutions |
|-----------------|--|
| Public Housing | None |
| HCV | None at this time. Our plan is to continue to lease up to our MTW baseline plus additional vouchers to fully utilized our HAP dollars. |
| n/a | n/a |

II.3.Plan.WaitList

C. MTW Plan: Wait List Information

Wait List Information Projected for the Beginning of the Fiscal Year

| Housing Program(s) * | Wait List Type** | Number of Households on Wait List | Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed | Are There Plans to Open the Wait List During |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|

*** the
Fiscal
Year

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------|--------|--------------|
| Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program | Community-Wide | 19,160 | Open | Remains Open |
| Public Housing | Site-Based | 21,439 | Open | Remains Open |
| Project-Based Local (Springhill) | Site-Based | 15,570 | Open | Remains Open |
| Wheatley Choice Neighborhood | Site-Based | 0 | Closed | Yes |
| Project-Based Local (Gardens San Juan) | Site-Based | 12,225 | Open | Remains Open |

Rows for additional waiting lists may be added, if needed.

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

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

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

n/a

n/a

n/a

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

n/a

n/a

n/a

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

n/a

n/a

n/a

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

A site-based waiting list will be utilized for subsidized units in the new Wheatley Family I development. This means that applicants may apply only at the Wheatley Family I property and this waiting list will be used only for that property.

III. Proposed MTW Activities

A. FY2017-1: Time-limited Working Household Referral Program

This activity is designed to achieve the MTW statutory objective to give incentives that promote self-sufficiency, by providing working households in need of short-term housing assistance an opportunity to quickly access public housing units. This activity seeks to provide targeted assistance to a subset of households that 1) are working, and 2) would benefit from a period of increased housing stability to complete education/training, increase savings, or accomplish another self-sufficiency goal. These households will benefit from accelerated access to housing units, and, due to the time limit on the housing assistance, will transition out within 5 years. By focusing on households that have already started on the path to self-sufficiency, this activity should accelerate the number of households that actually transition to self-sufficiency during the period they receive housing assistance.

1. Overview

This activity provides time-limited public housing assistance to working households referred to SAHA by Workforce Solutions Alamo (WSA). Households referred to SAHA by WSA will receive five years of public housing assistance. If, at the end of five years, a hardship exists, two additional years of assistance are made available.

Upon starting housing assistance, participating households are required to enroll and participate in a SAHA self-sufficiency program such as Jobs-Plus or FSS.

Households will typically use the conventional public housing rent structure and biennial recertification schedule (per MTW Activity FY2014-4). However, both structure and schedule will be affected by the requirements of the self-sufficiency program selected by the household. For example, those enrolled in FSS will make use of an escrow account. Those in Jobs-Plus will have the option to establish an Earned Income Disregard (EID). For households living in Cassiano, the new Cassiano Jobs-Plus program will require an EID.

The total number of households to be served under this activity is currently capped at 200, and will be pulled in at a rate of 25 per quarter. Over 20,000 households are currently on the public housing waitlist. The 200 time-limited households represent 1% of that waitlist. As a result, providing these households with housing assistance will have a very limited impact on other households currently on the waitlist, especially at the draw rate of 25 per quarter. Additionally, it is expected that the time-limited units will turn over faster than standard units, creating more housing opportunities in the long run.

However, SAHA is taking steps to minimize any short-term negative impacts to non-participants. SAHA will reach out to households currently in waitlist pools whose applications indicate that they are working to notify them of the opportunity provided by this new program. Also, properties with extremely long wait times are being made unavailable to time-limited households, in order to not extend the already long wait times even longer.

2. Previous Pilot

Previously, a pilot project (MTW Activity FY2013-1) was approved as part of the FY2013 MTW Plan. The pilot ended in FY2016. FY2013-1 is now closed out and is replaced with this activity, FY2017-1. This activity builds on the lessons learned from the pilot. Some of those lessons included:

- The pilot activity relied on applicants self-identifying as working households during the application process. A wait list preference was provided to these applicants. However, many applicants that selected the working household preference were in fact not actually working. As a result, staff and applicants spent valuable time in initial meetings that did not result in successful placements. This new activity addresses this challenge by removing the preference. In its place, households will be eligible for a time-limited unit if they are referred by a partner workforce agency.
- Pilot households were required to participate in FSS or similar self-sufficiency activity, but did not always do so. Staff identified a number of factors, including: lack of clear communication and immediate follow up on the requirement, pilot households living in elderly communities (where there are no FSS or Jobs-Plus staff), and the novelty of the requirement (for both staff and applicants). The new activity addresses these factors by partnering closely with workforce partners who will assist in communication, as well as increased understanding of what training areas need to be emphasized.

Activity elements that remain consistent with the pilot include:

- Working households who participate in this activity will receive five years of housing assistance, with a two-year extension if needed based on hardship.
- Hardship policies mirror FSS practices and policies: SAHA can extend the term of the assistance up to 2 years if the family provides a written request for an extension and SAHA finds that good cause exists for the extension.
- FSS or Jobs-Plus participation is required -- each FSS and Jobs-Plus family receives case management services from a Case Manager who maintains close communication with the family and works with them to develop individualized plans. These plans establish specific interim and final goals to measure the family's progress toward fulfilling its obligations and becoming self-sufficient.

Changes and new elements that will be incorporated into the MTW Activity to improve program outcomes include:

- The pilot had been oriented to increasing housing choice and self-sufficiency. Now that this activity is referral-driven (instead of wait list preference-driven), the rationale for increasing housing choice by decreasing wait list time is no longer applicable. Instead, the activity will be focused solely on self-sufficiency.
- Households that participated in the previous pilot and remain in good standing will be rolled over automatically into the new program, and their time spent in the pilot will not count against the five-year time limit (the “clock is reset”). These households will sign a new lease addendum specifying the new terms of their lease as early as October, pending final approval of this MTW Plan.
- SAHA and WSA staff are developing a branding and communication strategy regarding the referral program
- SAHA staff will increase messaging of requirements and time limits backed up with strong written policies and procedures
- CDI and PH staff will coordinate activities using a master tracking worksheet, that tracks the following:
 - Specific instances when the 5-year term limit is being communicated to participating households
 - If the family refuses to participate in FSS, CDI will inform PH staff, who will initiate eviction proceedings
 - Whether the household is meeting the financial counseling requirement
 - Household cohorts
 - New strategies employed as part of the Individual Plan development (for example, it was discussed that the goals should be focused on how much money it will take for the household to be able to pay flat rent by their 5th year)
 - Hardship tracking process, including all hardships requested
 - Improve methods to ensure families are complying with the rules of the pilot (including retaining employment throughout)
 - Develop a procedure for households moving to section 8

3. Metrics and Data Sources

For the most part, the metrics of this activity remain the same as the pilot activity. The most significant change is the proposal to track metrics by annual cohorts. Each year, a new cohort will be added to the tracking tables below, allowing for comparisons between groups that started in different years. These cohorts will be tracked as SAHA metrics, in addition to the HUD Standard Metrics that establish annual, activity-wide benchmarks and outcomes.

One metric is to be removed: the SAHA metric for “Average Years of participation”. Staff felt that this figure provided little information that was programmatically useful, and that the other metrics being tracked provided better feedback regarding program performance.

Metric data will be compiled from internal databases (primarily Elite and TAAG systems) as well as periodic staff reports.

4. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i> | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$0.00 | XXX |

| <i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</i> | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Average income of participating households (Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars). | \$12,500: Median earned income of households rolling over from pilot program | \$4700 annual increment leading to target established by Income Report analysis of median household income at time of self-sufficiency exit (\$36,000) |
| | | \$17,200 |

| 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 |
| (6) Other (Heads and co-heads with any Earned Income) | Number of heads of households and co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity. | Expected number of heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. |
| | 18 | 23 |
| (6) Other (Heads and co-heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity. | Expected percentage of total work-able households with heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. |
| | 75% (18 out of 23) | 100% |

| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 0 | 0 |

| SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of qualified households referred by partners and accepted by SAHA to participate (Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency) | 23 (# of households continuing from pilot) | 100 (up to 200 households will participate at a time; participation will ramp up to 200 by year 2) |

| <i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i> | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$283.17 | \$283.17 |

| <i>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i> | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$160.92 | \$160.92 |

| <i>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i> | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 0 | 1 |

| HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 12 months | 2 months |

5. SAHA Metrics

| Increase in Household Income, by cohort | | |
|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Average income of participating households (Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Cohort 1)). | \$12,500: Median earned income of households rolling over from pilot program | \$4700 annual increment leading to target established by Income Report analysis of median household income at time of self-sufficiency exit (\$36,000) |
| | | \$17,200 |

| Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status, by cohort | | |
|--|--|---|
| <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 |
| (6) Other (Heads and co-heads with any Earned Income) | Number of heads of households and co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity.(Cohort 1) | Expected number of heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. |
| | 18 | 23 |
| (6) Other (Heads | Percentage of total work-able | Expected percentage of total work- |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| and co-heads with any Earned Income) | households with heads or co-heads with earned income prior to implementation of activity. (Cohort 1) | able households with heads or co-heads with earned income after implementation of the activity. |
| | 75% (18 out of 23) | 100% |

| <i>Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency, by cohort</i> | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of qualified households referred by partners and accepted by SAHA to participate (Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Cohort 1)) | 23 (# of households continuing from pilot) | 100 (up to 200 households will participate at a time; participation will ramp up to 200 by year 2) |

| <i>Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency, by cohort</i> | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (Cohort 1). | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 0 | 1 |

| <i>Hardship Rate, by cohort</i> | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Rate of hardship requests. All types of hardships are counted, including but not limited to requests at the end of the five-year term. (Cohort 1) | 0 | 0.05 |

6. Authorizations

This activity requires waivers to provide time-limited housing assistance in partnership with local community-based organizations and government agencies, as authorized in MTW Agreement Attachment C, Section B(4) (Transitional/Conditional Housing Program), Section C(2) (Local Preferences and Admission and Continued Occupancy Policies and Procedures), Section C(5) (Use of Public Housing as an Incentive for Economic Progress), and Section C(11) (Rent Policies and Term Limits).

B. FY2017-2: Restorative Housing Pilot Program

This activity is designed to achieve the MTW statutory objective to give incentives that promote self-sufficiency, through resident services initiatives that provide eligible probationers and their families a public housing preference. This activity identifies a population of underserved residents – probationers – who currently face challenges securing stable housing. By providing a public housing preference, these households can more quickly establish a solid foundation from which to undertake subsequent reintegration and self-sufficiency goals

This activity is a two-year pilot program that will allow for up to 50 adult probationers who are reporting as part of the “Resurgence Collaborative” reentry initiative to have preference for housing on SAHA public housing properties. Probationers will be selected for application into the pilot by the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD). Probationers in the pilot will receive dual case management support from the SAHA FSS Program and their Community Supervision Officer (CSO). The two-year term of the pilot program does not restrict how long residents will be able to continue to receive housing assistance.

The total number of households to be served under this activity is currently capped at 50. Over 20,000 households are currently on the public housing waitlist. Providing probationers and their households with housing assistance will have a very limited impact on other households currently on the waitlist.

Households will typically use the conventional public housing rent structure and biennial recertification schedule (per MTW Activity FY2014-4). However, both structure and schedule will be affected by the requirements of the self-sufficiency program selected by the household. For example, those enrolled in FSS will make use of an escrow account. Those in Jobs-Plus will have the option to establish an Earned Income Disregard (EID). For households living in Cassiano, the new Cassiano Jobs-Plus program will require an EID.

1. Target Population

Bexar County CSCD will select eligible probationers for the pilot based on the Texas Risk Assessment System (TRAS) in order to identify probationers with high housing “needs” and a relatively low risk of reoffending. Probationers identified with a high housing need and low risk will be screened by their CSO for SAHA’s income requirements and disability status to determine their eligibility for SAHA assistance. If the probationer meets SAHA’s income requirements they will be offered to apply for the Pilot via the Referral Form. The probationer’s total criminal history will be taken into account for these risk assessments.

2. Criminal History Review

Probationers will be selected for application to the pilot by the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections. Only Bexar County adult probationers currently serving a probation sentence for an allowable offense (Class B misdemeanor, nonviolent Class A misdemeanor, lowest-level controlled substance possession offense, or a first-time burglary offense) will be eligible for the pilot program. Probationers concurrently serving three or more separate probation sentences for allowable offenses or a single probation term for three or more allowable offenses will be ineligible for the Pilot. An exemption to current SAHA Screening and Eviction Guidelines will be required to allow some participants in the Pilot population to avoid automatic denial.

Probationers with a criminal history that includes narcotics distribution, violent felonies, or multiple burglary offenses at any time will be ineligible. Probationers with any allowable offenses within the past five years for which they are not currently serving a probation sentence for will also be ineligible unless the probationer successfully completed a probation sentence(s) for the offense(s) in question. Federal bans on sex offenders and persons convicted of drug manufacturing on federal property remain. In addition, people previously evicted from federally-assisted housing or who have committed crimes on SAHA property in the past will be ineligible for the Pilot.

3. Dual Case Management

Probationers selected for the pilot will be dual-case managed by a SAHA FSS Case Worker and their CSO. FSS will attempt to use only one or two case managers for the Pilot population as will the Bexar County CSCD. Selected probationers must be willing to engage in FSS case management for up to 5 years and if they unilaterally terminate case management they may be evicted. Selected probationers in the Pilot will receive a FSS case manager upon entering public housing, and the FSS case manager's role will be to supervise and motivate clients in conjunction with the CSO. Bexar County CSOs will have the final say on what court-ordered services must be completed and in what order, though the FSS case manager and CSO should coordinate and jointly agree on non-court ordered services and supervision. Selected probationers will be required to report to a CSO at the Barbara Jordan Center location in order to utilize services at the Resurgence Collaborative.

The SAHA FSS Case Manager would work to be present and present materials at SAHA-based hearings related to a Pilot participant; the Bexar County CSO would handle criminal and court-related matters pertaining to offenses probationers in the Pilot may commit. Both case managers should coordinate efforts and meet on at least a monthly basis to review problem cases and problem-solve.

The FSS Case Managers will also coordinate with property managers to address problems as needed. Scheduled meetings with clients do not have to be attended by both managers but efforts

and communication should be coordinated so as not to confuse or mislead clients. SAHA will track the results of this Pilot with Bexar County CSCD through the FSS program.

4. Pilot Requirements

The probationers must also stay in good standing with their probation requirements (including substance monitoring and home inspections). Probationers rearrested for violations of their current probation or new criminal offenses may be swiftly evicted from public housing and removed from the lease if determined by their CSO and SAHA. Family members would not be subjected to eviction if another adult in the household is capable of taking over the lease, unless otherwise determined by SAHA and the Bexar County CSCD.

