

Moving to Work

2011 Annual Report



Denny Terrace

Denny Terrace, a 40-year-old public housing high-rise, received improvements to its building systems and exterior meant to improve energy conservation, extend its useful life, and better integrate with its lively surrounding neighborhood.



Lake City Court, a new 86-unit low-income building in north Seattle, replaced 16 townhomes built on a site once plagued by flooding due to inadequate drainage. The re-graded 1.8-acre site is now rich with conveniences and services



Lake City Court

March 30, 2012

TECHNICAL REVISIONS SUBMITTED JULY 20, 2012

Seattle Housing Authority

Board of Commissioners

Yusuf Cabdi
Nora Gibson, Vice Chair
John Littel, Chair
Juan Martinez
Kollin Min
Doug Morrison
Heyward Watson

Leadership

Tom Tierney, Executive Director
Al Levine, Deputy Executive Director
Andrew Lofton, Deputy Executive Director
Dean Barnes
Rod Brandon
Lisa Wolters
Virginia Felton
James Fearn
John Forsyth
Ann-Marie Lindboe
Stephanie Van Dyke
Shelly Yapp

Prepared by

Beka Smith

With contributions from: Marguerite Carlson, Mallory Day, John Forsyth, Laura Gentry, Dennis Hall, Jason Hallerman, Janet Hayes, Wendy Lance, Andria Lazaga, Ann-Marie Lindboe, Tracey Locke, Susan Nagano, Carmine Pascucci, Rebecca Proudman, Cheryl Sabin, Vickie Seeber, Tricia Smiley, Jodi Speer, Brian Sullivan, Scott Woo, Bob Wyda, Shelly Yapp

Table of Contents

Section I: Introduction	3
Section II: General Housing Authority Information	7
Section III: Non-MTW and MTW Related Housing Authority Information	16
Section IV: Long-term MTW Plan	17
Section V: Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested	18
Section VI: Ongoing MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted	19
Section VII: Sources and Uses of Funding	50
Section VIII: Administrative Information	57
Appendix A: New Public Housing Units	59
Appendix B: New Project-based Voucher Units	61
Appendix C: Household and Applicant Demographics	64
Appendix D: Capital Performance and Evaluation Report	75

I. Introduction

This section provides an overview of the purpose and layout of the report and highlights major priorities and accomplishments for Seattle Housing Authority (also referred to as Seattle Housing, SHA) during 2011.

What is “Moving to Work”?

The Seattle Housing Authority is one of 35 housing authorities across the country participating in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) “Moving To Work” (MTW) Demonstration.¹ The MTW program has three primary goals:

- Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness
- Incentivize employment, job training, educational programs, or other programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient
- Increase housing choices for low-income families

As an MTW agency, Seattle Housing tests innovative new methods to improve housing delivery and better meet local needs. The agency may implement alternatives to national regulations for issues described in an amended and restated 2008 agreement between Seattle Housing and HUD. Seattle Housing’s original MTW agreement was executed in 1999, making 2011 the agency’s 13th year of participation in the MTW program.

Each year, Seattle Housing adopts a plan that highlights MTW initiatives and other activities planned for the following fiscal year. At the end of the year, the agency creates the annual report to describe the year’s accomplishments.

What is in this report?

The annual report describes Seattle Housing’s activities and performance in 2011, in comparison to projections in the 2011 Annual Plan. The report follows the required outline established in Attachment B of the agency’s MTW agreement with HUD:

Section I: Introduction provides an overview of Seattle Housing’s goals and objectives for 2011.

Section II: General Housing Authority Operating Information reports on housing stock, leasing, and waiting lists.

Section III (Non-MTW and MTW Related Housing Authority Information) and Section IV (Long-term MTW Plan) are optional and are not included in this report.

¹ Because HUD’s name for the demonstration, “Moving To Work,” sounds like a jobs program for residents, Seattle Housing has renamed the demonstration “Moving To new Ways,” to keep the acronym and avoid confusion over the program’s purpose. However, for reporting purposes, Seattle Housing uses the official name of Moving To Work.

Section V: Proposed MTW Activities describes the activities that were proposed and approved in the 2011 Annual Plan and their current state of implementation.

Section VI: Ongoing MTW Activities provides required information detailing previously HUD-approved uses of MTW authority, including evaluation data on the effectiveness of different MTW activities.

Not all of Seattle Housing's activities and programs are part of the MTW program, although they may benefit from some of the changes that the agency is able to make due to MTW status. In previous reports, we included information about both MTW and non-MTW activities. However, due to increasingly strict specifications from HUD about the contents and format of this report, we have decided to use this document to focus on MTW activities alone. For more information about all of Seattle Housing's programs, please see our website for agency-wide annual reports and our strategic plan.

Goals and objectives for 2011

The 2011 Annual Plan set several priorities for the year. Following is what happened in regard to those priorities.

Streamlining the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program

2011 was the first year of implementation for a number of MTW activities designed to reduce the administrative burden of operating the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV, voucher) program. The agency was successful in implementing new MTW activities that:

- reduced the frequency of rent reviews for fixed-income households to every three years
- simplified the calculation of utility allowances
- disregarded the collection of information on assets valued less than \$50,000

The agency also streamlined the process for medical deductions and began to allow landlords to self-certify that necessary minor repairs were complete. However, these improvements that were made did not require MTW authority. In addition progress was made in planning for implementation of two approved MTW activities that will:

- reduce the frequency of HCV inspections for tenants who remain in the same unit
- streamline the process for determining rent reasonableness

We expect implementation of these activities to begin in 2012.

Unified rent policy

The agency continued to examine the agency's rent policies and identified a number of opportunities to increase alignment between programs, such as using the same threshold for asset income in both the HCV and Low Income Public Housing (public housing, LIPH) programs. These areas of alignment were

proposed and approved as new MTW activities in the annual plan for 2012. The agency continues to consider opportunities for more substantial reforms in 2013.

Seattle Senior Housing Program

Seattle Housing introduced public housing subsidy to the majority of the Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) in 2011. This subsidy will allow the agency to address critical capital and operating needs while continuing to serve predominately extremely low-income seniors. Using MTW flexibility allowed the program to maintain much the same policies and procedures that residents were accustomed to, including maintaining existing policies regarding rents, inspections, lease renewals, cleaning fees, and pets. The agency also used its previously approved MTW authority for streamlined public housing acquisitions (MTW Strategy 1.P.02) to simplify and expedite the administrative process for bringing the units into the public housing program.

Agency assessment system

Seattle Housing continued to work in collaboration with other MTW agencies to develop and obtain HUD approval of an alternate system for measuring MTW agencies' performance, including presenting on the topic at the annual MTW conference. This work will continue into 2012.

Transforming Rental Assistance

In 2011 Seattle Housing did not pursue an MTW demonstration project using HUD's Transforming Rental Assistance principles. The agency may continue to consider this as a possibility in the future.

Other Agency Highlights (2011)

2011 was an important year for Seattle Housing in many ways. Among a number of significant accomplishments the agency:

- Completed the rehabilitation of Denny Terrace, including ventilation improvements, replacement of hot water lines, new windows, new exterior siding, and common area upgrades
- Constructed 86 new affordable units at Lake City Court
- Developed 66 new affordable units in the Rainier Vista community
- Won a \$10.3 million Choice Neighborhoods grant to spark the transformation of the Yesler Terrace neighborhood and a \$3.1 million Community Facilities Capital Fund grant to contribute to the development of early childhood education and adult training facilities at the Yesler Steam Plant
- Addressed weather damage with repairs to framing, siding, sidewalks, decks, and new windows at the second of three buildings at Wedgwood Estates and began work at four Seattle Senior Housing Program buildings
- Expanded the Ready to Rent program to help voucher holders and households on the waiting list identify and successfully lease housing of their choice, with 72 participants graduating in 2011

-
- Expanded housing choice throughout the city, with voucher households renting units at 272 new buildings during the year
 - Adopted a smoke-free policy for indoor areas, which will go into effect in early 2012
 - Integrated formerly separate employment and self-sufficiency programs in order to provide comprehensive services and help clients make progress on multiple fronts toward financial stability
 - Converted the seventh floor of Jefferson Terrace to host a medical respite care program for homeless individuals, staffed and operated by Public Health - Seattle & King County and Harborview Hospital

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

This section provides an overview of Seattle Housing's housing portfolio, leasing rates, and waiting list information.

Mission statement

The mission of the Seattle Housing Authority is to enhance the Seattle community by creating and sustaining decent, safe and affordable living environments that foster stability and self sufficiency for people with low incomes.

Agency overview

Seattle Housing Authority is a public corporation, providing affordable housing to approximately 28,000 people in neighborhoods throughout the city of Seattle. Seattle Housing operates a variety of programs that include agency operated housing, partner operated communities, and private rental housing.