Pilot Probationers who must go to residential drug treatment will not forfeit their public housing unit provided they have other immediate family members already living in the unit and capable of maintaining the lease. Probationers exiting residential drug treatment would still be able to apply to the pilot, if all other eligibility requirements being met. An MOU will be created for the Pilot to share information between SAHA and the Bexar County CSCD. In addition to the MOU the participating probationers will be required to sign a release of information form in order for the CSCD to share any of case specific information (i.e. drug tests) with the SAHA case manager.

Probationers who are evicted due to an arrest or violation will be ineligible to apply for the Pilot in the future. Evicted probationers' spots in the Pilot will be recycled into the population cap for each pilot program. The same will apply for those probationers who leave public housing either voluntarily or through increased self-sufficiency. Individuals who finish their probation requirements may still be required to meet with a FSS case manager, and their spot will be recycled into the Pilot population cap.

Probationers will be required to obtain services at the "Resurgence Collaborative" at the Barbara Jordan Center determined by their FSS case manager and CSO. Services not provided at the Resurgence Collaborative may be completed through FSS/Probation's existing network of services providers. In addition, the FSS case manager will work to engage family members in services offered at the Resurgence Collaborative to build self-sufficiency in the entire family.

5. Pilot Logistics

Up to 50 probationers reporting as part of the "Resurgence Collaborative" reentry initiative and their immediate families will be allowed prioritized access to public housing at SAHA properties over a two-year period. The population cap of 50 will include both probationers coming into new public housing units with their families and probationers who are being allowed to move in with immediate family members that are already living in public housing properties.

Probationers selected for the Pilot will be given a signed referral from their CSO to present to SAHA staff at the Unified Application Center. The Referral Form will be created specifically for this Pilot and will be based on similar referrals for other SAHA special populations/projects. If probationers apply to the Pilot and their term of probation expires before a spot in the Pilot becomes open, their Referral will expire and they will have to reapply to obtain SAHA housing assistance. Probationers who commit a crime after being accepted into the Pilot but before moving into their unit will be removed from the Pilot.

6. Outcomes

According to 2012 Byrne CJI Grant Implementation Plan Data collected by Trinity University, the Choice Neighborhood footprint (location of the Resurgence Collaborative), offenders in the footprint have higher rates of recidivism (re-arrests) and a higher arrest rate. The number of people per ZIP code on probation in the footprint is twice that compared to other ZIP codes in Bexar County. Additionally 52% of probationers who live in these ZIP codes had their probation revoked instead of completed, compared to 41% for Bexar County as a whole. Focus groups conducted by Trinity University with probationers also found that transportation is one of the most significant barriers for probationers. Together this baseline data illustrates that the Choice Neighborhood has a higher percentage of probationers, these probationers struggle with basic needs such as transportation, and these probationers have their probation revoked or re-offend at a greater rate than Bexar County as a whole.

The program is anticipated to reduce recidivism among probationers. The prioritized access to housing in the Pilot will also allow SAHA to determine the effect of immediate housing on probationers in regards to such measures.

7. Data Sources

Data will be collected from Bexar County CSCD and SAHA sources, including internal databases (Elite, TAAG) and staff reports, and compiled and tracked by SAHA CDI staff.

8. HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$0.00 | \$6475 |

| SS #1: Increase in Household Income | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase) | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase |

| 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 |
| (1) Employed Full- Time | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase |
| (2) Employed Part- Time | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% increase |
| (5) Unemployed | Baseline will be established as clients are admitted into the program | 5% decrease |

| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 0 | 0 |

| SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households assisted by services | 0 | 50 |

| <i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i> | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$283.17 | \$283.17 |

| <i>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i> | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$160.92 | \$160.92 |

| <i>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i> | | |
|--|-----------------|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency. | 0 | 0 (no transitions expected in first year of 2-year pilot program) |

| HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 12 months | 2 months |

9. SAHA Metrics

| Revocation Rate | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Percentage of revocations (probationers with probation revoked) | 52% (average from sample) | 41% or less (average for target zip codes) |

10. Authorizations

This activity requires a waiver to establish a local preference for probationers, as authorized in MTW Agreement Attachment C, Section C(2) (Local Preferences and Admission and Continued Occupancy Policies and Procedures), and Section C(5) (Use of Public Housing as an Incentive for Economic Progress),.

IV. Approved MTW Activities

A. Implemented Activities

1. FY2011-1e: Preservation and Expansion of Affordable Housing

This activity is designed to increase housing choices, and was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year.

Under SAHA's broader uses of funds authority, Attachment D, the agency can use MTW funding for local, non-traditional units providing that the activities meet the requirement of the MTW statute. While SAHA has had the authority to utilize this flexibility since 2011, the Agency has not utilized it for the construction of new units; all past development reported under this activity in past years occurred outside the scope of MTW as it used other funding sources including tax-credits, HOME funding, CDBG, and other local and state funding.

SAHA began utilizing this ability to fund local, non-traditional units in combination with a new flexibility to combine replacement housing factor (RHF) funds with the MTW block grant; the Agency executed an RHF amendment and approved RHF Plan that was approved by HUD in FY2014.

This activity is designed to increase housing choices. It operationalizes the expansion policies adopted in FY2011 by utilizing the local, non-traditional unit authorization under SAHA's broader uses of funds authority and securing the approval to combine RHF funds into the MTW block grant; which requires the Agency to construct new affordable units (defined as units reserved for households with income at or below 80% AMI).

While SAHA may develop new communities with market-rate units in addition to affordable units; this activity does not authorize the use of MTW funds (including RHF funds) for the development of those market-rate units.

It is also important to note that SAHA's flexibility to construct new Section 8 or 9 units is authorized under MTW single-fund flexibility and those outcomes are reported in the sources and uses section of this report (Section V). The only units authorized under this activity FY2011-1e are units reserved for households with income at or below 80% AMI that receive no Section 8 or 9 funding.

This activity was revised for FY2016. Language describing Preservation and Expansion Policy context, background, and process was moved to Appendix 3. While the Preservation and Expansion Policy language can provide a helpful backdrop to the goals of FY2011-1e, it can also distract from the specific use of MTW flexibility. The language in FY2011-1e is now focused on the use of MTW funds to preserve or expand affordable housing units without any Section 8 or Section 9 subsidy. Since no preservation of non-Section 8/9 units is planned for FY2016, the metric "HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved" has been set to a benchmark of 0 (zero).

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics or baselines. FY2017 benchmarks have been updated to reflect latest Wheatley / East Meadows construction schedule.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i> | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of new non-Section 8 or 9 housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box. | 0 | 77 |
| Wheatley CNI Phase 2 | 0 | 77 |

| <i>HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved</i> | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of non-Section 8 or 9 housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box. | 0 | 0 |

2. FY2011-9: Allocate tenant-based voucher set-asides for households referred by non-profit sponsors who provide supportive services

This activity is designed to increase housing choices, and was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year.

SAHA allocates set-aside of tenant-based vouchers for households referred by non-profit sponsors who commit to provide supportive services. The set-aside would be for households with specific priority needs, such as those who are homeless. Current partners are The Center for Health Care Services (CHCS) and San Antonio Metropolitan Ministries (SAMM).

CHCS and SAMM provide a needs assessment of the household in order to qualify and certify them as homeless as defined by HUD. Once the household is determined eligible by CHCS and SAMMs, the household is referred by CHCS/SAMMs to SAHA and placed on the waiting list. When the household is selected from the SAHA waiting list, SAHA processes all referrals in accordance with HUD guidelines and the SAHA Voucher Program Administrative Plan. The household is scheduled for an appointment with SAHA staff to determine eligibility. Once the household is determined eligible they complete documents necessary for processing. One requirement of the program is that CHCS and SAMM provide intensive case management for one year to every household participating in the program. CHCS and SAMM provide reports to SAHA on a quarterly basis.

The set-aside program was implemented in December 2011. Since implementation SAHA has leased up 195 participants of which 31 have terminated the program.

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics, baselines, or benchmarks. FY2017 benchmarks are the same as for FY2016.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice (HCV)</i> | | |
|---|-----------------|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). | 0 | 200 households utilizing committed vouchers |

III. SAHA Metrics

| <i>Maintain Households Served</i> | | |
|--|-----------------|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Percentage of households served that continue to be housed after 2 years | 0 | 90% of households successfully housed after 2 years |

3. FY2013-2: Simplified Earned Income Disregard (SEID) (Public Housing)

This activity is designed to promote self-sufficiency, and increase cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2012-2013 MTW Plan.

This activity expands the number of months for which SEID is available to participants to 60 months, and makes the benefit available continuously during the 60 months, without start/stop. Income is disregarded on a sliding scale based on year of participation:

- During year 1, 100% of earned income is disregarded
- Year 2: 80%
- Year 3: 60%
- Year 4: 40%
- Year 5: 20%

Head, spouse, or co-head of household qualifies entire household (formerly only Head of Household could participate). FSS participants are not eligible for SEID, as the escrow is a statutory regulation of the FSS program. Program does not change for current FSS participants, who may continue to accumulate their escrow.

Starting in FY2016, SAHA required participating households to attend quarterly financial counseling sessions, in order to ensure that families are given all the tools and knowledge necessary to succeed. At the time of the referral, staff schedule an appointment with financial counseling providers such as Family Service Association or the Financial Empowerment Center. Participating households need to attend the counseling sessions within the time to process the change, or within one month of processing. Staff has access to the appointment log, and sign in sheets for financial counseling, and a very good relationship with counseling partners to obtain information on attendance.

For participants who are unable to attend an in-person session, on-line options are provided and monitored by staff.

Jobs-Plus Staff monitor attendance, and follow up with members to ensure they are on track. Should they fail to attend, staff report back to management when a member lapses. A hardship provision allows a grace period for unforeseen circumstances.

One new metric was added in FY2016, "Average length of time participants are employed during 60 months (PH)".

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

Starting in FY2017, a new Jobs-Plus program will be underway at Cassiano Homes. Cassiano residents will not be eligible for the Simplified EID described in this activity, they will utilize the HUD authorized Jobs-Plus Earned Income Disregard (JP-EID). Benchmarks for FY17 have been updated: SS #3 now reflects higher expectations for FY17 based on FY16 performance, while CE #1 and CE #2 now reflect anticipated no-change in cost- or time-savings. Also, SS #5 has been added as a standard metric (previously this had been tracked as a SAHA metric).

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| SS #1: Increase in Household Income (PH) | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). (Amount of Income disregarded (average per year)) | \$11,000 | \$12,100 |

| 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 |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 0 | 100 |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected percentage of total work-able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). |
| | 0 | 100% |

| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 0 | 0 |

| SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency (PH) | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase). | 5 | 200 |

| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency | | |
|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 0 | 0 (will not see transitions until year 5 of implementation) |

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$4884 (200 HOURS * \$24.42) | \$4884 (200 HOURS * \$24.42) |

| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 200 hours | 200 hours |

| CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 13.22% | 10.62% |

| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$130,284 | \$130,284 |

III. SAHA Metrics

| Number of Household Members who take advantage of disregard (average) (PH) | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of Household Members who take advantage of disregard (average) | 1 | 1.5 |

4. FY2013-4: HQS Inspection of SAHA-owned non-profits by SAHA inspectors

This activity is designed to reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2012-2013 MTW Plan. Implementation began on January 1, 2013.

This activity allows SAHA inspectors (instead of third- party contractors) to inspect and perform rent reasonableness assessments for units at properties that are either owned by SAHA under the Agency's non-profit portfolio or owned by a SAHA affiliate under the Agency's partnerships portfolio. At the time of implementation, SAHA's inspections department was equipped to absorb the additional inspections without the need to add additional full-time or part-time equivalent positions.

SAHA estimated that the impact to the agency would be a cost savings of \$55.46 per inspection. This figure was the projected result of replacing 3rd-party contractors with in-house inspectors. At the time of adoption of this activity, the cost of contracting with a 3rd-party to conduct 2,391 inspections annually was \$182,478 per fiscal year. That translated into a cost per inspection of \$76.32. The cost per inspection using SAHA staff was estimated at \$20.86. The net savings per inspection was projected to be \$55.46.

As required by HUD, "CE #2: Staff Time Savings" has been added to this activity. While SAHA recognizes HUD's efforts to standardize metrics across MTW agencies, this metric is not in alignment with the nature of this activity. Agency cost savings in this activity is not the result of staff time savings, but instead of increased efficiency.

In FY 2016, the benchmark was adjusted to reflect the latest SAHA staff cost estimate of \$35.06 per inspection. The baseline was also adjusted to \$42.90, in order to ensure an accurate apples-to-apples analysis. Both figures now exclude benefits in calculating cost.

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics, baselines, or benchmarks. FY2017 benchmarks are the same as for FY2016.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) | Cost of task prior to | Expected cost of task after |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | implementation of the activity (in dollars). | implementation of the activity (in dollars). |
| | 1,758 inspections * \$42.90 = \$75,418 | 1,758 inspections * \$35.06 = \$61,635.48 |

| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 0 | 3,045 inspections x .5 hours = 1,522.5 hours |

5: FY2014-2: Early Engagement

This activity is designed to increase housing choices by providing training to support successful participation in SAHA's assisted housing programs, and was originally approved as part of the FY2013-2014 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year.

This activity establishes a requirement that applicants complete a defined set of courses upon admission to PH or HCV. The courses are designed to provide incoming households with the skills to become successful residents, while establishing clear expectations and minimizing the number of crisis situations over the long term. The curriculum is the product of formal partnerships with other agencies who participate as instructors or advisors in the design and implementation of the courses. Topics include finding the right home/neighborhood, working with landlords, financial literacy, fair housing, safety, upkeep, and sustainability.

Elderly and disabled heads of households are exempt from the requirement, but encouraged to take the courses. Those who successfully complete the courses will receive a certificate. SAHA will communicate to landlords the value of a certified applicant as someone who is better prepared for a successful tenancy.

After an on-hold period of several months during FY2015, this activity resumed in FY2016. The pause in the activity was due to prioritizing lease-up over other considerations. The benchmark for "HC #7: Households assisted by services that increase housing choice" increased from 480 in FY2015 to 700 in FY2016. In the FY2014 MTW Plan, baselines for this activity were set at "44" and "41" for HCV and PH, respectively. In the FY2015 MTW Plan, these baselines were both changed to "0" in error. The FY2016 MTW Plan re-established the correct baselines.

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics or baselines. FY2017 benchmarks have been adjusted for two SAHA metrics related to Negative Program Exits.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</i> | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |

| | | |
|--|------------|------------|
| Number of households participating in early engagement (increase). | (PH + HCV) | (PH + HCV) |
| | 0 | 700 |

III. SAHA Metrics

| <i>Negative Program Exits (HCV)</i> | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households exiting the housing program for a negative reason | 44 | 40 |

| <i>Negative Program Exits (PH)</i> | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households exiting the housing program for a negative reason | 41 | 37 |

6. FY2014-3: Faster Implementation of Payment Standard Decreases (HCV)

This activity is designed to reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2013-2014 MTW Plan.

Typically, when Fair Market Rent (FMR) is reduced and the payment standard is adjusted accordingly, the reduced payment standard is applied at each participant's second regular reexamination. This activity will allow SAHA to apply the lower payment standards at each participant's next reexamination (Move, Interim and/or Annual reexaminations), or as predicated on business need. If the participant's rent portion increases as a result of applying the new payment standard, SAHA will provide the participant a 30-day notice of rental increase.

The per unit cost will be calculated by the total housing assistance payments divided by the total number of units leased each month. The housing assistance payments expense will be obtained from the monthly financial statements and the total units will be obtained from the Unit Month Report.

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics, baselines, or benchmarks.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | 12,621 Annual Average Households Served (FY2014) multiplied by \$551.68 | 12,129 Annual Average Households Served (FY2014) multiplied by \$537.96 |
| | \$6,962,753.28 | \$6,524,916.80 |

7. FY2014-5 – Triennial Reexaminations (HCV)

Statutory Objective: Reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness

Approved/Implemented: FY2014/FY2014 Q3

Description: Prior to this activity, HCV Elderly/Disabled households on a 100% fixed income completed biennial reexamination of their household income and composition. SAHA defines fixed income as Social Security (SS), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and pension. Documentation shows that elderly and disabled participants experience minimal income changes each year; typically, the only change is the result of a cost of living increase from the Social Security Administration (SSA). The inconvenience to the elderly and disabled residents due to these reexaminations may pose a physical burden and result in inefficient use of staff time. This activity allows SAHA to conduct triennial reexaminations for elderly/disabled HCV participant households on a 100% fixed income.

This activity was implemented in January 2014 for households with a reexamination date in May 2014. Every household will have the option of interim reexaminations at any time if there is a change in household composition, reduction in income or an increase in medical expenses.

FY2014 Update: There were 657 triennial reexaminations completed during year 1 of the three-year rolling implementation.

FY2015 Update: There were 3,296 triennial reexaminations completed during year 2 of the three-year rolling implementation.

FY2016 Update: There were 3,087 triennial reexaminations completed during the final year of the three-year rolling implementation. The Agency is estimating the cost prior to the implementation of triennials for 12,000 households was \$253,320. Based on FY2016 outcomes, the Agency estimates the current cost after full implementation is \$65,167; resulting in an estimated cost savings of \$188,153 this year.

FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics, baselines, or benchmarks. SAHA may create its own local form(s) with a different expiration date or other elements to accommodate this activity.

Data Collection: SAHA collects data for this activity using the Agency's housing database system, Elite. Annual time studies are completed to estimate the average time spent on processing.

HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | Baseline average HAS salary (\$21.11) multiplied by 12,000 reexams | Next year's average HAS salary (\$21.11) multiplied by 8,000 reexams |
| | \$253,320/yr | \$168,880/yr |

| CE #2: Staff Time Savings (HCV) | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | # triennials multiplied by 1 hour | # triennials multiplied by 1 hour |
| | 12,000 per year | 8,000 |

| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue(HCV) | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). (Defined as Total HAP Expense) | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). |
| | \$304,222 | \$304,222 |

8. FY2014-4: Biennial Reexaminations (HCV & PH)

This activity is designed to reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2013-2014 MTW Plan. Activity was implemented January 2014 for the May 2014 reexaminations.

This activity establishes a biennial (instead of an annual) schedule for reexaminations, applicable to all non-elderly/non-disabled HCV participant households (approximately 8,500 households). This activity disregards 100% of additional household income for two years therefore SAHA will no longer disregard participant's income using the traditional Earned Income Disregard calculation.

SAHA may initially use random selection methods and tools to select voucher participants in scheduling reexaminations. Half of the HCV participants will be on a two-year reexamination cycle starting in the first year and the remainder will be on a two-year cycle starting in the second year of program implementation. Every family will have the option of interim reexamination at any time if there is a change in family composition, reduction in income or an increase in expenses. All HCV participants, excluding Elderly/Disabled participants on a fixed income, must complete annual reexaminations of their family income and composition. SAHA proposes to conduct biennial reexaminations for all non-elderly/non-disabled HCV participant households (approximately 8,500 households).

Starting in FY2016, SAHA created a local form, using HUD Form-9886 as a starting point, that changed the expiration date from 15 months to 39 months. In the future, SAHA may create its own local form(s) with a different expiration date or other elements to accommodate this activity. Benchmarks for Cost Savings metrics (both HCV and PH) were updated to reflect anticipated changes in average staff salaries.

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics, baselines, or benchmarks. Baseline and benchmark values have been provided this year for metrics that in previous plans were listed as "Values forthcoming".

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV)</i> | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total cost of task in dollars. | Baseline average HAS hourly rate multiplied by 8,500 reexams | Next year's average HAS hourly rate multiplied by 4,250 reexams |
| | \$128,350 per year | \$97,580 |
| <i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings (HCV)</i> | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours. | # of potential biennials multiplied by 1 (# of hours to complete) | # of biennials multiplied by 1 (# of hours to complete) |
| | 8,500 hours per year | 4,250 hours per year |

| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue(HCV) | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$2,243,429 | \$2,243,429 |

| SS #1: Increase in Household Income (HCV) | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$6,735 | \$12,140 |

| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (HCV) | | |
|--|--|--|
| <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 |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Heads of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 4,250 * .51 = 2,168 | 4,250 * .51 = 2,168 |
| (6) Other (Heads | Percentage of total work-able | Expected percentage of total work- |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| with any Earned Income) | households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). |
| | 51% | 51% |

| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (HCV) | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 84 | 84 |

| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency (HCV) | | |
|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 0 | 10 |

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (PH) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Cost reduction on reexamination process | | $(4701 \text{ hours} \times .75 \times \$22.83) + (4701 \text{ hours} \times .25 \times \$36.97)$ |
| | $9,402 \times .75 \times \$21.34 = \$150,479.01$ | |
| | $9,402 \times .25 \times 30.16 = \$70,891.08$ | |
| | \$221,370.09 | \$123,942 |
| CE #2: Staff Time Savings (PH) | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Staff time spent on reexaminations | # Annual Reexams (4,701) * Reexam processing time (2 hours) | $9,402/2 \times 2 \text{ hours}$ |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| | | |
| | 9,402 hours | 4,701 hours |

| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue (PH) | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$10,029,168 | \$10,029,168 |

| SS #1: Increase in Household Income (PH) | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$3001.39 | \$3001.39 |

| SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (PH) | | |
|--|--|--|
| <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 |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Heads of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 0 | 1175 |
| (6) Other (Heads | Percentage of total work-able | Expected percentage of total work- |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| with any Earned Income) | households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | able households in (6) Other (defined as head(s) of households with earned income) after implementation of the activity (percent). |
| | 0 | 22.32% |

| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (PH) | | |
|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 75 | 75 |

| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency (PH) | | |
|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying a flat rent for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | 0 | 0 |

9. FY2014-6: Rent Simplification (HCV)

This activity is designed to reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2013-2014 MTW Plan. Originally scheduled for implementation in July 2014, final implementation was delayed until January 2015.

Note that this activity applies only to HCV participants that are **not** part of FY2015-1 MDRC/HUD Rent Study. If a household is selected to participate in the control or treatment group of the Rent Study, they will be subject only to FY2015-1, and not this activity FY2014-6.

Previously, rent calculation was based on 30% of the participant's adjusted monthly income. This activity lowers the percentage used to calculate rent to 27.5% of monthly gross income for all MTW HCV participants and new admissions, and eliminates deductions (i.e., medical and child care) with minimal impact to the participants' rent portion.

The per unit cost will be calculated by the total housing assistance payments divided by the total number of units leased each month. The housing assistance payments expense will be obtained from the monthly financial statements and the total units will be obtained from the Unit Month Report. SAHA will conduct time studies to verify the number of hours that staff spends calculating tenant rent portion. The quality control score will be obtained from an Access database.

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year. Baseline and benchmark values have been updated for FY17 for CE #1 and #2. Previously, these metrics reflected an inconsistent methodology: CE #1 used per unit costs, and CE #2 used dollar figures. These metrics now include baselines and benchmarks calculated according to methodologies consistent with other CE #1 and #2 metrics.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Avg Staff salary * 1 hour * # of households processed | Avg Staff salary * 0.25 hours * # of households processed |
| | \$21.11 * 2679 = \$56,553.69 | \$14,138.42 |

| CE #2: Staff Time Savings (HCV) | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | 1 hour * # of households processed | 0.25 hours * # of households processed |
| | 2679 hours | 670 hours |

| CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | Quality Control Monthly Score | Quality Control monthly Score |
| | 89% | 95% |

| CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | Values forthcoming | Values forthcoming |

| SS #1: Increase in Household Income | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | Values forthcoming | Values forthcoming |

| 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 |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number). |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | Values forthcoming | Values forthcoming |
| (6) Other (Heads with any Earned Income) | Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent). |
| | Values forthcoming | Values forthcoming |

| SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | | |
|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | Values forthcoming | Values forthcoming |

| SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency | | |
|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (Number of households paying full contract rent (no subsidy) for at least 6 months) after implementation of the activity (number). |
| | Values forthcoming | Values forthcoming |

III. Hardship Policy

Households who experience a rent increase of \$26 or more due to the rent simplification calculation will be granted a hardship exemption and have the household's TTP calculated in accordance with 24 CFR 5.628 (i.e., non-MTW TTP calculation). Participants who are granted a hardship exemption will remain exempt until their rent portion falls below the \$26 threshold. Hardship exemptions under this provision will be verified at each annual and interim recertification.

10. FY2015-1: MDRC / HUD Rent Study

I. Introduction

This activity is designed to promote self-sufficiency, increase cost-effectiveness, and increase housing choices. It was originally approved as part of the FY2014-2015 MTW Plan.

San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) has been selected to participate in a study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to evaluate a Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) alternative rent reform policy (the “Study”). MDRC, a nonprofit and nonpartisan education and social policy research organization, is conducting the Study on behalf of HUD. The Study sets forth alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies that will be implemented at several public housing authorities across the country in order to fully test the policies nationally.

The goals of this alternative rent policy are to:

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

A computer-generated program will randomly select the participants for the Study from the pool of eligible vouchers. The Study Group vouchers will be managed using the proposed policies. The Control Group vouchers will be managed using the existing policies. Eligible participants in both the Study and Control Groups will include only those with vouchers that are administered under the Moving To Work (MTW) Program and not currently utilizing a biennial certification. Non-MTW Vouchers (i.e., Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing, Moderate Rehabilitation, and Shelter Plus Care), Enhanced Vouchers, and HUD Project Based Vouchers are excluded from the Study. Additionally, the Study is focused on work-able populations and will not include Elderly Households; Disabled Households, and households headed by people older than 56 years of age (who will become seniors during the course of the long-term study). Households currently participating in Family Self-sufficiency and Homeownership programs will not be included in the Study. Households that contain a mix of members with an immigration status that is eligible for housing assistance and immigration status that is non-eligible for housing assistance would not be included in the Study.

II. Description of Rent Reform Components

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

- 1) Simplify income determination and rent calculation of the household's Total Tenant Payment (TTP) and subsidy amount by:
 - a) Eliminating deductions and allowances,
 - b) Changing the percent of income from 30% of adjusted income to a maximum of 28% of gross income,
 - c) Ignoring income from assets when the asset value is less than \$25,000, and
 - d) Using retrospective gross income, i.e., 12-month "look-back" period and, in some cases, current/anticipated income in estimating a household's TTP and subsidy.
 - e) Capping the maximum initial rent burden at 40% of current gross monthly income.
- 2) Conduct triennial income recertification rather than annual recertification with provisions for interim recertification and hardship remedies if income decreases.
- 3) Streamline interim certifications to eliminate income review for most household composition changes and moves to new units.
- 4) Require the TTP is the greater of 28% gross monthly income (see #1 above) or the minimum rent of \$100. A portion of the TTP will be paid directly to the landlord.
- 5) Simplify the policy for determining utility allowances.

Additionally, the Study will offer appropriate hardship protections to prevent any Study Group member from being unduly impacted as discussed in Section V below.

A. Description of the Rent Reform Activity

1) Simplified Income Determination and Rent Calculation

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

2) Elimination of Deductions

SAHA proposes a new method of calculation, which eliminates the calculation of deductions and allowances in the determination of annual income.

a) Percent Annual Gross Income.

The Total Tenant Payment (TTP) rent calculation will be determined by establishing gross annual income and then determining the greater of 28% of the gross monthly income or the minimum rent of \$100.

b) Elimination of Income from Assets valued less than \$25,000

SAHA will eliminate the verification and calculation of income earned from household assets valued less than \$25,000. Households would not be required to document assets worth less than that amount. This will reduce administrative costs and simplify the program for greater transparency and program compliance.

c) Review of Retrospective Income.

To establish annual gross income for the three year certification period, SAHA will review the total household income without deductions for the twelve-month period prior to recertification, i.e., the “Retrospective Gross Income.” A household’s annual gross income will depend on its *Retrospective Gross Income* during a 12-month “look back” period.

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

d) Capping the Initial Maximum Rent Burden

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

3) **Triennial Certifications**

SAHA currently performs re-certification of HCV households on an annual basis. The annual certification will review program eligibility, household composition, income and

other household circumstances. Additional re-examinations (“interim certifications”) may be required for changes in the household situation such as: composition, income, and change in unit.

SAHA proposes performing re-certification of the Study Group every third year (triennial). The triennial certification will review program eligibility, household composition, current income and income over the past twelve months (“retrospective income”), unit information and shall set the Total Tenant Portion (TTP) and the household share of the rent. The TTP for the Study Group will remain in effect during the three year certification period, with some exceptions related to decreases in income and changes in household.

Under the alternative rent policy, a household’s annual gross income will be determined using its reported (and verified) *retrospective gross income* during a 12-month “look-back” period. (In this calculation, gross income will exclude any prior income from sources that have expired for the household during that period, such as TANF or Unemployment Insurance benefits, since the household can no longer count on them. It will include imputed welfare income – i.e., any sanctioned portion of a household’s TANF grant). SAHA will create a local form to supplement the HUD form 9886 to provide tenant consent for SAHA to collect information relevant to the triennial recertification period.

If the household has an increase in income between certifications, the household’s TTP will not be re-determined and increased to reflect the higher income. However, if the household has a decrease in income, the household may request and SAHA may provide an interim re-certification or other remedies under the hardship process (see Section V). The interim re-certification will be conducted when a household has a reduction of income of more than 10% from the retrospective gross income.