Residents include more than 5,000 elderly individuals, 9,000 children, and 8,000 people with disabilities. At the end of 2011 86 percent of households had annual incomes below 30 percent of Area Median Income (AMI). Households' average income in 2011 was \$12,075.

In keeping with our mission, Seattle Housing supports a wide range of community services for residents, including employment services, case management, and youth activities.

Funding for the agency's activities comes from a wide range of sources including the HUD MTW Block Grant, special purpose HUD funds, other government grants, tenant rents, and revenues from other activities.

MTW Block Grant-funded housing

The majority of Seattle Housing's funding from HUD comes in the form of a block grant that combines the public housing operating fund, public housing capital fund, and MTW voucher funding into one funding source. The block grant does not include American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding.

Housing Choice Vouchers

The Housing Choice Voucher program is also commonly known as HCV or Section 8. The program is a public/private partnership that provides vouchers (housing subsidies) to low-income families for use in the private rental housing market. Seattle Housing administers more than 8,000 vouchers, which are funded and regulated by HUD. Participants typically pay 30 to 40 percent of their household's monthly

income for rent and utilities, depending on the unit that they choose. Voucher subsidies are provided through a variety of means including:

- Tenant-based (tenants can take their vouchers into the private rental market)
- Project-based (the subsidy stays with the unit, property, or defined set of properties)
- Program-based (MTW flexibility allows Seattle Housing to provide unit-based subsidies that float within a group of units or properties)
- Provider-based (Seattle Housing uses MTW flexibility to distribute subsidies through service providers so that they can master lease units and sublet to participants in need of highly-supportive housing)
- Agency-based (tenant-based vouchers distributed through selected partners)

Public Housing

The Low Income Public Housing program (also referred to as public housing, LIPH) is comprised of approximately 6,000 units in high-rises (large apartment buildings), scattered sites (small apartment buildings and single family homes), and in communities at NewHolly, Lake City Court, Rainier Vista, High Point, and Yesler Terrace. HUD's MTW Block Grant provides funding to help pay for operating costs exceeding rental income. Households typically pay 30 percent of their monthly income for rent and utilities. About 130 of these public housing units are utilized by service providers who provide transitional housing or services to residents. About 900 public housing units are part of the Seattle Senior Housing Program (further described in the following Local Housing section). Forty units receiving public housing subsidy through the agency are units owned by nonprofits and operated as traditional public housing.

Other HUD-funded housing

Special Purpose Vouchers

Seattle Housing administers vouchers for special purposes such as housing veterans and reunited families. These vouchers are often awarded competitively and funding is provided outside of the MTW Block Grant.

Section 8 New Construction

The agency has 130 locally-owned units that receive Section 8 New Construction funding. They serve people with extremely low incomes.

Moderate Rehab

Seattle Housing administers HUD Section 8 Moderate Rehab funding for 759 units operated by partner nonprofits serving extremely low-income individuals.

Local housing

Local housing programs do not receive any MTW Block Grant fund operating subsidy. Some MTW Block Grant funds are used for capital improvements in local housing properties that serve low-income residents.

Senior Housing

The Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) was established by a 1981 Seattle bond issue. It includes 23 apartment buildings throughout the city, totaling nearly 1,000 units affordable to low-income elderly and disabled residents. In 2011 the agency added public housing subsidy to 894 of these units in order to keep rents affordable while addressing needed capital repairs. The agency used MTW authority to maintain the SSHP program's unique rules and procedures despite the introduction of public housing subsidy.

Approximately 100 units in the Seattle Senior Housing Program remain in our local housing portfolio without public housing subsidy. An additional 97 senior housing units are located in three buildings that are operated by partner nonprofits that offer unique services to their residents.

Tax Credit and Other Affordable Housing

Seattle Housing operates nearly 1,500 units of unsubsidized housing in townhomes and small apartment complexes throughout Seattle, including low- and moderate-income rental housing in the agency's redeveloped family communities (NewHolly, Rainier Vista, and High Point). These units do not receive ongoing operating subsidy, with the exception of project-based housing choice vouchers in selected units.

Changes in housing inventory

Seattle Housing experienced the following changes in housing resources between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011. (See following page.)

Table 1: Changes in housing inventory

Housing Program	2010 year end (actual)	2011 year end (projected)	2011 year end (actual)
MTW Block Grant-funded housing			
Housing Choice Voucher	8,338	8,358	8,363
<i>Tenant-based</i>	5,624	5,574	5,545
<i>Project-based – partner-owned</i>	2,141	2,349	2,380
<i>Project-based – Seattle Housing-owned</i>	364	360	364
<i>Program-based – Seattle Housing-owned</i>	150	10	15
<i>Provider-based</i>	59	65	59
Public Housing	5,316	6,311	6,302
<i>Seattle Housing-owned *</i>	5,276	6,271	6,262
<i>Partner-owned</i>	40	40	40
MTW Block Grant-funded Housing Total	13,654	14,669	14,665
Other HUD-funded housing			
Housing Choice Vouchers - Special Purpose	365	340	912
<i>Disaster Housing Assistance Program</i>	0	0	0
<i>Family Unification Program</i>	100	100	200
<i>Mainstream Disability</i>	75	75	75
<i>Housing Conversion</i>	25	0	435
<i>Relocation</i>	0	0	0
<i>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</i>	165	165	202
<i>Welfare to Work</i>	0	0	0
Section 8 New Construction	130	130	130
Section 8 Moderate Rehab	759	759	759
Other HUD-funded Housing Total	1,254	1,229	1,801
Local housing			
Seattle Senior Housing Program *	994	34	100
Seattle Senior Housing Program – operated by partners	97	65	97
Tax credit housing (without public housing subsidy)	661	696	720
Other affordable housing	818	813	818
Local Housing Total	2,570	1,608	1,735
Managed by Seattle Housing for other owners	14	6	14
Total Housing**	16,964	17,136	17,822

*Includes residential units leased to agencies that provide transitional housing or supportive services and units for live-in staff

**Due to project-basing and program-basing of vouchers in Local Housing, Total Housing is the sum of all housing units minus vouchers-MTW: Project-based – Seattle Housing-owned and Program-based – Seattle Housing-owned. Managed by Seattle Housing for other owners is also not included in Total Housing.

Housing choice vouchers

In 2011 Seattle Housing was successful in obtaining funding for 572 additional vouchers from HUD, including:

- 100 Family Unification Program vouchers
- 37 Veterans Assistance Supportive Housing vouchers
- 435 conversion vouchers

Also during the year, 25 special purpose vouchers were moved from “Other HUD-funded housing” to “MTW Block Grant-funded housing.”

Units receiving new project-based voucher assistance

In 2011 the agency project-based a total of 300 vouchers; however, only 165 were MTW. Details of these units are provided in Appendix B.

Through two separate competitive processes conducted in partnership with the City of Seattle, the agency issued 114 project-based vouchers to existing projects and to new construction projects that were ready for occupancy in 2011. Twenty-six of these vouchers were High Point replacement units.

A total of 38 project-based vouchers were previously awarded as part of Seattle Housing’s commitment to the Sound Families. Construction of these units was completed in 2011.

The agency also project-based 13 vouchers in Rainier Vista, a Seattle Housing-owned property, in 2011. These units serve as Rainier Vista replacement units.

Seattle Housing received 182 Enhanced Vouchers for residents at Four Freedoms, a Section 536 Flexible Subsidy Project undergoing conversion to market rate in 2011. Residents were provided the option of choosing to project-base their enhanced voucher, ensuring affordable units in this project for the foreseeable future. A total of 125 residents chose to project-base their voucher.

The agency project-based ten VASH vouchers at Gossett Place, a community that also received MTW project-based vouchers through the previously mentioned competitive processes conducted in partnership with the City of Seattle in 2011.

Public housing

Seattle Housing ended the year with 986 more public housing units than at the beginning of the year, 9 fewer than projected. The following is a summary of the changes:

- 51 new public housing units at Lake City Court (described in Appendix A) came on line in 2011.

-
- An additional 42 public housing units were constructed at Rainier Vista Phase III. (See Appendix A for details.)
 - The agency brought 894 of the units in the Seattle Senior Housing Program into the public housing program. (See Appendix A for details.)
 - At Denny Terrace, two units were merged into one, resulting in a decrease of one unit from its total count.

Disposition and demolition activity

In 2011 Seattle Housing disposed of vacant land at Rainier Vista Phase III, a HOPE VI redevelopment site. No Seattle Housing units were demolished or disposed of in 2011.

Local housing

Seattle Housing developed 35 new tax credit units at Lake City Court and 24 at Rainier Vista. However, the agency's total count of local housing units decreased, primarily because the agency brought most of the units within the SSHP program into the public housing portfolio.