- a) SAHA interim certification will re-calculate the household TTP based on a new retrospective gross income review to determine the greater of 28% of the retrospective gross income or the minimum rent of \$100. This retrospective gross income will establish the TTP that will remain in effect until the sooner of the next triennial certification; or a tenant requested interim certification. The tenant may only request one interim certification per year. The year period during which only one interim is permitted begins on the effective date of the triennial recertification and ends 12 months later.
- b) At the triennial certification at the beginning of the three-year period (and at subsequent triennials) if a household’s current/anticipated gross income is less than its retrospective gross income by more than 10%, the current income alone will be used to create a “temporary” TTP for a six-month grace period. After that grace period, the TTP will automatically be switched to the TTP amount based on the

previously determined retrospective gross income. No interim recertification interview would be required to reset this TTP.

- c) At the initial triennial certification only, if a household's childcare expense exceeds \$200 per month, the gross income will be reduced by a deduction of reasonable childcare cost above the \$200 per month, to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period. SAHA defines reasonable childcare costs as less than \$3,000 per year for one child and \$6,000 per year for two children. After that grace period, the TTP will automatically be switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined retrospective gross income. No interim recertification interview would be required to reset this TTP.
- d) The Study Group will be allowed one request per year for an interim certification to reset their TTP. The year period during which only one interim is permitted begins on the effective date of the triennial recertification and ends 12 months later. The TTP will only be reset if a household's new retrospective monthly income (at the time of the request) is more than 10% lower than its most recent prior retrospective gross monthly income. If the limit on interim certification presents a hardship, the household will need to apply for a Hardship Exemption (See Section V below).

4) **Streamline Interim Certifications**

SAHA will institute a streamlined interim certification process for the Study Group to report change of circumstance that does not require adjustment in subsidy. For these events, SAHA will not request income information. These events include:

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

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

In the event that the new or removed member requires a change to the voucher bedroom size, SAHA will review the retrospective gross income of the newly added or removed household members, apply a new utility allowance, and will reset the household TTP. A reduction in subsidy for new voucher bedroom size will be implemented when the current lease ends and new lease begins.

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

- b) Change of unit. Households seeking to move to a new unit will submit a request for move pursuant to current procedures. For households that move to more expensive units during three-year period, SAHA will absorb the higher contract rent costs up to the lesser of the gross rent or the payment standard, which is consistent with traditional rent rules. However, unless the request for move is due to a change in household composition, SAHA will not request income information or reset the household TTP until the sooner of the next scheduled triennial certification or tenant requested interim certification to reset TTP. SAHA will apply new utility allowance schedule, if any, to the household at the new lease effective date.
- c) Changes in Utility Allowances. When utility schedules are updated to reflect rate changes, utility allowances, and utility allowance payments (UAPs) will be adjusted only when HAP subsidies or TTPs are recalculated for other reasons. More specifically, updated utility schedules will be applied when households:
 - Change their contract rent,
 - Recertify and the TTP is recalculated during interim or triennial,
 - Move to new units, or
 - Change their household composition requiring a change in voucher size.

5) **Minimum Rent to Owner**

Currently, HUD does not require minimum rents to be paid by the voucher holder to the landlord. SAHA is proposing that Study Group members will be required to make a minimum payment of at least \$100 direct to the HCV landlord in addition to SAHA's portion of rent (Housing Assistance Payment "HAP"). The total amount of rent will equal the contract rent established in the lease. This policy mirrors the market system of tenants paying owners directly and creates a closer relationship and sense of responsibility for both the leaseholder HCV household and the property owner.

The amount of rent to owner the Study Group will pay is equal to their TTP less the Utility Allowance plus any amount over the payment standard for which the tenant may be responsible to pay. The Study Group rent to owner will not be less than the minimum rent. In the event that the Study Group household TTP less the Utility Allowance is less than the minimum rent, the household will pay the Owner the minimum rent and SAHA will reimburse the household the balance of the Utility Allowance. However, if the minimum rent to owner exceeds 40% of the household current/anticipated gross income, the household may request a Hardship Exemption as detailed in Section V below.

6) **Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule.**

Currently, SAHA annually reviews and periodically re-establishes a Utility Allowance Schedule which represents the reasonable expectation of costs for utilities as part of the tenant's lease.

The utility allowance is based on utility surveys and analysis of the type of structure, bedroom size, appliances provided by tenant, and type of appliances (gas/electric). The simplified schedule is based on the analysis of data collected from SAHA's existing HCV portfolio including the most common structure and utility types. This new utility allowance schedule will be implemented upon the triennial certification or change of unit.

SAHA proposes a simplified schedule to reduce administrative costs and reduce errors associated with the traditional method of applying Utility Allowance Schedule. The simplified utility allowance schedule is also anticipated to benefit property owners who will have a more accurate understanding of the total gross rent to be applied to their properties and to the Study Group members who will be able to use this new schedule to clarify gross rent in their selection of housing units.

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

Proposed Flat Utility Allowance

| Bedroom Size | Flat Rate |
|--------------|-----------|
| 0 | \$ 75 |
| 1 | \$ 94 |
| 2 | \$124 |
| 3 | \$174 |
| 4 | \$214 |
| 5 | \$277 |
| 6 | \$290 |
| 7 | \$333 |

III. FY2015 Update

During FY2015, SAHA has worked with HUD and MDRC to lay the groundwork for the implementation of this activity. SAHA has updated the Administrative Plan, updated procedures, trained and prepared the proper staffing of housing specialists and has made modifications to its housing software in order to implement these activities. SAHA has also started to enroll households into the Study and Control Groups.

IV. FY2016 Update

SAHA anticipated that enrollment would continue for several months into FY2016, through January 2016. This means that many of the metrics would need to be evaluated in the context of a half-year of full implementation.

V. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics, baselines, or benchmarks. SAHA may create its own local form(s) with a different expiration date or other elements to accommodate this activity.

VI. HUD Standard Metrics

For purpose of this section, year one represents the first fiscal year where activities are implemented.

| CE #1: Agency Cost Savings | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total cost of task in dollars. | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). |
| Cost per Annual Certification | <u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$12,657.50 <u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$12,657.50 <u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$12,657.50 <u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$37,972.50 | <u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$5,947.50 <u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0 <u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0 <u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$5,947.50 Savings is equal to: \$32,025.00 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Baseline Time to calculate annual certification: 830 hours ● <i>Times</i> average staff wage: \$15.25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Benchmark Time to calculate annual recertification: 390 hours ● <i>Times</i> average staff wage: \$15.25 |
| Cost per Interim Certification | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$6,328.75</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$6,328.75</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$6,328.75</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$18,986.25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Baseline Time to calculate interim certification: 415 hours ● <i>Times</i> average staff wage: \$15.25 | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$2,973.75</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$2,973.75</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$2,973.75</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$8,921.25 Savings is equal to: \$10,065.00</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Benchmark Time to calculate interim recertification: 195 hours ● <i>Times</i> average staff wage: \$15.25 |

| Cost of Rent Calculation | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$5,032.50</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$5,032.50</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$5,032.50</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$15,097.50</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Baseline Time to calculate rent: 330 hours ● <i>Times average staff wage: \$15.25</i> | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$1,982.50</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$1,982.50 Savings is equal to: \$13,115</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Baseline Time to calculate rent: 130 hours ● <i>Times average staff wage: \$15.25</i> |
|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Cost to Determine Income from Assets | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$19.29</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$19.29</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$19.29</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$57.87</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Baseline Time to determine Income from Assets: 1.27 hours ● <i>Times average staff wage: \$15.25</i> | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$2.52</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$2.52 Savings is equal to: \$55.36</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Benchmark Time to determine Income from Assets: 0.17 hours ● <i>Times average staff wage: \$15.25</i> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Cost to Determine utility allowance | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$2,952.50</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$2,952.50</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$2,952.50</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: \$7,777.50</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline Time to determine Utility Allowance: 170 hours • <i>Times</i> average staff wage: \$15.25 | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$1,372.50</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$0</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: \$1,372.50</p> <p>Savings is equal to: \$6,405</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmark Time to determine Utility Allowance: 90 hours • <i>Times</i> average staff wage: \$15.25 |
| | | |

| CE #2: Staff Time Savings | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Time to Complete Annual Certification | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: 830 hours</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: 830</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: 830</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: 2,490 hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Complete Annual Certification (not including 0.66 hours of preparation): 0.83 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 390 hours</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 390 hours</p> <p>Savings is equal to: 2,100 hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Complete Annual Certification (not including 0.66 hours of preparation): 0.39 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 |
| Time To Determine Tenant Rent | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: 330</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: 330</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: 330</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: 990</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Determine Tenant Rent: 0.33 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 130</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 130</p> <p>Savings is equal to: 860</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Determine Tenant Rent: 0.13 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 |
| Time to Determine Utility Allowance | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: 170 hours</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: 170</p> | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 90 hours</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: 170</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: 510</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Determine Utility Allowance: 0.17 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 | <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 90</p> <p>Savings is equal to: 420</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Determine Utility Allowance: 0.09 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 |
|--|---|---|

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
|---|---|---|
| Time to Determine Income from Assets | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Baseline is equal to: 1.27 hours</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Baseline is equal to: 1.27</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Baseline is equal to: 1.27</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Baseline is equal to: 3.8 hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Determine Income from Assets: 0.33 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 • <i>times</i> the estimated proportion of affected participants: 0.0038 (0.38%) | <p><u>YEAR 1:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0.17 hours</p> <p><u>YEAR 2:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> <p><u>YEAR 3:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0</p> <p><u>OVERALL:</u> Benchmark is equal to: 0.17 hours Savings is equal to: 3.63 hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to Determine Income from Assets: 0.33 hours • <i>times</i> the number of study participants: 1000 • <i>times</i> the estimated proportion of affected participants: 0.0005 (0.05%) |

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution

| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
|---|---|---|
| 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). |
| Average Error Rate in Determining TTP | Baseline is equal to: Error rate: 18% | Benchmark is equal to: Error rate: 15% |
| Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance | Baseline is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Error rate In Determining the Utility Allowance is 2% | Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain 2% Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance |

| <i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</i> | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| Average Earned Income of Study Group | Baseline is equal to: The Average Earned Income of Study Group: TBD after random assignment | Benchmark is equal to: The Average Earned Income of Study Group at first triennial recertification : TBD after random assignment |

| <i>SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i> | | |
|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Report the following information separately for each category: | Head(s) of households in in the categories identified below prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected head(s) of households in in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (number). |
| (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other | Percentage of total work-able households in the categories identified below prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero. | Expected percentage of total work-able households in the categories identified below after implementation of the activity (percent). |
| Study Group Employment Status for (1) Employed Full-Time: (2) Employed Part-Time: (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: (5) Unemployed: (6) Other: | Baseline is equal to: The percentage of the Study Group (1) Employed FT: TBD after random assignment (2) Employed PT: TBD after random assignment (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: TBD after random assignment (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: TBD after random assignment (5) Unemployed: TBD after random assignment (6) Other: NA | Benchmark is equal to: The percentage of the Study Group (1) Employed FT: TBD after random assignment (2) Employed PT: TBD after random assignment (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program: TBD after random assignment (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program: TBD after random assignment (5) Unemployed: TBD after random assignment (6) Other: NA |

| <i>SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i> | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| Study Group Households Receiving TANF Benefits | Baseline is equal to: TBD after random assignment | Benchmark is equal to: TBD after random assignment |

| <i>SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-sufficiency</i> | | |
|---|--|--|
| Self-sufficiency: A household in good standing transitions to self-sufficiency when their housing subsidy is reduced to \$0. | | |
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| Study Group Households Receiving Self-sufficiency Services | Baseline is equal to: TBD after random assignment | Benchmark is equal to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same number of Households Receiving Self-sufficiency Services Note: Activity is not designed to impact metric; metric is included for MTW standard metric reporting requirements only. Neutral benchmark (no change expected) has been set. |

| <i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i> | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| Average HCV Subsidy for Study Group | Baseline is equal to: TBD after random assignment | Benchmark is equal to: TBD after random assignment |

| <i>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i> | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| Total HCV Tenant Share for Study Group | Baseline is equal to: TBD after random assignment | Benchmark is equal to: TBD after random assignment |

| HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | <p>0</p> <p>The baseline for this activity is zero because the population selected for the rent reform activities has not been selected at this time.</p> | <p>0</p> <p>The benchmark for this activity is zero, the same as the baseline, because the rent reform activities are not designed to move families into neighborhoods of opportunity as an intended outcome.</p> |

VII. Hardship Policy

SAHA is participating in the Study in order to further the national discussion regarding the future of the Housing Choice Voucher Program. The alternative rent strategies are not intended to create an undue burden on the Study Group members. SAHA has established the following Hardship Policy for Study Group members. Households participating in the Study as part of the Control Group will be subject to the current SAHA policies.

A. Hardship Waiver Request Process.

The process for requesting a waiver will be as follows:

- 1) A household must initiate a request for a hardship waiver, by completing and submitting a written hardship request to Housing Assistant Specialist.
- 2) The household must supply information and documentation that supports a hardship claim with their written request. For example, a household must provide proof of the following: loss of eligibility for a federal state, or local assistance program; loss of employment or reduction in work hours; or the incapacitation or death of an income-earning household member and amount of lost income.

- 3) If a household claims zero income as part of its hardship request, it must provide a detailed accounting of funds used to cover basic costs of living (food, personal/family care necessities, etc.). This information must be provided every 90 days.
- 4) To request hardship based on the risk of eviction for non-payment of rent or utilities, a household must provide a copy of written 10 day notice from the landlord of non-payment of rent and the landlord's intent to terminate the household's tenancy, or a notice from a utilities company warning of a utilities shut-off. Tenant must promptly deliver the 10 day notice from the Landlord well in advance of a scheduled court date for eviction proceedings.

B. Hardship Waiver Criteria

SAHA may determine a financial hardship exists when the household cannot pay the minimum rent or has an excessive rent burden. Households will be considered for a hardship waiver, as discussed below, if:

- 1) The hardship cannot be remedied by the one interim recertification permitted each year (which cannot reduce a household's TTP below the minimum level).
- 5) The household is at an income level or experiences a loss of income and/or a TTP increase such that its total monthly TTP exceeds 40 percent of its current monthly gross income. The gross income will include imputed income in the same manner as current calculations.
- 6) The household faces risk of eviction for non-payment of rent – including utility shut-offs for non-payment of utility bills that could lead to eviction.
- 7) Other circumstances as determined by the housing agency.

C. Hardship Review Process

- 1) The administrative review of the household circumstances will be conducted by SAHA according to current review processes.
- 8) For hardship claims related to imminent risk of eviction, SAHA will conduct an expedited hearing process.
- 9) Where a hardship request is denied, the household may request an independent review or hearing of its case through the housing agency's normal grievance procedures.
- 10) SAHA will complete all information regarding the request for Hardship and the outcome in the system of record for tracking Hardship requests.

D. Hardship Remedies

- 1) The Hardship remedies may include any of the following:
 - a) Allowing an additional interim recertification beyond the normal one-per-year option. This could lower household's TTP (but only as low as the \$100 minimum TTP) until the next triennial recertification.
 - b) Setting the household's TTP at the minimum level for up to 90 days.
 - c) Setting the household's TTP at 28 percent of current income, for up to 180 days.
 - d) Offering a "transfer voucher" to support a move to a more affordable unit (including a unit with lower utility expenses).
 - e) A specific time frame for the temporary TTP or minimum rent may be established for longer than 180 days based on specific circumstances. However, the time frame will never go pass the triennial recertification date.
 - f) Any combination of the above remedies.
- 11) During the period when the TTP is reduced, the housing agency will increase its payment to the landlord to cover the portion of the rent previously paid by the tenant directly to the landlord, and it will notify the landlord of the change and the time period of the increased payments.
- 12) In addition to the remedy or remedies offered, the household may be referred to federal, state or local assistance programs to apply for assistance, or to obtain verification that they are ineligible to receive benefits.
- 13) The Hardship remedies are subject to the following limitations:
 - a) The tenant portion of the rent payments will not be suspended prior to a hardship designation.
 - b) Remedies will not affect any rent attributable to a gross rent that exceeds the applicable payment standard.
 - c) Opting out of the alternative rent policy is not a remedy option.

E. End of Hardship Waiver Period

- 1) If the hardship continues, the household may submit a request for an extension of the hardship remedy. However, the time frame will never go past the triennial recertification date.
- 14) At the end of the hardship waiver period, the household's regular TTP will be reinstated.

VIII. Transition Period

A. Selection of Participants

Study Participants will be randomly selected from the eligible vouchers through a computer generated random selection program. Eligible vouchers will specifically exclude the following:

- 1) Vouchers not currently administered under the Moving to Work Program:
 - a) Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)
 - b) Moderate Rehabilitation
 - c) Shelter Plus Care
- 15) Enhanced Vouchers
- 16) HUD Project Based Vouchers
- 17) Vouchers administered under portability
- 18) Elderly households: Head of Household, co-head, spouse or single member households 62 years or older pursuant to the Administrative Plan
- 19) Households headed by people older than 56 years of age (who will become seniors during the course of the long-term study).
- 20) Disabled households: Head of Household, co-head, spouse or single member households with disability as defined in the Administrative Plan
- 21) Households currently participating in the Family Self-sufficiency Program
- 22) Households participating in the Homeownership Program
- 23) Households that contain a mix of eligible and non-eligible household members would not be included in the Study

B. Enrollment of Study Group members

- 1) Prior to Certification Meeting

Selected Study Group members will receive special information with their recertification package to introduce them to the rent reform policies and to answer household questions. SAHA will conduct the triennial certification at the time otherwise scheduled for the household annual certification.

- 2) During Certification Meeting

At the initial triennial certification, the household will have the changes in rent reform policies explained to them. They will be provided with a gift card as a nominal thank you for providing filling out a base information form.

Changes in the household share, TTP, utility schedule allowance will be provided to the household with no less than 30 days' notice.

3) Mitigation of impact at initial triennial certification

A "grace period" of six months will be provided to mitigate the impact of the transition for the following two cases:

- a) At the triennial certification at the beginning of the three-year period (and at subsequent triennials), if a household's current/anticipated income is less than its retrospective income by more than 10%, the current income alone will be used to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period.
- b) At the initial triennial certification only, if a household's childcare expense is above \$200 per month, the gross income will be reduced by a deduction of reasonable childcare cost above the \$200 to create a "temporary" TTP for a six-month grace period.

After that grace period, the TTP will automatically be switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined average prior income. No interim recertification interview would be required to reset this TTP.

11. FY2015-2: Elderly Admissions Preference at Select Public Housing Sites

This activity is designed to meet the statutory objective of increasing housing choices for low-income families and was originally approved as part of the FY2014-2015 MTW Plan.

This activity establishes a 4-to-1 elderly admissions preference at specific communities in order to increase housing choices for elderly households.

The goal of the activity is to address continuing concerns of elderly residents at specific communities regarding lifestyle conflicts between elderly and non-elderly residents. Property Management's ability to address these conflicts is reduced significantly when the ratio of non-elderly to elderly residents rises above a certain proportion. The 4-to-1 admissions preference is proposed in order to create and maintain an optimal mix of elderly and non-elderly residents in each community.

The idea of an optimal mix is based on research of the reaction to a 1995 Massachusetts law that attempted to limit the percentage of non-elderly disabled tenants living in state-funded elderly housing. In 2002, the Massachusetts Office of Legislative Research provided an update on the success of the 1995 law, which had established optimal proportions of 86.5% elderly and 13.5% non-elderly residents. Housing officials reported that the law had been largely successful in:

- 1) reducing the number of problems that arise from these mixed populations sharing the same housing;
- 2) slowing what had been a sharply increasing rate of non-elderly disabled households moving in, and
- 3) reducing the relatively high percentage of non-elderly disabled tenants in certain projects.

Housing advocates, however, suggested that the optimal proportion should be 80% elderly and 20% non-elderly residents. This MTW activity, FY2015-2, adopts that suggested 80/20 ratio ("4-to-1") both for its admissions preference as well as for its ultimate unit mix.

In practical terms, this activity allows the admission of four elderly applicants from the waiting list before admitting a non-elderly applicant, until such time as an optimal mix of elderly and non-elderly disabled residents is reached for the community. No residents will be required to relocate in order to meet these targets. The agency is not establishing a date by which to achieve the 80/20 target, and will rely solely on the normal resident turnover process to gradually transition the population balance.

When a property reaches its target 4-to-1 ratio of elderly to non-elderly residents, SAHA will start to draw applicants using a 1-to-1 ratio of elderly to non-elderly applicants in order to maintain the overall 4-to-1 balance. Should the mix ever tip in the other direction and start to house elderly residents at a higher ratio than 4-to-1, then SAHA will draw non-elderly disabled residents at a higher rate than elderly residents in order to maintain the overall 4-to-1 balance.

This activity impacts only two public housing communities, and only 85 units over 3-5 years. The impact will be gradual, at a rate of around 20 units per year for both properties. The communities at which this policy will be applied are Fair Avenue and WC White. The following section describes how the activity would work at each community.

I. Fair Avenue

The total number of units at Fair Avenue is 216, making 173 the 80% target for elderly households. Currently, Fair Avenue is home to 110 elderly (62 and over) households. So Fair Avenue needs to add 63 elderly households to meet the 80% target. The turnover rate for Fair Avenue last year was 19.9% (3.5 units per month), or 43 units over the course of the year.

If the turnover rate is the same for this plan year, SAHA expects those 43 available units to be offered to 35 elderly households and 8 non-elderly disabled households. Specifically, the first four available units would be offered to elderly households, and the fifth available unit would then be offered to a non-elderly disabled household. The sixth through ninth units would be offered to elderly households, and the tenth to a non-elderly disabled household. That sequence, repeated through the year in 8 full cycles and 1 partial cycle, is represented in the following table, where “E” represents Elderly Household and “NE” represents Non-elderly Disabled Household.

| Fair Avenue: Admissions cycle and estimated time frame based on turnover rate of 3.5 units per month | E | E | E | E | NE |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 (Jul – Aug) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 (Aug-Sep) | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 (Sep-Oct) | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 4 (Nov-Dec) | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 5 (Dec-Jan) | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| 6 (Jan-Feb) | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |
| 7 (Mar-Apr) | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 |
| 8 (Apr-May) | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 |
| 9 (May-Jun) | 41 | 42 | 43 | | |
| Total admissions at the end of the plan year | 35 | | | | 8 |

Assuming that turnover is proportionally distributed between elderly and non-elderly units, SAHA expects the number of elderly households at Fair Avenue to increase to 123 by the end of the plan year.

| Household Type | Current number of units | Number made available due to turnover (subtract) | Number offered based on admissions preference (add) | Net change | Total number at end of plan year |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--|---|------------|----------------------------------|
| Non-Elderly Disabled | 106 | -21 | +8 | -13 | 93 |
| Elderly | 110 | -22 | +35 | +13 | 123 |

At the net rate of 13 units per year, Fair Avenue will reach the goal of adding 63 elderly households in 4 to 5 years.

The variable that SAHA knows the least about today is how turnover will be distributed between elderly and non-elderly households. This calculation assumes that turnover is proportionally distributed between the household types. As the year progresses and actual data comes in, this assumption can be corrected with a better projection.

II. WC White

The total number of units at WC White is 75, making 60 the 80% target for elderly households. Currently, WC White is home to 38 elderly (62 and over) households. So the community needs to add 22 elderly households to meet the 80% target. The turnover rate for WC White last year was 25.33% (1.6 units per month), or 19 units over the course of the year.

If the turnover rate is the same for this plan year SAHA expects those 19 available units to be offered to 16 elderly households and 3 non-elderly disabled households. Specifically, the first four available units would be offered to elderly households, and the fifth available unit would then be offered to a non-elderly disabled household. The sixth through ninth units would be offered to elderly households, and the tenth to a non-elderly disabled household. That sequence, repeated through the year in 3 full cycles and 1 partial cycle, is represented in the following table, where “E” represents Elderly Household and “NE” represents Non-elderly Disabled Household.

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| WC White: Admissions cycle | E | E | E | E | NE |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| and estimated time frame based on turnover rate of 1.6 units per month | | | | | |
| 1 (Jul – Sep) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 (Oct-Dec) | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 (Jan-Apr) | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 4 (Apr-Jun) | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | |
| Total admissions at the end of the plan year | 16 | | | | 3 |

Assuming that turnover is proportionally distributed between elderly and non-elderly units, SAHA expects the number of elderly households at WC White to increase to 44 by the end of the plan year.

| Household Type | Current number of units | Number made available due to turnover (subtract) | Number offered based on admissions preference (add) | Net change | Total number at end of plan year |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------|---|
| Non-Elderly Disabled | 37 | -9 | +3 | -6 | 31 |
| Elderly | 38 | -10 | +16 | +6 | 44 |

At the net rate of 6 units per year, Fair Avenue will reach the goal of adding 22 elderly households in 3 to 4 years.

The variable that SAHA knows the least about today is how turnover will be distributed between elderly and non-elderly households. This calculation assumes that turnover is proportionally distributed between the household types. As the year progresses and actual data comes in, this assumption can be corrected with a better projection.

III. FY2015 Update

This activity did not begin implementation until November 1, 2014. The agency's priority up to that time was increasing occupancy across the public housing portfolio. Since November, the agency has actually seen a very low rate of elderly household applicants at all properties. As a result, staff

have been challenged with trying to implement the activity while maintaining a high occupancy at Fair and WC White.

IV. FY2016 Update

Benchmarks were updated for FY2016 to reflect the 2nd-year targets of the original model.

V. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year, nor to metrics, baselines, or benchmarks.

VI. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i> | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total number of elderly households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | 148 | 167 |
| At Fair Avenue, number of elderly households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | 110 | 123 |
| At WC White, number of elderly households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | 38 | 44 |

VII. SAHA Metrics

| <i>Elderly Household Percentage</i> | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| At Fair Avenue, percentage of units occupied by elderly households. | 110 of 216 total units (51%) | 136 of 216 total units (63%) |
| At WC White, percentage of units occupied by elderly households. | 38 of 75 total units (51%) | 50 of 75 total units (67%) |

12. FY2015-3: Modified Project Based Vouchers

This activity is designed to meet the statutory objectives of increasing housing choices for low-income families and increasing cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2014-2015 MTW Plan.

This activity modifies the standard Project Based Voucher program in two ways.

First, this activity allows SAHA to commit vouchers to developments in SAHA's new and existing properties. The vouchers increase the number of units that are affordable to households based on their actual ability to pay. For example, a tax credit rent affordable to a 30% AMI household will be affordable to a 4-person household earning \$17,640 or more. However, many households earn much less than that, and a 4-person household earning \$10,000 (typical for SAHA-assisted households) is not able to afford a tax credit rent affordable to a 30% AMI household.

SAHA may commit vouchers to San Juan Homes III, Wheatley Courts, Victoria Commons, or any other SAHA-owned or SAHA-controlled development. This activity applies only to commitment of vouchers to SAHA-owned or controlled units. Any commitment of vouchers to privately-owned developments will be made through a competitive process outside the scope of this activity.

Secondly, this activity also increases cost effectiveness by removing the automatic provision of a tenant-based voucher to a household who wishes to relocate from a unit associated with local project based set aside voucher. The removal of the automatic provision reduces HAP costs, and also stabilizes overall occupancy at the communities where vouchers are committed. Previously, activity FY2011-8 provided a tenant-based voucher to a household after two years in the local project based set aside unit.

I. FY2016 Update

Starting in FY2016, this activity no longer tracked Occupancy (a non-standard SAHA metric). In previous years, project based vouchers were used at Springhill for the sole purpose of increasing occupancy. No project based vouchers were expected to be used at Springhill starting FY2016, so the metric was no longer necessary. In the FY2015 MTW Plan, metrics for Wheatley Courts and Victoria Commons Chavez Multifamily were included in this activity. Due to changing development timelines, they were not included in the FY2016 MTW Plan. Metrics were updated accordingly for FY2016.

SAHA did not anticipate project-basing any new housing choice vouchers in FY2016. Thirty-one (31) vouchers project-based the previous year remained at San Juan.

II. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA expects 8 vouchers to be project-based at East Meadows (formerly Wheatley) in FY17. Thirty-one (31) vouchers project-based two years ago remain at San Juan.

III. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i> | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| # of additional units made affordable to households based on their actual ability to pay (at or below 80% AMI) | 0 | 31 |
| San Juan III (units at or below 60% AMI) | 0 | 31 |
| Wheatley / East Meadows | 0 | 8 |

| <i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i> | | |
|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| San Juan III | # of units * average per unit cost (PUC) * 12 months $31 * \$563.38 * 12 = \$209,577$ | \$0.00 |

| <i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i> | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| San Juan III | # of recertifications after 2 years (due to new biennial recertification schedule) * average staff time per recertification (in hours) $31 * 1.5 = 47 \text{ hours}$ | 0 hours |

IV. SAHA Metrics

| <i>Median household income</i> | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Median income of households living in local project based set-aside voucher units, by income bracket | | |
| 80% AMI | 80% AMI | 75% AMI |
| 60% AMI | 60% AMI | 55% AMI |
| 50% AMI | 50% AMI | 45% AMI |
| 30% AMI | 30% AMI | 25% AMI |

13. FY2015-4: Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule

This activity is designed to meet the statutory objective of increasing cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2014-2015 MTW Plan.