Major capital activities

MTW Block Grant funds

None of Seattle Housing's 2011 capital activities utilized 30 percent or more of the agency's capital budget under its MTW Block Grant, the threshold for reporting on capital activities in this report. While none of the agency's projects met this threshold, Seattle Housing made progress on a number of renovations and repairs during the year, including projects at Denny Terrace and buildings in the SSHP program. The agency also completed a large number of small-scale capital projects, including the renovation of roofs, windows, and carpets at various communities, and commissioned a study of the heating system at Jefferson Terrace.

Reflecting the actual time needed to plan, design, procure contractors, and implement capital activities, public housing capital fund activities are typically used over several years. Seattle Housing continues to meet HUD's obligation and expenditure deadlines for these funds. Details of obligation and expenditure levels at year end for all open capital fund grants are provided in Attachment D.

HOPE VI

The HOPE VI grant for Lake City Court was nearly complete by year end. All units have been developed.

Competitive federal development/redevelopment funding

Choice Neighborhoods: In 2011 Seattle Housing won a Choice Neighborhoods grant of \$10.3 million to spark the transformation of the Yesler Terrace neighborhood. The grant will fund the first phase of

development, building low-income housing on a site just east of Boren Avenue, as well as education and employment programs and support for economic development. Partners include Seattle University, Seattle Public Schools, and Historic Seattle.

Community Facilities Capital Fund: The agency also received a \$3.1 million grant from HUD to contribute to the development of early childhood education and adult training facilities at the Yesler Steam Plant. The new center will house a Head Start program, youth tutoring, an Express Credit Union for affordable financial services, and training and employment opportunity services.

Sustainable Communities: Seattle Housing worked in partnership with other agencies on a transit-oriented affordable housing project led by King County Metro in the Northgate area. In 2010 the Northgate project received a Sustainable Communities grant to fund the initial stages of planning and in 2011 community partners began studying site options for development.

Section 202 or 811: Seattle Housing had considered working with a development partner; however, the development partner did not pursue funding through HUD Section 202 or 811 during 2011.

Leasing information

The following table shows projected and actual utilization for vouchers and occupancy for Seattle Housing-operated housing.

Table 2: Actual and projected units leased

HOUSING PROGRAM	2010 year end (actual)	2011 year end (projected)	2011 year end (actual)
Housing Choice Vouchers-MTW	8,386	8,404	8,201
Housing Choice Vouchers-Non-MTW	175	252	688
Low Income Public Housing	5,170	6,203	6,150
Local Housing*	2,493	1,505	1,513

**Does not include 97 local SSHP units operated by partners; includes residential units leased to agencies that provide transitional housing or supportive services and units for live-in staff.*

Leasing issues

Across Seattle Housing's portfolios, 2011 was a highly successful year in improving turnaround time and leasing of vacant units, due in large part to an increased management focus on this issue. We expect these trends to continue into the coming year.

Housing choice vouchers

During 2011 the agency focused on project-based commitments and leasing special purpose vouchers. Leasing housing conversion vouchers was a challenge, as lease up is at the discretion of each household. In addition, the agency received FUP and VASH voucher awards late in the year and therefore a significant portion were not yet leased by year end. The agency will continue to lease these vouchers in 2012.

The tenant-based voucher waitlist remains closed to new applicants. Utilization of MTW vouchers has remained stable due to low attrition rates and we have therefore been unable to issue new vouchers from the waitlist at a significant rate.

Public housing

Public housing occupancy rates were high throughout 2011, with an occupancy rate of 99 percent throughout the year. The few properties that had slightly lower occupancy percentages were either undergoing or in need of significant modernization or had very few units, meaning that even a single vacancy could skew the percentages.

Local housing

Concerted management effort at communities such as Longfellow Creek and Wisteria Court, combined with a tight rental market, resulted in higher than anticipated occupancy rates in Seattle Housing's unsubsidized housing portfolio in 2011. While some properties continued to struggle to lease units, due to factors such as location, unit size, older housing stock, and market conditions, the overall occupancy level increased throughout the portfolio.

Seattle Senior Housing Program: Occupancy rates within the Seattle Senior Housing Program remained consistent with 2010 levels at approximately 98 percent occupancy. Staff undertook a tremendous effort to lease outstanding units in November and December of 2011 due to the introduction of public housing subsidy to the program. We anticipate that this will have a positive impact on occupancy rates moving into 2012, as there were only a small number of unfilled units at year end.

Waiting list information

Waiting list strategies

Seattle Housing's waiting list strategies vary to match the needs of different properties and housing programs. Applicants may be, and often are, on multiple waiting lists at the same time. For more information about the characteristics of households on the waiting lists, please see Appendix C.

Tenant-based housing choice vouchers

A single tenant-based voucher waiting list is maintained by Seattle Housing. A list of applicants was established through a lottery in 2008 and remains closed.

Other housing choice vouchers

Each partner maintains a unique waiting list for voucher subsidy in the project-based, program-based, provider-based, and agency-based voucher programs.

Seattle Housing-operated housing

Site-specific waiting lists are offered for all of Seattle Housing's affordable housing properties. The waiting lists for senior housing and public housing in traditional communities are purged on an ongoing basis through the use of Save My Spot, a system that allows applicants to check in monthly by phone or computer to indicate their continued interest in housing opportunities with Seattle Housing. With the exception of select bedroom sizes at NewHolly, Seattle Housing's waiting lists remain open.

Waiting list changes

Housing choice vouchers

The tenant-based voucher waiting list has been closed since 2008. Vouchers were issued to households on the waiting list from September 2010 through February 2011, after which issuance was suspended due to low attrition. A waitlist purge was completed during 2011 and as of December 2011 there were just under 1,000 applicants on the waiting list for vouchers.

New project-based properties opened during 2011 and the agency was successful in obtaining additional special purpose vouchers, making more waiting list options available to potential tenants.

Seattle Housing-operated housing

Unsurprisingly, given the current economic climate and Seattle Housing's low vacancy rates, waiting list numbers for Seattle Housing-operated properties remained high in 2011. In the month of December 2011 alone, the agency received nearly 500 new applications. The influx of new applications was partially counterbalanced by new admissions and updates to our waiting list to ensure that household information remained up to date.

The following is a summary of the number of applicants on waiting lists for Seattle Housing-operated housing as of December 2011. (Please note that there is overlap among lists as applicants are allowed to apply for multiple programs.)

- Public housing - 5,900
- HOPE VI (all housing programs) - 14,450
- SSHP - 625
- Other affordable housing - 3,700

Seattle Housing continues to explore a number of potential improvements to improve efficiency in waiting list processes.

III. Non-MTW and MTW Related Housing Authority Information

This section is optional and intentionally left blank. For more information about the agency, please see: www.seattlehousing.org.

IV. Long-term MTW Plan

This section is optional and intentionally left blank. For more information about Seattle Housing's long-term plans, please see the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan at: <http://www.seattlehousing.org/news/strategic/>.

V. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested

This section provides HUD-required information regarding activities that were proposed in the 2011 Plan.

2011: New MTW Strategies

Seattle Housing implemented all three of the new strategies proposed in the 2011 MTW Plan. These strategies were:

- Simplified utility allowance schedule: HCV participants' rent is adjusted for a Utility Estimate based on the number of bedrooms (defined as the lower of voucher size or actual unit size) and tenant responsibility for payment of energy, heat, and sewer/water under their lease, with a proration for energy-efficient units. (Strategy #10.H.14 of MTW Activity #10 Local Rent Policy)
- Property-specific pet policies: SHA may establish pet policies, which may include the continuation or establishment of pet-free communities or limits on the types of pets allowed, on a building by building basis. (Strategy #5.P.04 of MTW Activity #5 Local Leases)
- SSHP rent policy: Rents in SSHP units receiving public housing subsidy are one of four flat rents based on the tenant's percentage of Area Median Income (Under 20 percent, 20-29 percent, 30-39 percent, or 40 percent or over). (Strategy #10.P.17 of MTW Activity #3 Inspection Protocol)

Further information about these activities is provided in Section VI.

VI. Ongoing MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

This section provides HUD-required information detailing previously HUD-approved uses of MTW authority, including evaluation criteria and specific waivers used.

Background

Every effort has been made to include all previously approved MTW activities. Any omissions are unintentional and should be considered continuously approved. If additional previously approved activities are discovered, the agency will add them to subsequent plans or reports.

It should be noted that throughout the first ten years of the MTW program, HUD requirements regarding how and when to seek approval for MTW activities fluctuated. Some MTW flexibilities were requested outside of the annual Plan (e.g. streamlined acquisition process) or were considered implicit (e.g. using MTW Block Grant funds to allow residents in local housing programs to participate in agency-sponsored social services). In other cases, Seattle Housing needed only to state in very broad terms its intention to implement an MTW activity.

In many cases, MTW activities appeared in multiple plans. The dates included in this section are the first year the activity was mentioned in an approved plan and the first year it was implemented.