Currently, SAHA annually reviews and periodically re-establishes a Utility Allowance Schedule which represents reasonable utility cost expectations as part of a tenant's lease. The Utility Allowance Schedule is based on utility surveys and analysis of the type of structure, bedroom size, appliances provided by tenant, and type of appliances (gas/electric).

This activity establishes a new, simplified schedule that is based on the analysis of data collected from SAHA's existing HCV portfolio including the most common structure and utility types. The simplified schedule reduces administrative costs associated with the traditional method of applying a Utility Allowance Schedule. Specifically, the activity will allow the HCV department to be more cost effective by reducing staff time spent on calculating multiple utility schedules for 6 different structure types plus various utility types such as gas, electric or propane.

Note that this activity applies only to HCV participants that are **not** part of FY2015-1 MDRC/HUD Rent Study. If a household is selected to participate in the control or treatment group of the Rent Study, they will be subject only to FY2015-1, and not this activity FY2015-4.

The simplified utility allowance schedule is also anticipated to benefit property owners, who will have a more accurate understanding of the total gross rent to be applied to their properties, and to benefit participants, who will be able to use this new schedule to clarify gross rent in their selection of housing units.

The new utility allowance schedule is implemented at the time of recertification, interim or change of unit. The schedule will be applied to the lesser of these two options:

- the actual size of the unit, or
- the size of the voucher.

SAHA will continue to use current market consumption data to determine when adjustments to the simplified schedule are needed (upon change of more than 10% in rates).

Based on current utility rates the simplified schedule is:

| Bedroom Size | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-------------------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Utility cost (\$) | 75 | 94 | 124 | 174 | 214 | 277 | 290 |

I. FY2017 Modifications and Expectations

SAHA does not anticipate any significant or non-significant changes to this activity in the Plan year. Benchmark has been updated for CE# 1 to reflect changing staff costs. Baseline and benchmark values, in previous plans listed as “Values forthcoming”, have been provided this year for CE #5.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i> | | |
|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 0.17 hours multiplied by 11,727 households = 1850 hours multiplied by average staff cost \$15.25 | 0.09 hours multiplied by 10,881 households = 979 hours multiplied by average staff cost \$21.95 |
| | \$28,212.50 | \$21,489.05 |

| <i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i> | | |
|--|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Time to Determine Utility Allowance | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours): 0.17 hours times 11,727 households = 1850 hours | 0.09 hours times 10,881 households = 979 hours |

| <i>CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i> | | |
|---|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | Utility Allowance Error Rate = 2% | Utility Allowance Error Rate = 2% |

| <i>CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i> | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | \$599,829 | \$599,829 |

III. Hardship Policy

Households will have recourse to the same hardship policy described in FY2014-6 Rent Simplification activity. Households who experience a rent increase of \$26 or more due to the rent simplification calculation will be granted a hardship exemption and have the household's TTP calculated in accordance with 24 CFR 5.628 (i.e., non-MTW TTP calculation). If the rent increase is not directly related to utility allowance increase, the TTP calculation will include the simplified utility allowance.

Participants who are granted a hardship exemption will remain exempt until their rent portion falls below the \$26 threshold. Hardship exemptions under this provision will be verified at each recertification.

13. FY2016-2: Biennial and Triennial Notification of Rent Type Option

This activity is proposed to increase cost effectiveness, through a more efficient coordination of communication with residents, and was originally approved as part of the FY2015-16 MTW Plan.

PHAs are typically obligated to periodically (once a year) inform Public Housing Residents that they have an option of paying income-based rent or a flat rent. The PHA must give each family the opportunity to choose between the two methods for determining the amount of tenant rent payable monthly by the family.

As more residents move to biennial and triennial reexamination schedules, however, the number of staff interactions with residents decreases. It becomes more efficient to coordinate communication and notification requirements during a single visit, and notify residents of their option in accordance with their new schedules.

A resident may still choose a different rent type at any time, independent of the notification.

I. Data Sources

Recertifications are tracked in SAHA's Emphasys Elite software. A paper copy of the rent choice notification, signed by the resident, is kept in each family's file folder.

II. HUD Standard Metrics

| <i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings (HCV)</i> | | |
|--|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Staff time ($\$26.44 * 7 = \185.08) plus material costs of $\$2863 = \mathbf{\$3048}$ | Staff time ($\$26.44 * 3.5 = \92.54) plus 50% of material costs ($\$1431$) = \$1524 |

| <i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i> | | |
|--|--|--|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| 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). |
| | 7 hours | 3.5 hours |

A. **Not Yet Implemented Activities**

SAHA does not have any activities to describe in this category this year.

B. Activities On Hold

None at this time.

C. Closed Out Activities

FY2011-1 Block grant funding with full flexibility

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out due to its reference to the MTW Single Fund Flexibility, and not to any additional waivers.

FY2011-1a Promote Education through Partnerships

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because it uses only the MTW Single Fund Flexibility, and no additional waivers.

FY2011-1b Pilot Child Care Program

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The pilot childcare training program ended in the fall of 2011. While the program did have some success in FY2011 in assisting 10 residents in their completion of child care training and certification, there was not enough support for the program to continue.

FY2011-1c Holistic Case Management

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because it uses only the MTW Single Fund Flexibility, and no additional waivers.

FY2011-1d Resident Ambassador Program

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because it uses only the MTW Single Fund Flexibility, and no additional waivers.

FY2011-2 Simplify and streamline HUD approval process for the development, redevelopment, and acquisition of Public Housing

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because faster transaction times have reduced the need for this activity.

FY2011-3 Biennial reexamination for elderly/disabled (PH)

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because was replaced by new activities FY2014-4 and FY2014-5.

FY2011-4 Streamline methods of verification for PH and HCV

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because it was replaced by new activity FY2014-1.

FY2011-5 Requirements for acceptable documents for PH and HCV

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because it was replaced by new activity FY2014-1.

FY2011-6 Commitment of project-based vouchers (PBV) to SAHA-owned or controlled units with expiring subsidies (HCV)

This activity was designed to increase housing choices, and was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity is proposed to be closed out because it will be superseded by FY2015-3 upon approval of this MTW Plan.

FY2011-7 Remove limitation of commitment on PBV so that PBV may be committed to more than 25% of the units in family developments without required provision of supportive services

This activity was designed to increase housing choices, and was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity is closed out because it has been superseded by FY2015-3.

FY2011-8 Revise mobility rules for PBV

This activity was designed to increase cost efficiency, and was originally approved as part of the FY2010-2011 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity is proposed to be closed out because it will be superseded by FY2015-3 upon approval of this MTW Plan.

FY2012-10 Biennial Reexamination for Elderly/Disabled Participants on Fixed Income (HCV)

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2011-2012 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. The activity has been closed out because it was replaced by FY2014-4.

FY2012-11 Local Project Based Voucher Program for Former Public Housing Residents

This activity was originally approved as part of the FY2011-2012 MTW Plan was closed out before implementation due to discussions with HUD about RAD option.

FY2014-1 Streamline Reexamination Requirements and Methods (HCV)

This activity was designed to reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2013-2014 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. This activity was closed out as of FY2016, due to staff analysis finding that it was no longer needed.

FY2013-1 Time-limited Working Household Preference Pilot Program

This activity was designed to increase housing choices and promote self-sufficiency, and was originally approved as part of the FY2012-2013 MTW Plan. Implementation started in FY2014. This pilot activity is proposed to be closed out as of FY2017 and upon approval of this plan. Staff analysis of the pilot identified process improvements that will be implemented in a new MTW Activity proposed for FY2017. Pilot households will be transitioned into the new MTW Activity or the standard public housing program.

FY2013-3: Standardize Section 8 and Public Housing Inspection Progress

This activity was designed to reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness, and was originally approved as part of the FY2012-2013 MTW Plan and implemented in that fiscal year. This activity unified Section 8 and Public Housing inspection standards. The intent was to raise lower standards

to a higher, uniform level. It was anticipated that UPCS (public housing) would serve as model for most elements, but some would have been derived from HQS (section 8).

This activity was placed on hold in FY2014, pending results of HUD tests at other PHAs. HUD has completed study and is now doing a demonstration. SAHA has no plans to participate in demonstration but will implement new inspection process for section 8 when HUD implements a new process.

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

V.1.Plan.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

A. MTW Plan: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

Estimated Sources of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall provide the estimated sources and amounts of MTW funding by FDS line item.

| Sources | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---------------|
| FDS Line Item | FDS Line Item Name | Dollar Amount |
| 70500 (70300+70400) | Total Tenant Revenue | \$11,674,426 |
| 70600 | HUD PHA Operating Grants | \$123,543,355 |
| 70610 | Capital Grants | \$4,069,973 |
| 70700 (70710+70720+70730+70740+70750) | Total Fee Revenue | \$0 |
| 71100+72000 | Interest Income | \$35,948 |
| 71600 | Gain or Loss on Sale of Capital Assets | \$438,567 |
| 71200+71300+71310+71400+71500 | Other Income | \$2,000,850 |
| 70000 | Total Revenue | \$141,763,119 |

Estimated Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall provide the estimated uses and amounts of MTW spending by FDS line item.

| Uses | | |
|---------------|---------------|--------|
| FDS Line Item | FDS Line Item | Dollar |

| | Name | Amount |
|--|--|---------------|
| 91000 (91100+91200+91400+91500+91600+91700+91800+91900) | Total Operating - Administrative | \$15,453,188 |
| 91300+91310+92000 | Management Fee Expense | \$7,724,489 |
| 91810 | Allocated Overhead | \$0 |
| 92500 (92100+92200+92300+92400) | Total Tenant Services | \$815,191 |
| 93000 (93100+93600+93200+93300+93400+93800) | Total Utilities | \$4,587,429 |
| 93500+93700 | Labor | \$0 |
| 94000 (94100+94200+94300+94500) | Total Ordinary Maintenance | \$12,693,874 |
| 95000 (95100+95200+95300+95500) | Total Protective Services | \$561,318 |
| 96100 (96110+96120+96130+96140) | Total insurance Premiums | \$1,242,618 |
| 96000 (96200+96210+96300+96400+96500+96600+96800) | Total Other General Expenses | \$1,741,220 |
| 96700 (96710+96720+96730) | Total Interest Expense and Amortization Cost | \$779,712 |
| 97100+97200 | Total Extraordinary Maintenance | \$0 |
| 97300+97350 | Housing Assistance Payments + HAP Portability-In | \$90,990,927 |
| 97400 | Depreciation Expense | \$10,917,766 |
| 97500+97600+97700+97800 | All Other Expenses | \$0 |
| 90000 | Total Operating (900) Expenses | \$147,507,732 |
| | | |

- Per Board Resolution 5620 (June 2, 2016), the following Capital items will be funded with MTW funds and/or reserves:
 - Section 8 funding shortfall: \$1 million
 - Capital Planning: \$400,000
 - Redevelopment of Victoria Plaza: \$13 million
 - Matching Funds for the Choice Implementation Grant: \$5 million
 - Preservation and Expansion of Affordable and Public Housing: \$9.9 million

- Program administration and implementation of MTW initiatives: \$1 million

Activities that Will Use Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

A. Education Partnerships

SAHA's education-related programming is significant and diverse, and includes:

- REACH Awards: recognize and reward nearly 300 students annually for academic achievement
- College Scholarship Program: funds scholarships for up to 50 students annually to provide much needed support to ensure higher educational achievement (see below)
- Education Summit: provides up to 900 residents annually with access to education and college resources, financial literacy, and other self-help resources

B. Resident Ambassador Empowerment Program

The Resident Ambassador Program employs 16 residents throughout the year, providing meaningful work experience for residents. SAHA has found that this program is an effective strategy to engage all residents in educational, training, workforce development, and other self-sufficiency programs.

C. Summer Youth Program

The Summer Youth Employment Program employs up to 80 resident youth each year, providing work experience and capacity development such as resume writing, banking/financial literacy, interview skills, conflict resolution and other life and workforce development soft skills.

D. Health and Wellness

SAHA sponsors a variety of events to promote health and wellness, including:

- Golden Gala: much-loved annual event for up to 1,000 elderly and disabled residents
- H2A (Healthy Habits Active) Living Awards: highlight resident involvement and engagement in civic engagement, health, and other quality of life activities
- Annual Father's Day initiative: engages up to 500 families in positive family activities and recognize fathers' contributions through "El Hombre Noble" awards

E. College Scholarship Fund

SAHA's Education Investment Foundation (EIF) provides scholarships to eligible public housing residents and voucher households. REACH Awards annually recognize and reward nearly 300

students for academic achievement. The College Scholarship Program funds scholarships for up to 50 students annually to provide much needed support to ensure higher educational achievement.

The EIF is looking to expand the number of college scholarships it is awarding, and SAHA proposes using MTW funds as one source of funding. SAHA believes that these scholarships are a critical element that can improve education outcomes.

EIF will implement programs to assist with tracking progress of students, such as summer employment programming. Scholarship renewal for students with low GPAs will be contingent upon program participation and academic progress.

F. Choice Neighborhoods Initiative

San Antonio's Eastside features a unique history, valued institutions, established churches, small businesses, and a core group of dedicated and loyal residents. The San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) is utilizing the \$30 million EastPoint Choice Neighborhoods Initiative grant from the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), to transform the Wheatley Courts area into a "community of choice" -- a safe, healthy, vibrant, thriving community for children, families and seniors.

The Choice Neighborhood Initiative invests in People, Housing and Neighborhood through transforming distressed neighborhoods into viable and sustainable mixed-income neighborhoods by linking housing and infrastructure improvements with much-needed services, such as quality schools, healthcare, transportation, and access to jobs.

The **People** outcomes focus on families' health, education, safety, and employment, through efforts to encourage and support self-sufficiency and job readiness, and to facilitate access to early childhood and adult education. The **Housing** plan is to redevelop Wheatley Courts into a 412-unit energy efficient, mixed-income community, and to expand the supply of quality housing with 208 new housing units at The Park at Sutton Oaks. The **Neighborhood** component will: transform the neighborhood of poverty into a safe, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood, with homeownership opportunities; develop a plan to grow business and retail opportunities; and improve access to health and wellness activities and resources.

The key Choice partners include the City of San Antonio (CoSA), McCormack Baron Salazar, Inc., Urban Strategies, Inc., United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County (Eastside Promise Neighborhood), San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD), St. Philip's College, San Antonio for Growth on the Eastside (SAGE), and Resurgence Collaborative Partners.