Each MTW activity represents an authorization previously approved by HUD. The implementation of these activities may vary over time as Seattle Housing strives to continuously improve its practices and respond to a changing environment. For the sake of the demonstration, we attempt to specify the strategies that are utilized. However, these strategies are part of a whole and cannot always be viewed as distinct parts.

Some MTW activities include strategies that Seattle Housing has implemented in the past but did not need to use in 2011, such as alternative investment policies. In addition, some strategies are inactive because they are no longer allowed by HUD, such as Seattle Housing's MTW procurement policies. Other strategies are still under development, with implementation planned for 2012, such as several strategies related to the FSS program. Others are on hold until Seattle Housing has the capacity to pursue them, and are currently listed as inactive. For each activity, we define which strategies are active, inactive, or under development. Activities under the sub-heading of "Not needed in 2011" are still active, but circumstances did not require their use during the year.

MTW Activity #1 – Development Simplification

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Agreement and 1999 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Development simplification helps Seattle Housing to move quickly to acquire, finance, develop, and remove public housing properties from its stock in an efficient, market-driven manner. MTW flexibilities allow the agency to respond to local market conditions and avoid time delays and associated costs incurred as a consequence of HUD requirements and approval processes. While of greatest impact when the housing market is highly competitive, these strategies present opportunities at all times for Seattle Housing to avoid costs and increase housing options as circumstances arise.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment C (C)(12), (C)(13), (C)(16); Attachment D (C)(2). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Public Housing Development Simplification Strategies

- Streamlined public housing acquisitions: Acquire properties for public housing without prior HUD approval, provided that HUD site selection criteria are met. (MTW Strategy #1.P.02. Implemented in 2004.)
- Streamlined public housing demo/dispo process: Utilize a streamlined demolition/disposition protocol negotiated with the Special Applications Center for various public housing dispositions (including those for vacant land at HOPE VI sites and scattered sites property sales). (MTW Strategy #1.P.05. Implemented in 2004, however, most of the streamlined features are now available to all housing authorities.)

Not Needed in 2011

- Design guidelines: Seattle Housing may establish reasonable, modest design guidelines, unit size guidelines and unit amenity guidelines for development and redevelopment activities. (MTW Strategy #1.P.01. The agency has not yet needed to exercise this flexibility.)
- Total development cost limits: Replaces HUD's Total Development Cost limits with reasonable limits that reflect the local market place for quality construction. (MTW Strategy #1.P.03. The agency has not yet needed to exercise this flexibility.)
- Streamlined mixed-finance closings: Utilize a streamlined process for mixed-finance closings. (MTW Strategy #1.P.04. Implemented in 2005.)

Impact

Development simplification strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness and promote housing choice by allowing Seattle Housing to acquire, finance, develop, and remove property in a manner that maximizes our ability to take advantage of market conditions and avoids unnecessary costs.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase housing choice in cost-effective manner	Public housing units acquired through expedited process	0	200 by 2018	894 units in 2011; 1,031 units using expedited process to date
	Public housing units developed/financed through streamlined mixed-finance closings	0	100% of units in mixed finance closings (0 in 2011)	Not applicable – 0 mixed finance closings in 2011

Revisions to benchmarks or metrics

The previous benchmark for public housing units developed/financed through streamlined mixed-finance closings was 177 in 2009 and 2010, which represented 100 percent of units in mixed finance closings during those years. In order to continue to report on this benchmark in years subsequent to 2010, we have clarified that the benchmark is 100 percent each year, or 0 total units for 2011.

Data collection methods

Seattle Housing closely tracks details regarding all public housing acquisitions and mixed-finance closings.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #2 – Family Self-Sufficiency Program

Status

Under development - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing's Family Self-Sufficiency Program supports residents with services and financial incentives that help them to pursue self sufficiency in multiple arenas, including employment, education, and moves to market-rate housing. MTW strategies have been designed to help the Family Self-Sufficiency Program to expand its impact by partnering with other agencies, providing incentives for participation, and using local selection criteria, contract terms, and escrow calculation methods.

Authorization

MTW Agreement- Attachment C (C)(5), (C)(11), (E). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Family Self-Sufficiency Program Strategies

Under development

- FSS escrow accounts: Use local policies for determining escrow calculation, deposits, and withdrawals. (MTW Strategy #2.A.03. Not yet implemented.)
- FSS program incentives: Provide incentives to FSS participants who do not receive escrow deposits. (MTW Strategy #2.A.06. Not yet implemented.)
- FSS participation contract: Locally designed contract terms including length, extensions, interim goals, and graduation requirements. (MTW Strategy #2.A.04. Not yet implemented.)
- FSS selection preferences: Up to 100 percent of FSS enrollments may be selected by local preferences. (MTW Strategy #2.A.07. Not yet implemented.)

Inactive

- Partner with city: Partner with the City of Seattle to share responsibilities and resources for a new integrated FSS program. (MTW Strategy #2.A.01. Implemented in 1998; discontinued in 2000.)
- SJI preference + time limits: Preference for Seattle Jobs Initiative participants coupled with time limits. (MTW Strategy #2.A.02. Implemented in 1998; discontinued in 2000.)
- FSS Program Coordinating Committee: Restructure Program Coordinating Committee (PCC) to better align with program goals and local resources. (MTW Strategy #2.A.05. Not yet implemented.)

Impact

Seattle Housing's active MTW strategies related to the Family Self-Sufficiency Program are intended to promote self sufficiency by increasing assets, increasing graduation from the FSS program, and increasing access to self sufficiency services through referrals to other agencies.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase graduation from FSS program	Percentage of participants graduating from FSS program within three years of enrollment	In 2010, 14 percent graduated within three years of enrollment	Four years following implementation, 20 percent of new enrollees will graduate within three years of enrollment	Not applicable – MTW FSS strategies not yet implemented
Increase participants' assets	Percentage of participants with escrow deposits within two years of enrollment in the FSS program	In 2010 39 percent of active participants had escrow deposits within two years of enrollment	Three years following implementation, 42 percent of new enrollees will have escrow deposits within two years of enrollment	Not applicable – MTW FSS strategies not yet implemented
Increase access to self sufficiency services	Number of service providers that participants are referred to	Participants were referred to a total of 78 different service providers throughout 2010	Referrals to 70 service providers/year	Not applicable – MTW FSS strategies not yet implemented

Challenges

Seattle Housing has delayed implementation of FSS MTW strategies because of limitations imposed by HUD funding requirements, which has hindered our ability to make an impact on measures such as program graduation. While the standard MTW agreement is intended to provide the opportunity to use local strategies in the implementation of FSS goals, previous Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs) did not allowed MTW agencies to implement approved MTW activities while continuing to receive funding

for FSS staff. However, the newly released HCV FSS NOFA appears to allow for MTW flexibilities. With this exciting development, Seattle Housing will revisit FSS MTW strategies in 2012.

Data collection methods

Referrals are tracked in client case notes. Participant data related to enrollment and graduation are tracked in Seattle Housing's property management and HCV management software.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #3 - Inspection Protocol

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing uses a cost-benefit approach to unit and property inspections. Current strategies in this approach include using Seattle Housing's own staff to complete HQS inspection of its properties with vouchers, inspecting residences less frequently, and allowing landlords to certify their own corrections of minor items.

Authorization

MTW Agreement- Attachment C (C)(9)(a), (D)(5), (D)(7)(a); Attachment D (D)(1); specific regulations waived include 24 CFR 982.405 (a), 982.352(b)(iv)(A), 983.59, 983.103(f). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Inspection Protocol Strategies

- Reduced frequency of inspections: Cost-benefit approach to housing inspections allows Seattle Housing to establish local inspection protocol, including inspections every other year for residents who have not moved. (MTW Strategy #3.A.03. Formerly mislabeled #3.H.03. Implemented in 2003 for public housing; implementation planned for 2012 for vouchers.)

Under development

- MTW Activity 3.A.01: Private sector cost benefit and risk management approaches to inspections such as avoiding duplicative inspections by using other recent inspections for agencies such as the Washington State Housing Finance Commission. (Implementation planned for 2012.)

Voucher Inspection Protocol Strategies

- Inspect Seattle Housing-owned properties: Seattle Housing staff, rather than a third party entity, complete HQS inspection of Seattle Housing owned properties with vouchers. (MTW Strategy #3.H.01. Implemented in 2001.)

Inspection strategies that are unique to the project-based program are listed under MTW Activity #9 – Project-Based Program.

Inactive

- MTW Strategy #3.H.02: Fines for no-shows at inspections
- MTW Strategy #3.H.04: Self-certification for minor fails: Self-certification by landlords of correction of minor failed inspection items. (Implemented in 2010.) This policy remains active, however we believe that MTW authority is not required and it is therefore listed as inactive from a MTW perspective. If HUD rules change and MTW authority becomes necessary to continue to implement this policy, we will reactivate this strategy.