San Antonio is the only community in the nation to receive a Promise Zone designation, as well as all three of the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative grants, which, in addition to Choice, includes a \$23.7 million grant from the Dept. of Education to bolster children's educational

achievement and foster community development, and two Byrne Criminal Justice grants, totaling nearly \$1 million, to improve safety and security in the neighborhood.

G. People

The outcomes for Wheatley Courts residents will be achieved through comprehensive, on-site case management, that will facilitate access to quality early childhood education, after-school programs and adult education, as well as improved employment opportunities, with a particular emphasis on expanding job readiness, training and placement programs. The initial assessments indicated that only 12% of Wheatley residents have attended college or received a college degree, 49% have a high school diploma or GED, 39% have no high school diploma or GED, and 51% are unemployed. The People objectives for the Choice effort include: able-bodied adults working; pathways for education and workforce success; resident and community stakeholders able to organize and lead; healthier lifestyles for residents; and programs with a sustainable approach and framework.

H. Housing

The Housing plan to develop a total of 620 high-quality, energy-efficient, mixed-income units is being implemented in four phases. Phase I includes 208 units at The Park at Sutton Oaks, which is now complete. Phase II includes 215 units for families, and is planned to be completed March 2017. Phase III features 80 units for seniors, with construction scheduled to begin June 2016, and completion planned for November 2017. The final and fourth phase includes 117 units for families, which is scheduled to begin June 2017, and be completed by November 2018. The housing development and related infrastructure improvements will be funded through public-private partnerships, featuring a combination of federal, state, and city funding, as well as private equity.

I. Neighborhood

Safety and Security, the leading concern of residents in this community, is being addressed through a Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation [BCJI] grant. An initial research survey indicated: twice as many crimes committed in the footprint vs. County or City; twice as many residents on probation vs. County or City; and a higher level of violent and drug crime. Community meetings resulted in the following strategies: develop hot spot policing along key streets; address root causes of crime (substance abuse); increase workforce development activities; establish resident empowerment activities; and focus on solutions courts and working with restitution participants. The Byrne team has successfully brought together the Resurgence Collaborative, the first comprehensive re-entry program in Texas with community-based network providers co-located with Probation Field Office directed solely for the Eastside Community in transition and their families. The Byrne team has also adopted the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, and has focused on one hot spot intersection in the Choice footprint. The CPTED efforts have successfully deterred crime have started to transform this intersection.

Access to Healthcare is a primary concern for the Choice area. In partnership with SAHA and Urban Strategies, the San Antonio Metropolitan Health Department (SAMHD) conducted a Health Impact Assessment (HIA), which resulted in three key recommendations. The first recommendation was to increase access to health care. To meet this need, SAHA has executed an agreement to partner with the University Health System (UHS) to build a new health clinic in the Choice footprint. The second recommendation from the HIA was to increase community amenities for physical activity. This need will be met by Bexar County and CoSA which has committed to building a linear park with exercise equipment along the walking path and a basketball court at one end of the park. The third recommendation from the HIA was to increase food security and access to fresh fruit and vegetables, as the Choice footprint is a food desert. To meet this need, Choice is collaborating with Bexar County-Precinct 4, Eastside Promise Neighborhood (EPN), San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD), University of the Incarnate Word (UIW), SAMHD, and CoSA Office of Sustainability to establish an urban farm.

Economic Development is a key component of the greater revitalization and long-term success of the Eastpoint community. An Economic Development Committee has developed a plan for the area, which includes: provide assistance to existing businesses; attract a diversity of new businesses; create a vibrant commercial corridor that accommodates business activity and supports local residents; re-brand the community's image to attract the interest of the greater San Antonio community; and promote income diversity. One strategy that aligns with this plan is the business Façade improvement component of the Critical Community Improvement (CCI) plan. Through this strategy, Choice is partnering with San Antonio for Growth on the Eastside (SAGE) to fund at least 12 façade improvement grants for business in the Choice footprint.

The Infill Housing and Rehabilitation Strategy is a key component to address the pervasive neighborhood deterioration and is another strategy in the CCI plan. The strategy involves land acquisition and investment for new homes, owner-occupied home repair, and property improvement by landlords. This strategy will be implemented in partnership with the City and County, utilizing a place-based approach by expanding homebuyer assistance, increasing opportunities for owner-occupied housing rehabilitation assistance, and reducing the shortage of affordable rental housing options.

| V.2.Plan.Local Asset Management Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| B. MTW Plan: Local Asset Management Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Is the PHA allocating costs within statute? | | | | | | | | | | Yes | or | | | | | | | |
| | | Is the PHA implementing a local asset management plan (LAMP)? | | | | | | | | | | | or | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>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. The narrative shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix? | | | | | | | | | | | or | No | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| n/a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

VI. Administrative

- A. **Resolution signed by the Board of Commissioners, or other authorized PHA official if there is no Board of Commissioners, adopting the Annual MTW Plan Certification of Compliance**

See Appendix 1.

- B. **The beginning and end dates of when the Annual MTW Plan was made available for public review, the dates, locations of public hearings and total number of attendees for the draft Annual MTW Plan, (to ensure PHAs have met the requirements for public participation, HUD reserves the right to request additional information to verify PHAs have complied with all requirements as set forth in the Standard MTW Agreement);**

The 2016 MTW Plan was posted for public comment on February 11, 2016. The draft Plan was posted on SAHA's website, and two hard copies were printed out and placed in the two main lobbies of the Central Offices. The public comment period closed on April 14, 2016, when the Board of Commissioners approved the Plan during the April 14, 2016 regular board meeting.

A variety of opportunities were provided for public comment, including via email to mtw@saha.org, by mail to 818 S. Flores, and at two public hearings: one on March 26 during the Operations and Choice Neighborhood Committee meeting, and a second on April 14 during the Board of Commissioners meeting. On February 10, MTW staff presented to the quarterly training meeting of the public housing Resident Council.

Comments received included the following:

Question: Where will this presentation and the plans be available?

Response: The presentation and plans will be available electronically on the website. Hard copies will be made available at central office. A hard copy can be made available at individual properties upon request.

Question: Is this information available in Spanish?

Response: Due to the size of the documents, it is not feasible to have the plans in Spanish. A translator can be provided at informational sessions and additional assistance can be provided upon request.

Question: Why is the plan only addressing public housing and section 8 and not the non-profits?

Response: The US Department of Housing and Urban Development requires plans for public housing, assisted housing programs (vouchers/Section 8), Moving to Work, and Capital Fund Program. Some of the Beacon and Partnership portfolios are covered under these plans if there are public housing, assisted housing vouchers, and/or moving to work units at the property.

FY2017-1

Question: Does this activity exclude seniors?

Response: No, not specifically. households must live at properties with Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) and/or Jobs-Plus case management staff

Note: This requirement has been removed from this activity and no longer applies.

FY2017-2

Question: Why is it only on the east side?

Response: The agency has a partnership with the Resurgence Collaborative which is located on the east side.

Question: Can this pilot be implemented in other parts of the city, for example the west side?

A: At this time, the 2 year pilot is focused on the east side as that is where the partnership has been fostered. If the pilot is successful, it could be expanded to other parts of the city.

Question: How do you know if it is successful?

Response: Every year we will evaluate metrics and provide a report to HUD on the status of the pilot.

Question: Would you have to wait the 2 years before starting another pilot?

Response: Not necessarily. If the pilot shows to be successful in the first year and there is a need/partnership opportunity in another part of the city, the agency could expand the pilot if approved by HUD.

FY2017-3

Question: Does SAHA offer any scholarships for adults to go back to college?

Response: At this time, the agency is proposing to fund scholarships and reach awards for k-12. Additional information on other resources for adults who are interested in returning to college can be made available by SAHA case management staff.

Question: Are residents at non-profits eligible for the scholarships/awards

Response: All public housing and section 8 residents are eligible.

Starting in January 2016, the MTW Advisory Committee was briefed on draft MTW Plan progress at each of their monthly meetings.

- C. **Description of any planned or ongoing PHA-directed evaluations of the demonstration for the overall MTW program or any specific MTW activities, if applicable**

Not yet applicable.

- D. **The Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report (HUD 50075.1) or subsequent form required by HUD for MTW and non-MTW Capital Fund grants for each grant that has unexpended amounts, including estimates for the Plan Year and all three parts of the report;**

See Appendix 2.

Appendix 1: Resolutions and Certifications

SAN ANTONIO HOUSING AUTHORITY
Resolution 5611

RESOLUTION 5611, AUTHORIZING THE PROPOSED 2016-2017 MOVING TO WORK (MTW) AGENCY PLAN, INCLUDING REVISIONS TO THE MTW PLAN, THE PUBLIC HOUSING ADMISSIONS AND CONTINUED OCCUPANCY POLICY (ACOP), THE HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER ADMINISTRATIVE PLAN (ADMIN PLAN), CAPITAL FUND PROGRAM PLAN (CFP), AND THE 5-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of the San Antonio Housing Authority, a public instrumentality created pursuant to the laws of the State of Texas ("SAHA") must approve the 2016-2017 Moving to Work (MTW) Agency Plan for fiscal year 2016-2017 including the revised MTW Plan, Public Housing Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP), the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan (Admin Plan) and the Capital Fund Program; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of the San Antonio Housing Authority also desires to authorize the submission of the 2016-2017 MTW Agency Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"); and

WHEREAS, the Board further desires to authorize the Chairman and the Interim President and CEO to execute and submit to HUD such certifications and other documents that they deem necessary or advisable in connection with the submission of the MTW Agency Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners of SAHA hereby:

- 1) Approves Resolution 5611, authorizing the proposed 2016-2017 Moving to Work (MTW) Agency Plan, including revisions to the MTW Plan, the Public Housing Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP), the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan (ADMIN PLAN), Capital Fund Program Plan (CFP), and the 5-year Capital Improvement and Development Plan; and
- 2) Authorizes the Chair and Interim President and CEO to execute and submit such certifications and other documents as necessary for the submission of the 2016-2017 MTW Plan to HUD.

Passed and approved the 14th day of April 2016.



Morris A. Stribling, DPM
Chair, Board of Commissioners

Attested and approved as to form:



David Nisivoccia
Interim President and CEO

Form 50900: Elements for the Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report

Attachment B

Certifications of Compliance

**Annual Moving to Work Plan
Certifications of Compliance**

**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing**

**Certifications of Compliance with Regulations:
Board Resolution to Accompany the Annual Moving to Work Plan***

Acting on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the Public Housing Agency (PHA) listed below, as its Chairman or other authorized PHA official if there is no Board of Commissioners, I approve the submission of the Annual Moving to Work Plan for the PHA fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016, hereinafter referred to as "the Plan", of which this document is a part and make the following certifications and agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in connection with the submission of the Plan and implementation thereof:

1. The PHA published a notice that a hearing would be held, that the Plan and all information relevant to the public hearing was available for public inspection for at least 30 days, that there were no less than 15 days between the public hearing and the approval of the Plan by the Board of Commissioners, and that the PHA conducted a public hearing to discuss the Plan and invited public comment.
2. The PHA took into consideration public and resident comments (including those of its Resident Advisory Board or Boards) before approval of the Plan by the Board of Commissioners or Board of Directors in order to incorporate any public comments into the Annual MTW Plan.
3. The PHA certifies that the Board of Directors has reviewed and approved the budget for the Capital Fund Program grants contained in the Capital Fund Program Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report, form HUD-50075.1.
4. The PHA will carry out the Plan in conformity with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
5. The Plan is consistent with the applicable comprehensive housing affordability strategy (or any plan incorporating such strategy) for the jurisdiction in which the PHA is located.
6. The Plan contains a certification by the appropriate State or local officials that the Plan is consistent with the applicable Consolidated Plan, which includes a certification that requires the preparation of an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, for the PHA's jurisdiction and a description of the manner in which the PHA Plan is consistent with the applicable Consolidated Plan.
7. The PHA will affirmatively further fair housing by examining its programs or proposed programs, identify any impediments to fair housing choice within those programs, address those impediments in a reasonable fashion in view of the resources available and work with local jurisdictions to implement any of the jurisdiction's initiatives to affirmatively further fair housing that require the PHA's involvement and maintain records reflecting these analyses and actions.
8. The PHA will comply with the prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of age pursuant to the Age Discrimination Act of 1975.
9. The PHA will comply with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 and 24 CFR Part 41, Policies and Procedures for the Enforcement of Standards and Requirements for Accessibility by the Physically Handicapped.
10. The PHA will comply with the requirements of section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, Employment Opportunities for Low-or Very-Low Income Persons, and with its implementing regulation at 24 CFR Part 135.
11. The PHA will comply with requirements with regard to a drug free workplace required by 24 CFR Part 24, Subpart F.
12. The PHA will comply with requirements with regard to compliance with restrictions on lobbying required by 24 CFR Part 87, together with disclosure forms if required by this Part, and with restrictions on payments to influence Federal Transactions, in accordance with the Byrd Amendment and implementing regulations at 49 CFR Part 24.

13. The PHA will comply with acquisition and relocation requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and implementing regulations at 49 CFR Part 24 as applicable.
14. The PHA will take appropriate affirmative action to award contracts to minority and women's business enterprises under 24 CFR 5.105(a).
15. The PHA will provide HUD or the responsible entity any documentation needed to carry out its review under the National Environmental Policy Act and other related authorities in accordance with 24 CFR Part 58. Regardless of who acts as the responsible entity, the PHA will maintain documentation that verifies compliance with environmental requirements pursuant to 24 Part 58 and 24 CFR Part 50 and will make this documentation available to HUD upon its request.
16. With respect to public housing the PHA will comply with Davis-Bacon or HUD determined wage rate requirements under section 12 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act.
17. The PHA will keep records in accordance with 24 CFR 85.20 and facilitate an effective audit to determine compliance with program requirements.
18. The PHA will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act and 24 CFR Part 35.
19. The PHA will comply with the policies, guidelines, and requirements of OMB Circular No. A-87 (Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments) and 24 CFR Part 85 (Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State, Local and Federally Recognized Indian Tribal Governments).
20. The PHA will undertake only activities and programs covered by the Plan in a manner consistent with its Plan and will utilize covered grant funds only for activities that are approvable under the Moving to Work Agreement and Statement of Authorizations and included in its Plan.
21. All attachments to the Plan have been and will continue to be available at all times and all locations that the Plan is available for public inspection. All required supporting documents have been made available for public inspection along with the Plan and additional requirements at the primary business office of the PHA and at all other times and locations identified by the PHA in its Plan and will continue to be made available at least at the primary business office of the PHA.