Impact

Active MTW inspection protocol strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by saving staff time through less frequent inspections and by inspecting Seattle Housing's own units rather than contracting this work out, with a goal of no negative impact on the quality of housing.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Decrease staff time	Staff time saved from avoided inspections	0	500 hours saved annually	792 hours saved (1,583 public housing inspections avoided)
Money saved	Money saved by using Seattle Housing staff instead of third party to inspect Seattle Housing units with vouchers	0	\$40,000 saved	\$67,955 saved (113 move-in inspections and 850 annual inspections conducted by SHA staff rather than third party)
Maintain housing quality	Voucher participant-requested inspections per leased vouchers	1.8 percent in 2009 (128 inspections were requested out of 6,997 households)	No increase in complaint inspection requests	<1 percent (55 inspections were requested)

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Maintain housing quality	Percent of units that fail regularly scheduled inspections	In 2009, 29 percent of voucher units failed their regularly scheduled inspections	No more than 33 percent fail regularly scheduled inspections	26 percent of voucher units failed their regularly scheduled inspections (2,344 failed inspections)
Maintain housing quality	Average REAC scores for public housing high rises	90.3 (2000 – 2002)	No decline in average REAC scores	89.9 (average of 2011 inspections that have been completed)

Challenges

Implementation of biennial inspections in the voucher program, where we expect to see most of the time savings, will not begin until 2012 as the necessary modifications to software are currently underway. An additional ongoing challenge is that the streamlined inspection protocol cannot be used for tax credit units, which account for about 55 percent of Seattle Housing’s public housing units. This reduces the total amount of staff time that the agency is able to save.

While technically the agency did not achieve the benchmark of no decline in average REAC scores, the average score for the baseline (90.3) is actually quite close to the average score for 2011 (89.9). As the average scores remain essentially the same, we do not believe that this slight discrepancy is cause for concern.

Data collection methods

The HCV management system records the results of all inspections by type and inspection requests.

Hours saved from avoiding annual inspections for public housing units is based on the total number of units that did not receive a full inspection during the year multiplied by the 30 minutes averaged per inspection in 2011.

Costs avoided by not using a third party to inspect Seattle Housing units with vouchers are estimated based on the costs incurred by the Tacoma Housing Authority in hiring a third party. It costs Seattle Housing staff \$135 less per move-in inspection and \$62 less for each annual inspection.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #4 – Investment Policies

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing's MTW investment policies give the agency greater freedom to pursue additional opportunities to build revenue by making investments allowable under Washington State's investment policies in addition to HUD's investment policies. Each year, Seattle Housing staff assess potential investments and make a decision about whether this MTW flexibility will be needed. In 2011 investment flexibility was not needed and all Seattle Housing investments followed HUD policies.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment C (B)(5). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Investment Policy Strategies

Not Needed in 2011

- Investment policies: Seattle Housing may use Washington State investment policies in lieu of HUD investment policies. (MTW Strategy #4.A.01. Implemented in 1999.)

Impact

Investment policy strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by increasing investment revenue.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase investment revenue	Return rate from investments made using Washington State policies rather than HUD investment policies	Return on investments made under HUD guidelines for same time period - 0.52% in 2011	Percent return on investments made outside of HUD guidelines is better than baseline	No investments were made using this flexibility in 2011

Challenges

None of Seattle Housing's 2011 investments utilized this MTW flexibility. However, Seattle Housing continues to monitor the performance of its investments and may use this flexibility in the future.

Data collection methods

Seattle Housing's financial records track return on investments.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #5 – Local Leases

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing utilizes local lease strategies to incorporate best practices from the private market and encourage self-sufficiency.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment C (C)(9)(b), (C)(10), (E). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Local Leases Strategies

- Self-sufficiency requirement: All households receiving subsidy from Seattle Housing (public housing or voucher) living in HOPE VI communities must participate in self-sufficiency activities or be working. (MTW Strategy #5.A.01. Implemented in 1999.)

Not Needed in 2011

- Local lease: Seattle Housing may implement its own lease, incorporating industry best practices. (MTW Strategy #5.P.01. Not yet implemented beyond the strategies previously enumerated.)

Inactive

- Grievance procedures: Modify grievance policies to require tenants to remedy lease violations and be up to date in their rent payments before granting a grievance hearing for proposed tenancy terminations. (MTW Strategy #5.P.02. Not yet implemented.)

Public Housing Local Lease Strategies

- Lease term of less than one year for public housing units: Residents may renew their leases for six month or month-to-month time periods. (MTW Strategy #5.P.03. Implemented in 2010.)

- Property-specific pet policies: SHA may establish pet policies, which may include the continuation or establishment of pet-free communities or limits on the types of pets allowed, on a building by building basis. (MTW Strategy #5.P.04. Implemented in 2011.)

Impact

Active local lease strategies are intended to promote self sufficiency by encouraging work-able adults to participate in self-sufficiency activities and to simplify property management by not having different lease renewals by housing program.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase work-able adults who earn income through employment	Percent of work-able public housing and voucher households whose primary source of income is wages	Percent of households without self-sufficiency requirement for the same time period with wages as primary source of income – 56% in 2011	Percent is higher for HOPE VI households (with self-sufficiency requirement) than baseline (56%)	9% higher (61% of work-able households in HOPE VI earned income through employment in 2011 - 616 out of 1,009 total work-able HOPE VI households)
Decreased administrative burden of managing different lease renewal terms	Number of public housing units for which lease renewals of less than one year are available	0	826	1,813
Housing choice for seniors who prefer pet-free environment	Number of units in pet-limited communities	0 – without MTW authority, SHA could not limit pets in this manner	933	894

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Housing choice for seniors who prefer pet-free environment	Resident satisfaction with living environment	To be developed in survey	SSHP residents responding to the survey will be at least equally satisfied with their living environment compared to general public housing residents	N/A - Survey has not yet been developed

Challenges

The difficult current economic climate limits the ability of Seattle Housing's staff and partners to engage all non-working household members in self-sufficiency activities and help them obtain living wage employment.

We did not achieve our benchmark of 933 units in pet-limited environments because 894 rather than 933 SSHP units began to receive public housing subsidy in 2011, rather than the 933 SSHP units that were originally projected to transition to public housing. In actuality, there has been no change in pet policies at any of the communities.

Data collection methods

Income and student status is maintained for all household members in a database. Implementation of Yardi software in Fall 2012 is expected to allow the agency to electronically track exemptions from the self sufficiency requirement and compliance information for each household member.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activities #6 and #7

These activities are intentionally excluded as they are no longer reported on as MTW activities.

MTW Activity #8 – Special Purpose Housing Use

Status

Active - First implemented prior to MTW participation in 1999 and continued throughout MTW participation

Description

Seattle Housing utilizes public housing units to provide special purpose housing and to improve quality of services or features for targeted populations. In partnership with agencies that provide social services, Seattle Housing is able to make affordable housing available to households that would not likely be admitted in traditional public housing units. With this program Seattle Housing allows partner agencies to use residential units both for service-enriched transitional/short-term housing and for office space for community activities and service delivery. The ability to designate public housing units for specific purposes and populations facilitates this work, by allowing units to target populations with specific service and housing needs, and specific purposes such as pet-free housing.

Authorization

MTW Agreement- Attachment C (B)(2), (B)(3), (B)(4), (C)(1), (C)(2), (C)(4), (C)(5), (C)(6), (C)(9)(a), (C)(9)(b), (C)(10), (C)(11), (C)(15); Attachment D (Uses of MTW Funds), (B). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Public Housing Special Purpose Strategies

- Agency units for housing and related supportive services: Seattle Housing makes residential units available for service-enriched housing by partner agencies. (MTW Strategy #8.P.01. Implemented prior to MTW participation in 1999.)
- Agency units for services: Make residential units available as space for community activities, management use, and partner agencies providing services in and around the community. (MTW Strategy #8.P.02. Implemented prior to MTW participation in 1999.)
- Designate public housing units for special purposes/populations: Seattle Housing may designate properties/units for specific purposes to more effectively serve diverse populations. (MTW Strategy #8.P.03. Implemented in 2000.)
- Program-specific waiting lists: Seattle Housing or agencies operate separate waiting lists for specific programs such as service enriched units. (MTW Strategy #8.A.02. Implemented prior to MTW participation.)
- Service enriched housing: With the help of key partners, Seattle Housing may develop supportive housing communities. (MTW Strategy #8.A.03. Implemented in 2001.)

Inactive

- Conditional Housing: Housing program for those who do not currently meet Seattle Housing's minimum qualifications. (MTW Strategy #8.A.01. Not yet implemented.)
- Definition of elderly: Changes definition of elderly for HUD-designated elderly preference public housing from 62 to 55. (MTW Strategy #8.P.04. Not yet implemented.)
- Pet-free environments: Establish pet-free environments in connection with selected service enriched housing. (MTW Strategy #8.P.05. Not yet implemented.)

Impact

Active Special Purpose Housing Use strategies are intended to increase housing choice by providing service-enriched housing for households that would otherwise be difficult to serve in traditional housing authority units and by enabling services to be available in the community.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase access to service-enriched units	Number of households served in service-enriched units annually	81 units (as of 1998)	2 households served for every unit used for transitional housing or related services	2.6 households per unit (based on 210 households served in the 80 units)
Maintain availability of services	Number of on-site agencies in Seattle Housing's residential units	5	5	5
Maintain and increase stability for households in service-enriched units	Percent of exiting households that leave service-enriched units for stable housing destinations (transitional, permanent, or unsubsidized market-rate housing)	0%	70%	78% (106 out of 136 households exiting service-enriched units in 2011)

Data collection methods

Unit use is tracked by staff in Seattle Housing's property management software. Outcome measures, including households served, are reported by partner agencies according to their lease terms or contract for services. Outcome data for service-enriched medical respite units at Jefferson Terrace is not included as the units came online midway through the year and will begin to report on households served annually in 2012.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #9 - Project-based Program

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing uses MTW to develop and implement a local project-based program, providing vouchers to subsidize units in Seattle Housing-owned and privately owned properties throughout Seattle. Seattle Housing's project-based activities include a large number of MTW strategies to reduce costs, make project-based programs financially feasible for owners, and to provide housing choice in the City. The project-based program promotes housing choice through strategies such as offering site-specific waiting lists maintained by providers (and, therefore, does not issue exit vouchers), expanding the definition of eligible unit types, allowing more project-based units per development and overall, admitting certain types of felons, allocating vouchers to programs and providers (not just units), allowing payment standards that promote services and the financial viability of projects, and coupling housing assistance with services by working with partners. The project-based program reduces Seattle Housing's costs through strategies allowing project-based staff to self-certify selected inspections and maintain their own waiting list, reducing the frequency of inspections by Seattle Housing staff, streamlining admissions, establishing a minimum threshold for calculating income on assets, and non-competitively allocating subsidies to Seattle Housing units. Project-based program strategies also make contract terms consistent with requirements for other leveraged funding sources.

Authorization

MTW Agreement- Attachment C (B)(1)(b)(vi),(vii), (B)(2), (B)(4),(D)(1)(a),(b),(c),(e)(f), (D)(2), (D)(3)(b), (D)(4), (D)(5), (D)(6), (D)(7); Attachment D (B)(ix),(x),(D)(1), (D)(2); specific regulations waived include 24 CFR 982.204(a), 982.405(a), 982.451, 983.103(c), 983.20, 983.202(a), 983.251(c), 983.260(b), 983.30, 983.51, 983.53(a)(7), 982.553(a), 983.51(e), 983.56(a), 983.59(a), 983.59(b)(1), 983.6(a), 5.609(b)(3). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Voucher Project-based Program Strategies

- Cost-benefit inspection approach: Cost-benefit approach to housing inspections allows Seattle Housing to establish local inspection protocol, including allowing project-based building management to self-certify that HQS is met at the time of move in for mid-year turnover project-based units. (MTW Strategy #9.H.01. Implemented in 2004.)
- Choice offered at beginning (no exit vouchers): Because housing choice is provided at the beginning of the project-based admissions process through site-specific waiting lists, exit vouchers are not offered. (MTW Strategy #9.H.03. Implemented in 2000.)
- Contract term: Project-based commitments are renewable up to 40 years. (MTW Strategy #9.H.04. Implemented in 2000)
- Eligible unit types: Seattle Housing allows shared housing and transitional housing under project-based contracts. (MTW Strategy #9.H.05. Implemented in 2002.)
- HAP contracts: HAP contract are modified to ensure consistency with MTW changes and add tenancy addendum. (MTW Strategy #9.H.06. Implemented in 2000.)
- Non-competitive allocation of assistance: Seattle Housing allocates project-based subsidy non-competitively to Seattle Housing controlled units. (MTW Strategy #9.H.07. Implemented in 2000.)
- Percent of vouchers that may be project-based: Seattle Housing allows a greater percentage of vouchers that are project-based than non-MTW HUD limits. (MTW Strategy #9.H.09. Modified in the 2008 MTW Annual Plan.)
- Unit cap per development: Waives the 25 percent cap on the number of units that can be project-based in a multi-family building without supportive services or elderly/disabled designation. (MTW Strategy #9.H.10. Implemented in 2008.)
- Streamlined admissions: The applications process is streamlined for project-based HCV units. (MTW Strategy #9.H.12. Implemented in 2000.)
- Payment standards for Seattle Housing units: Allows higher than Voucher Payment Standard for Seattle Housing-operated project-based units if needed to support the project budget (while still taking into account rent reasonableness). (MTW Strategy #9.H.14. Implemented in 2004.)
- Admissions - admit felons under certain conditions: Allows for the admission into Project-based Voucher and Mod Rehab units of Class B and Class C felons subject to time-limited sex offender registration requirements who do not, in the opinion of the owner of the subsidized units, constitute a threat to others. (MTW Strategy #9.H.16. Implemented in 2005.)
- Program-based vouchers: Seattle Housing allocates a floating voucher subsidy to a defined group of units or properties. (MTW Strategy #9.H.17. Implemented in 2007 in Seattle Housing's Seattle Senior Housing Program.)

-
- Provider-based vouchers: Provide vouchers to selected agencies to couple with intensive supportive services. The agency master leases units and subleases to tenants. (MTW Strategy #9.H.18. Implemented in 2007.)
 - Partners maintain own waiting lists: Allow partners to maintain waiting lists for partner-owned and/or operated units/vouchers and use own eligibility and suitability criteria. (MTW Strategy #9.H.20. Formerly 12.H.01. Implemented in 2000.)

Under Development for 2012 Implementation

- Owners conduct new construction inspections: Seattle Housing may allow project-based owners to conduct their own new construction/rehab inspections and to complete unit turnover inspections. (MTW Strategy #9.H.08. Included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan.)

Inactive

- Assets in rent calculation: Only calculate income on assets declared as valuing \$5,000 or more. (MTW Strategy #9.H.02. Implemented in 2005, superseded by MTW Strategy #10.H.12, which increased the threshold for calculating asset income to an amount up to \$50,000.)
- Rent cap-30 percent of income: Project-based participants can not pay more than 30% of their adjusted income for rent and utilities. (MTW Strategy #9.H.11. Implemented in 2000.)
- Competitive allocation process: Commit vouchers to the City's competitive process for housing funding. (MTW Strategy #9.H.13. Implemented in 2005.)
- Subsidy cap in replacement units: Cap subsidy at levels affordable to households at 30% AMI in project-based HOPE VI replacement units where Seattle Housing also contributed capital to write-down the unit's affordability to that level. (MTW Strategy #9.H.15. Included in the 2004 MTW Annual Plan and currently active as a policy; however, we believe that MTW authority is not required for this policy at this time. If HUD policies change, we will reactivate this MTW activity.)
- Streamlined admissions and recertifications: Seattle Housing may streamline admissions and recertification processes for provider-based, project-based and mod rehab programs. (MTW Strategy #9.H.19. Not yet implemented.)

Impact

The project-based program is intended to promote cost effectiveness by reducing staff time and leveraging funding, as well as expanding housing choice by increasing access to service-enriched affordable housing.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Decrease staff time	Seattle Housing hours saved by allowing partners to maintain their own waiting lists and not conducting new and turnover inspections	0	1,400 hours	1,437 hours saved (833 hours saved by allowing partners to maintain their own waiting lists; 604 hours saved due to unit turnover inspections avoided)
Maintain cost effectiveness of HAP	HAP costs	Average HAP for tenant-based vouchers	HAP for project-based is equal to or less than HAP for tenant-based	\$60 less per month (\$621 for project-based compared to \$681 for tenant-based)
Increase access to service-enriched units for hard to house populations	Number of service enriched units	0	2,406	2,744
Leverage funding	Number of units with leveraged service funding	0	600	933

Revisions to benchmarks or metrics

The benchmark for time saved by allowing partners to maintain their own waiting lists and not conducting new and turnover inspections has been decreased from 2,000 to 1,400. The previous benchmark of 2,000 was calculated using a time savings of one hour per avoided inspection rather than one half hour, which overrepresented the total amount of time savings.