San Antonio Housing Authority

PHA Name

TX006

PHA Number/HA Code

I hereby certify that all the information stated herein, as well as any information provided in the accompaniment herewith, is true and accurate. Warning: HUD will prosecute false claims and statements. Conviction may result in criminal and/or civil penalties. (18 U.S.C. 1001, 1010, 1012; 31 U.S.C. 3729, 3802)

David Nisivoccia

Name of Authorized Official


Signature

Interim President and CEO

Title

4.20.16

Date

*Must be signed by either the Chairman or Secretary of the Board of the PHA's legislative body. This certification cannot be signed by an employee unless authorized by the PHA Board to do so. If this document is not signed by the Chairman or Secretary, documentation such as the by-laws or authorizing board resolution must accompany this certification.

Appendix 2: Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation
Report (HUD 50075.1) and Replacement Housing Factor
(RHF) Plan - 2014/2015

SAHA plans to combine RHF funds into the MTW block grant and intends to accumulate the RHF grants. See following pages for allocations, schedule, and proportionality test.

Appendix 3: Preservation and Expansion of Affordable Housing Policy

A. Purpose, Goals, Priority Guidelines of the Affordable Housing Preservation and Expansion Policy (P&E Policy)

On May 12, 2011 the SAHA Board of Commissioners adopted the Affordable Housing Preservation and Expansion Policy (P&E Policy). The P&E Policy establishes SAHA's principles, goals, priorities and strategies to preserve and expand the supply of high quality, sustainable and affordable housing in San Antonio.

B. Purpose

SAHA is committed to implementing a work plan to preserve and expand its affordable housing portfolio. In San Antonio, an estimated 200,000 households are eligible for some form of housing assistance. In order to address the demand for this housing, SAHA has prepared a work plan that reflects project priorities for both expansion and preservation to meet this demand. This has become increasingly important as SAHA's existing public housing portfolio is quite old, yet still a valuable source of affordable rental housing. In order to meet this demand a combination of preserving existing housing stock and adding to the affordable housing available to households in San Antonio has been developed. In addition, SAHA has commissioned a Capital Needs Assessment that will provide more detailed information on the capital improvement needs of its portfolio. The cost of needed property improvements exceeds the available resources; thus limited resources need to be used effectively and efficiently. To guide the use of limited funding, SAHA's Board of Commissioners has adopted policies that guide the work undertaken by staff in collaboration with a number of partners to effectively use limited resources, add value to the portfolio and guide decision making on property preservation, expansion, redevelopment, and disposition.

C. Goals

- Goal One: To maintain existing levels of deeply subsidized housing and create new affordably priced housing through acquisition, new construction and rehabilitation of existing affordable housing.
- Goal Two: To increase the quality, value, marketability and energy efficiency of all properties in the SAHA portfolio.
- Goal Three: Actively pursue emerging development and redevelopment opportunities that meet multiple community goals, such as economic and transit oriented development, while adding to the affordable housing infrastructure for San Antonio.

Goal Four: To integrate economic development and supportive service initiatives that will support residents and the surrounding neighborhoods in existing properties as well as in new and redeveloping projects.

Goal Five: Increase housing choices and the availability of housing for special populations through supportive housing (e.g. youth aging out of foster care, homeless individuals and families etc.).

D. Priority Guidelines

SAHA has established a set of guidelines against which all properties are evaluated. These guidelines take into consideration the age and condition of the property, past property improvements and the amenities in the area, to include schools, shopping, transit and employment. In addition, projects located in areas where other community investment is being made or anticipated are given priority. These guidelines are applied to both preservation and expansion activities:

1. Properties that are in good locations and with average building conditions are deemed to be good candidates for additional capital investment. This is because investment today will prevent further deterioration of a property and will maintain or improve revenue generation for SAHA as well as enhance livability. In addition, SAHA will integrate capital improvements on several projects in order to make significant change in the livability, appearance and functionality of a development. In other words, substantial rehabilitation will be completed. The work plan also allows SAHA to undertake capital projects to address health and safety issues where a substantial rehabilitation is not needed.
2. New developments that are in locations where additional community investment is being made are a priority.

E. Portfolio Evaluation Process

In October 2013, at the direction of the President and CEO, an internal Physical Needs Assessment (PNA) Task Force was created, to develop a standardized, objective process to evaluate individual assets in the SAHA portfolio. On December 6, 2013, the Board of Commissioners was provided a presentation that summarized the results of the PNA, performed by Raba Kistner Associates, of SAHA's Public Housing and Non-Profit portfolios. The methodology was then utilized to identify and prioritize short-term and long-term initiatives to address items identified in the PNA, while incorporating the goals and objectives outlined in SAHA's Affordable Housing Preservation & Expansion Policy, as adopted by the Board on May 12, 2011.

F. Asset Management Plan

On March 6, 2014, the SAHA Board of Commissioners heard an update regarding a newly-developed five-year Asset Management Plan for the preservation and expansion of affordable housing. The Asset Management Plan adds an implementation element to the previously adopted principles, policies, and goals. The Asset Management Plan represents staff's recommendation of

the best use of limited financial resources while embracing the goals and objectives of SAHA's Affordable Housing Preservation & Expansion Policy, and includes the following three elements:

G. Invest approximately \$35.3 million in capital repairs to extend the useful life of 985 Public Housing units located in 22 properties.

| Property Name Address | C D | E / F | # Units | Year Built | PNA Priorities 1-3 | PNA Priorities 1-3 Cost per Unit | 2014 CFP (In Progress) | 2015 CFP Year #1 July 2015 -June 2016 | 2016 CFP Year #2 July 2016-June 2017 | 2017 CFP Year #3 July 2017 - June 2018 | 2018 CFP Year #4 July 2018 - June 2019 | 2019 CFP Year #5 July 2019 - June 2020 |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|---------|------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Charles Andrews | 8 | F | 52 | 1995 | \$2,879,484 | \$55,374.69 | \$2,879,484 | | | | | |
| Le Chalet | 2 | E | 34 | 1971 | \$1,277,670 | \$37,578.53 | \$1,277,670 | | | | | |
| Morris Beldon | 2 | F | 35 | 1980 | \$912,870 | \$26,082.00 | \$912,870 | | | | | |
| Olive Park | 2 | F | 26 | 1975 | \$1,863,614 | \$71,677.46 | | \$1,844,570 | | | | |
| Victoria Plaza | 1 | E | 185 | 1958 | \$14,856,105 | \$80,303.27 | | \$10,000,000 | | | | |
| Francis Furey | 8 | F | 66 | 1988 | \$3,909,804 | \$59,239.45 | | \$3,909,804 | | | | |
| Midway | 5 | E | 20 | 1975 | \$701,096 | \$35,054.80 | | \$701,096 | | | | |
| Kenwood North | 1 | E | 53 | 1975 | \$938,927 | \$17,715.60 | | | \$938,927 | | | |
| Pin Oak I | 7 | E | 50 | 1979 | \$1,944,637 | \$38,892.74 | | | \$1,565,863 | | | |
| Park Square | 1 | F | 26 | 1976 | \$989,170 | \$38,045.00 | | | \$989,170 | | | |
| Sahara Ramsey | 9 | E | 16 | 1975 | \$521,339 | \$32,583.69 | | | \$0 | | | |
| Pin Oak II | 7 | F | 22 | 1981 | \$61,118 | \$2,778.09 | | | | \$61,118 | | |
| Linda Lou | 3 | E | 10 | 1972 | \$185,106 | \$18,510.60 | | | | \$185,106 | | |
| Escondido | 1 | E | 20 | 1971 | \$201,905 | \$10,095.25 | | | | \$201,905 | | |
| Village East | 2 | F | 24 | 1975 | \$2,812,814 | \$117,200.58 | | | | \$2,812,814 | | |
| Springview | 2 | E | 40 | 2004 | \$155,557 | \$3,888.93 | | | | \$155,557 | | |
| Glen Park | 9 | F | 26 | 1999 | \$1,240,881 | \$47,726.19 | | | | | \$1,240,881 | |
| Williamsburg | 1 | E | 15 | 1971 | \$657,400 | \$43,826.67 | | | | | \$657,400 | |
| College Park | 1 | E | 78 | 1975 | \$835,236 | \$10,708.15 | | | | | \$835,236 | |
| Matt Garcia | 3 | E | 55 | 1982 | \$653,944 | \$11,889.89 | | | | | \$653,944 | |
| L.C. Rutledge | 10 | F | 66 | 1979 | \$1,727,673 | \$26,176.86 | | | | | | \$1,727,673 |
| Cross Creek | 10 | F | 66 | 1976 | \$1,786,530 | \$27,068.64 | | | | | | \$1,786,530 |

H. Construct 1,222 new housing units in 5 development projects at an estimated cost of \$201.1 million.

| AFFORDABLE HOUSING EXPANSION /DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS 2015 - 2018* | | | | | | | | | | | Note: Estimated Dollars are in millions | | | |
|---|--------|-------|-----------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|-----|--|-----------------------|--------|---|----------|------------------|----------|
| Project | C D | Total | Home Owners hip | Mkt | Work force Hous ing | PBV | PH | Est. Total Develo pment Cost | Est. Start Date | FY 15 | FY 16 | FY 17 | F Y 1 8 | FY 19 |
| GARDENS at San Juan Square | 5 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 31 | 63 | \$31.7 | Complete | \$31.7 | | | | |
| WESTSIDE Redevelopment Initiative | 5 | 87 | 87 | 43 | 44 | 0 | 0 | \$9.0 | Jul-15 | \$0.6 | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$2.1 |
| Wheatley Cts. Ph. I | 2 | 220 | 0 | 64 | 77 | 8 | 71 | \$ 43.9 | Mar. 2015 | \$7.3 | \$29.3 | \$7.3 | | |
| Seniors OnSite Ph. II | 2 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 48 | \$ 13.5 | Dec. 2015 | \$0.9 | \$9.8 | \$2.8 | | |
| Multi Family Ph. III | 2 | 117 | 0 | 55 | 20 | 8 | 34 | \$ 25.3 | Sept. 2016 | | | \$6.3 | \$19.0 | |
| Infill Housing | 2 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | \$ 4.0 | Jan. 2016 | | \$0.7 | \$1.4 | \$1.4 | \$0.5 |
| Leigh St. Homes | 1 | 26 | 26 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | \$ 5.2 | Jul-15 | | \$2.6 | \$2.6 | | |
| Artisan Park Lots @ McMillan | 1 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 19.6 | Sep-15 | | \$4.8 | \$5.2 | \$5.2 | \$4.4 |
| Chavez/ Labor St. Mixed Use | 1 | 215 | 0 | 133 | 43 | 11 | 28 | \$ 36.3 | Jan-16 | | \$6.1 | \$24.0 | \$6.2 | |
| SNOWDEN @ Medical Center | 7 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | \$ 12.6 | Sep-16 | | | \$4.0 | \$8.6 | |
| Total | | 1222 | 246 | 414 | 478 | 86 | 244 | \$201.1 | | \$40.5 | \$55.4 | \$55.7 | \$42.4 | \$7.0 |

I. Evaluate modernization and repositioning opportunities impacting 1,963 affordable housing units in the Non-Profit portfolio.

| EVALUATE REPOSITIONING OF ASSET | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|--|
| Property Name | Unit Count | Recommendation | Year | Comments |
| Reagan West | 15 | Evaluate repositioning of asset | 2017 | Low physical/financial score= 60; Low policy & community scores; Small property (15 units); No debt. |
| Detrich Road | 30 | Evaluate repositioning of asset | 2017 | Low physical/financial score = 80; Low policy & community scores; Property isolated and located in industrial area; No debt. |
| Subtotal | 45 | | | |
| EVALUATE PRESERVATION/MODERNIZATION OF ASSET | | | | |
| Property Name | Unit Count | Recommendation | Year | Comments |
| Villa de Valencia | 104 | Evaluate Modernization/ Refinance | 2017 | Major foundation repairs underway. Additional exterior and interior upgrades under construction. |
| Springhill I & II & Courtland Park | 505 | Evaluate Modernization/ Refinance | 2016 | Existing bonds @ 5.85% are open to prepayment without penalty. Prioritize and estimate cost of exterior and interior upgrades. Evaluate projected net proceeds from refinance. |
| Castle Point | 220 | Evaluate modernize/refinance | 2016 | Castle Point: Good physical/financial score =90; Good policy & community scores; Significant equity; No prepayment penalty on existing debt. |
| Woodhill | 532 | Implement preservation Capex projects | 2016-2018 | Complete Capex project of \$3.6 MM using funds released from HUD and completion repair from Frost Bank refinance. |
| Monterrey Park | 200 | Evaluate modernize/refinance | 2019 | Low physical/financial performance =70; Scores well on policy & community attributes; Located in REnewSA & ICRIP location; Larger property with 220 units; Existing loan has no prepayment penalty and there is significant equity in the asset. |
| Pecan Hill | 100 | Evaluate modernize/refinance | 2017 | High physical/financial score =95; Scores well on policy & community attributes; No debt. |
| Homestead | 157 | Evaluate repositioning of asset | 2018 | Low physical/financial score = 55; Low policy & community scores; Barely break-even operations with minimal debt; No prepayment penalty on debt. |
| Sunshine | 100 | Evaluate modernize/refinance | 2017 | High physical/financial score =90; Scores well on policy & community attributes; No debt. |
| Subtotal | 1918 | | | |
| TOTAL | 1963 | | | |

J. Future Updates

Possibilities for inclusion in future updates to the Asset Management Plan include:

- Rex Site: Potential Transit-Oriented Development
- Scattered Site Properties
- Liquidation of non-residential properties and non strategic assets
- Choice Redevelopment Candidates:
 - Alazan-Apache Courts (741 units)
 - Cassiano Homes (499 units)
 - Lincoln Heights Courts (388 units)

K. Exceptions

The agency may consider disposition projects not identified in the MTW plan if they are deemed excess inventory and not supportive of the 2020 Strategic Plan. The agency may also consider unique, opportunistic, and unscheduled acquisition or construction projects that are not included in the MTW plan, but are supportive of the agencies 2020 Strategic Plan.

Such activities will not be considered significant amendments to the MTW plan, provided the following internal protocols are followed:

- 1) Completion of analysis describing the cost and benefits of the contemplated action
- 2) Consultation with other agency plans
- 3) Approval by ELT (and appropriate committee and Board of Commissioners if necessary)
- 4) The financial impact or cost of the activity is 5% or less of the annual expenses reflected in the current approved annual budget for the agency.

| <i>P&E Policy: Units of Housing Preserved</i> | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Unit of Measurement | Baseline | Benchmark |
| Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box. | 0 | 1087 |
| Charles Andrews | 0 | 52 |
| Victoria Plaza | 0 | 185 |
| Blanco | 0 | 100 |
| WC White | 0 | 75 |
| Westway | 0 | 152 |
| Matt Garcia | 0 | 55 |
| HB Gonzalez | 0 | 51 |
| Villa Tranchese | 0 | 201 |
| Fair Avenue | 0 | 216 |