Data collection methods

Seattle Housing maintains detailed tenant, inspection, landlord, and voucher allocation information in its voucher management system. Partner agencies maintain waiting list information and commit to service levels in their application for project-based vouchers. Time savings are based on an estimated one hour of

time saved processing a new tenant application for each household on a partner's waiting list and one half hour per turnover inspection avoided.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #10 – Local Rent Policy

Status

Active - First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing's rent policy tackles a number of objectives, including increasing housing choice by increasing flexibility in calculations determining the eligibility of units and payment standards and encouraging "graduation" out of subsidized housing. Rent policies also promote cost effectiveness and self sufficiency through a minimum rent and asset income threshold and through streamlined rent review processes.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment C (C)(11), (D)(1)(c), (D)(2)(a),(c); Specific regulations waived include 24 CFR 982.352(b)(iv), 982.508, 24 CFR 982.517, 982.604(a), and 5.609. Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Public Housing Rent Policy Program Strategies

- Absolute minimum rent: The minimum rent for all residents will be established annually by Seattle Housing. No rent will be reduced below the minimum rent amount by a utility allowance. (MTW Strategy #10.P.01. Implemented in 2001.)
- Earned Income Disregard: HUD's Earned income Disregard is not offered to public housing residents. (MTW Strategy #10.P.02. Implemented in 2001.)
- Rent reviews for fixed-income households every three years: Rent reviews conducted for households exclusively on fixed-incomes (SS/SSI/pensions) only every three years. Rent increases by Social Security Cost of Living Adjustment in intervening years. (MTW Strategy #10.P.03. Implemented in 2004.)
- Tenant Trust Accounts (TTA): A portion of working public housing residents' income may be deposited in an escrow account for use toward self-sufficiency purposes. (MTW Strategy #10.P.06. Implemented in 2001.)

-
-
- Ceiling rent two year time limit: When a tenant's calculated rent reaches the ceiling rent for their unit, the rent will not be increased beyond the rent ceiling for 24 months. After that time, the tenant's rent is calculated as 30 percent of adjusted gross income. (MTW Strategy #10.P.07. Implemented in 2005.)
 - Impute income from public benefits: Seattle Housing may impute income in rent calculation for tenants declaring no income who appear eligible for, but who have not pursued, benefits from the State's Employment Security or Department of Social and Health Services (such as Unemployment or TANF). (MTW Strategy #10.P.08. Implemented in 2005.)
 - SSHP rent policy: Rents in Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) units are one of four flat rents based on the tenant's percentage of Area Median Income, with annual adjustments and income reviews only every three years. . (MTW Strategy #10.P.17. Implemented in 2011.)
 - No HUD-defined flat rents: Seattle Housing does not offer tenants the choice of "flat rents" as required of non-MTW agencies. (MTW Strategy #10.P.18. This existing MTW strategy was previously unnumbered. Implemented in 2001).

Not Needed in 2011

- Utility allowance-schedule: Seattle Housing may change utility allowances on a schedule different for current residents and new move-ins. (MTW Strategy #10.P.12. Implemented in 2008.)
- Utility allowance-frequency of utility allowance updates: Seattle Housing may revise the schedule for reviewing and updating utility allowances due to fluctuations in utility rates no more than annually. (MTW Strategy #10.P.15. Implemented in 2010 for selected mixed-finance communities.)

Inactive

- Rent freezes: Voluntary rent policy freezes rent in two year intervals. (MTW Strategy #10.P.04. Implemented in 2001, inactive since 2005.)
- TANF rent calculation: Calculate TANF participant rent on 25% of gross income. (MTW Strategy #10.P.05. Implemented in 2000, inactive since 2005.)
- Partners develop separate rent policies: Allow partner providers and HOPE VI communities to develop separate rent policies that are in line with program goals and/or to streamline. (MTW Strategy #10.P.09. Not yet implemented.)
- Studio vs. 1 bedroom: Differentiate rents for studios vs. 1 bedroom units. (MTW Strategy #10.P.10. Not yet implemented.)
- Utility allowance-self-sufficiency and resource conservation: Change utility allowance where metering permits to encourage self-sufficiency and resource conservation. (MTW Strategy #10.P.11. Not yet implemented.)
- Streamlined for fixed income: Further streamline rent policy and certification process for fixed income households. (MTW Strategy#10.P.13. Not yet implemented.)
- Streamlined rent policy for partnership units: Allow non-profit partners operating public housing units to implement simplified rent policies. (MTW Strategy #10.P.14. Not yet implemented.)

-
- Utility allowance-local benchmark: SHA may develop new benchmarks for "a reasonable use of utilities by an energy conservative household" - the standard by which utility allowance are calculated. (MTW Strategy #10.P.16. Not yet implemented.)

Voucher Rent Policy Program Strategies

- Rent burden-include exempt income: Exempt income included for purposes of determining affordability of a unit in relation to 40 percent of household income. (MTW Strategy #10.H.01. Implemented in 2005.)
- Rent cap-use gross income: Rent burden calculated on 30 percent of Gross Income, up from HUD's standard 30 percent of Adjusted Income. (MTW Strategy #10.H.02. Implemented in 2005.)
- Rent reasonableness at Seattle Housing owned units: Allows Seattle Housing staff to perform rent reasonableness determination for Seattle Housing owned units. (MTW Strategy #10.H.03. Implemented in 2000.)
- Payment standard-SROs: Seattle Housing may use the studio payment standard for SRO units. (MTW Strategy #10.H.06. Implemented in 2003.)
- Rent reviews for fixed-income households every three years: Rent reviews conducted for households exclusively on fixed-incomes (SS/SSI/pensions) only every three years. (MTW Strategy #10.H.10. Implemented in 2010.)
- 180-day EOP clock: The 180-day End of Participation "clock" due to income will start when a family's Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) reaches \$50 or less. (MTW Strategy #10.H.11. Implemented in 2010.)
- Asset income threshold: Increased threshold for calculating asset income to an amount up to \$50,000. (MTW Strategy #10.H.12. Implemented in 2010.)
- Simplified utility allowance schedule: HCV participants' rent is adjusted for a Utility Estimate based on the number of bedrooms (defined as the lower of voucher size or actual unit size) and tenant responsibility for payment of energy, heat, and sewer/water under their lease, with a proration for energy-efficient units. (MTW Strategy #10.H.14. Implemented in 2011.)

Under Development for 2012 Implementation

- Rent reasonableness streamlining: Allows Seattle Housing to streamline rent reasonable determinations. (MTW Strategy #10.H.09. Implementation is planned for 2012.)
- Absolute minimum rent: The minimum rent for all residents will be established annually by Seattle Housing. No rent will be reduced below the minimum rent amount by a utility allowance. (MTW Strategy #10.H.05. Implementation is planned for 2012.)

Not Needed in 2011

- Payment standard: If certain market triggers or other guidelines are met, payment standard may exceed 120% of Fair Market Rent. (MTW Strategy #10.H.04. Not yet implemented.)

Inactive

- Tenant-based self-sufficiency incentives: Rent policies to foster self-sufficiency among employable households, including income disregards proportional to payroll tax; allowances for employment-related expenses; intensive employment services coupled with time limits; locally-defined hardship waivers. (MTW Strategy #10.H.07. Not yet implemented.)
- Imputed income from TANF: Impute TANF income if household appears eligible and has not documented ineligibility. TANF not counted toward income if family is sanctioned. (MTW Strategy #10.H.08. Not yet implemented.)
- Streamlined medical deduction: Seattle Housing provides medical deductions based on a standardized schedule. (MTW Strategy #10.H.13. Not yet implemented. MTW authority was not needed for the current approach of allowing self certification of medical expenses under \$5000.)

Impact

Active local rent policy strategies are intended to promote cost effectiveness by saving staff time, housing choice by making additional units eligible, and self sufficiency by encouraging households to build assets and move to housing in the private market.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase eligible units	Annual number of households who move into units that would have otherwise been ineligible without using exempt income, gross income, or 120 percent FMR	0	20 households	4 households used exempt income to qualify for the 40 percent rent cap at move in

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Decrease staff time	Seattle Housing staff time saved by not calculating asset income below \$50,000, three-year schedule for rent reviews for fixed income (including SSHP) households, and streamlined utility allowance	0	500 hours	1,245 hours saved (96 hours from avoided voucher asset income calculation and 1,149 hours from avoided fixed-income household voucher rent reviews)
Increase availability of affordable housing to households on the waiting list	Number of households leaving the HCV program due to 180 day EOP clock at a HAP between \$1 - \$50 and households leaving public housing after or within six months of reaching the time limit for the rent ceiling	0	20 households	6 households (6 voucher households and 0 public housing households in 2011)
Increase self sufficiency	TTA withdrawals for self-sufficiency purposes as percentage of active participants	0	30%	16% of participants (38 total self-sufficiency withdrawals)
Maintain affordable rents for senior housing residents in the SSHP program	Percentage of senior housing residents whose rent remains stable	0%- maintaining the current rent structure would not be possible without MTW authority.	100%	100% (894 households in SSHP units receiving public housing subsidy)

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Maintain affordable rents for senior housing residents in the SSHP program	Number of (one bedroom) senior housing residents paying more than 40% of their income for rent	37	Less than 47 (5%)	65
Achieve efficiency without increasing hardship	Hardship requests concerning the simplified utility allowance resolved	0	20 or fewer requests received and resolved in the the first year of implementation	0 requests received and resolved

Rent Reform Hardship Requests

There was one hardship request under the public housing rent policy in 2011, which was approved. There were no rent policy hardship requests for the voucher program.

Challenges

Fewer households left the HCV program due to the EOP clock and fewer public housing households left within six months of the rent ceiling limit than projected in the benchmark. This is in large part due to the poor current state of the economy, which has resulted in fewer households reporting increased income. In addition, tax credit regulations limit the use of the rent ceiling policy in more than half of Seattle Housing's public housing units. At this point we do not believe that a change in the EOP strategy is needed. However, we will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this policy and make changes as needed. However the agency is considering eliminating the rent ceiling policy.

Results for the Tenant Trust Account program have not been as successful as anticipated. We therefore plan to end the program in 2012 and will implement a new savings incentive program to be launched in the fall.

Fewer households moved into units that would have otherwise been ineligible without using exempt income, gross income, or 120 percent FMR than the benchmark. Two factors contributed to this: fewer vouchers issued to new households overall during the year and a substantial increase in the agency's Voucher Payment Standards in response to increased Fair Market Rents. As a result, fewer households needed exceptions.

The number of SSHP households paying more than 40 percent of their income for rent was higher than projected. The reason for this discrepancy was the out of date information that the agency had available when creating the benchmark. Prior to conducting certifications in 2011 in order to introduce public

housing subsidy to the SSHP program, many households had lived in SSHP units for years without a review and information regarding their income had subsequently become out of date. We do not believe the current number of households paying more than 40 percent is a cause for concern at this time as many SSHP households receive regular contributions from family members and the agency received no hardship requests in 2011; however, we will continue to closely monitor this measure.

Revisions to benchmarks or metrics

No changes were made to the benchmarks for this year's report, but the agency anticipates an increase of 873 hours in the projected staff time savings benchmark to begin in 2012, for a total benchmark of 1,373 hours saved. There are three reasons for this adjustment. First, we must add 599 hours to the benchmark in order to reflect the greater opportunity for time savings from triennial rent reviews due to the addition of SSHP units to the total public housing portfolio. However, because the introduction of public housing to the SSHP program required an initial review for all households, no time savings could be realized for this change in 2011. Second, we must add an additional 200 hours of projected time savings from the simplified utility allowance in the voucher program. Third, we will subtract 260 hours of projected time savings from the streamlined medical adjustment because MTW authority was not required for this activity (self-certification of medical expenses under \$5,000).

Data collection methods

Number of annual reviews avoided in the voucher program was calculated by counting the number of annual updates keyed in the voucher management system. The voucher program conducted a time study in 2011, which found that on average annual reviews for fixed income households required 51 minutes, while on average annual updates required 11 minutes, resulting in an average time savings of 40 minutes per avoided annual review. We use this average for our calculation of time savings.

The definition of "stable rent" in the SSHP program includes adjustment for inflation, which has historically been applied annually based on the Consumer Price Index and Social Security Cost of Living Adjustment. We continue to implement this adjustment for inflation annually.

With the exception of the time study described above, no changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #11 – Resource Conservation

Status

Active - First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing's resource conservation strategies take advantage of the agency's existing relationships with the City of Seattle and local utility providers, which continuously identify opportunities to increase resource conservation and reduce costs, rather than conducting a HUD-prescribed energy audit every five years. Conservation strategies have already achieved significant energy and cost savings to the agency, including conversion to more efficient toilets and electrical upgrades.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment D (C)(1). Our MTW authority is used for the strategy described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Public Housing Resource Conservation Strategies

- Energy protocol: Seattle Housing employs a cost-benefit approach for resource conservation in lieu of HUD-required energy audits every five years. (MTW Strategy #11.P.01. Implemented in 2000.)

Impact

Resource conservation strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by working continuously with local utility providers and the City of Seattle to identify conservation measures in a timely manner and avoiding the cost of hiring a third party to conduct energy audits every five years.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Avoided costs	Cost savings from not paying a third party to conduct energy audits	0	\$72,443 in 2014 (\$13.77 per unit * 5,261 units)	N/A – next audit would not occur until 2014
Savings in utility costs	Savings from water conservation measures (primarily toilet replacement)	0	\$900,000/year	\$1,089,127 in 2011; \$7.4 million since implementation

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Savings in utility costs	Savings from electricity conservation measures (homeWorks renovations 2004-2009)	0	\$147,000/year	\$125,800 in 2011; \$545,119 since implementation

Challenges

The impact of electricity conservation measures has been slightly offset by other building improvements such as the installation of additional fans to decrease moisture damage and more consistent heating of common areas.

Data collection methods

Seattle Housing maintains detailed utility consumption and rate data supplied by utility providers and Seattle Housing's own water billing system. Cost savings measures look solely at the impact of conservation initiatives and are not an agency-wide measure of utility usage. For example, portfolios that were not included in the conservation initiatives are not included in the analysis. Cost savings represent the total amount of energy saved through conservation initiatives and do not distinguish between resulting decreases in expenses for the agency and for tenants.

Avoided costs from not hiring a third party auditor are based on an informal poll of nearby housing authorities. The median per unit cost of an energy audit was \$13.77 per unit, calculated based on the Renton Housing Authority's reported cost of \$5,000 for an audit of 363 units.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #12 – Waiting Lists, Preferences, and Admission

Status

Active - First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing's waiting list, preferences, and admission strategies have two primary objectives: to decrease costs and to facilitate partnerships with agencies that provide supportive services. Seattle Housing's MTW flexibilities in this area allow the agency to provide a greater percentage of vouchers to

service providers and make special decisions if needed to prevent homelessness. These strategies also expedite admission into the program for partner agencies' clients by allowing agencies to maintain their own waiting lists and allowing applicants referred by selected providers to receive the next available unit.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment C (B)(1)(b)(vi), (C)(1), (C)(2), (D)(4); Specific regulations waived include 24 CFR 982.204(a),(f). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Public Housing Waiting Lists, Preferences, and Admission Strategies:

- Partners maintain own waiting lists: Seattle Housing allows partners to maintain waiting lists for partner-owned and/or operated units (traditional LIPH units; service provider units, etc.) and use their own eligibility and suitability criteria. (MTW Strategy #12.P.02. Implemented in 2000.)
- Expedited waiting list: Seattle Housing allows applicants referred by selected partners (primarily transitional housing providers) to receive expedited processing and receive the "next available unit." (MTW Strategy #12.P.03. Implemented in 2004.)
- Eligibility criteria: Unique eligibility criteria for specific units or properties, such as service enriched units. (MTW Strategy #12.P.05. First implemented in 2008.)

Inactive

- Site-based waiting lists: Applicants can choose from several site-specific and/or next available waiting lists. (MTW Strategy #12.P.01. First approved in 1999, but MTW flexibility is no longer required.)
- No waiting list: Allows for filling units without a waiting list. (MTW Strategy #12.P.04. Has not yet been implemented.)

Voucher Waiting Lists, Preferences, and Admission Strategies:

- Voucher distribution through service provider agencies: Up to 30 percent of Seattle Housing's tenant-based vouchers may be made available to local nonprofits, transitional housing providers, and divisions of local government that provide direct services for use by their clients without regard to their client's position on Seattle Housing's waiting list. (MTW Strategy #12.H.02. Implemented in 2002.)
- Special issuance vouchers: Seattle Housing has established a "special issuance" category of vouchers to address circumstances where timely issuance of vouchers can prevent homelessness or rent burden. (MTW Strategy #12.H.03. Implemented in 2003.)

Not needed in 2011

- Limit eligibility for applicants in subsidized housing: Implements limits or conditions for tenants living in subsidized housing to participate in the HCV program. For example, before issuing a Public

Housing resident a voucher, they must fulfill the initial term of their public housing lease. (MTW Strategy #12.H.05. Policy became active in 2011 but was not needed due to the limited number of households issued off of the waiting list.)

Inactive

- Local preferences: Seattle Housing may establish local preferences for federal housing programs. (MTW Strategy #12.A.01. Included in the 2002 MTW Annual Plan; however, this policy is available to all PHAs.)
- Admit applicants owing SHA money: Provide voucher assistance to households owing SHA money from prior tenancy under specific circumstances, for example if they enter into a repayment agreement. (MTW Strategy #12.H.04. First implemented in 2008 and still in place; however MTW authority is no longer needed.)
- Streamlined eligibility verification: Streamline eligibility verification standards and processes, including allowing income verifications to be valid for up to 180 days. (MTW Strategy #12.H.06. Not yet implemented.)

Partners Maintain own Waiting Lists (formerly 12.H.01) is now identified as 9.H.20 and can be found in the previous description of project-based strategies.

Impact

Active waiting list, preferences, and admission strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by reducing avoidable turnover and avoiding costs for tasks that can be fulfilled by service providers. They also promote housing choice by increasing the availability of service-enriched housing for populations that would be difficult to serve in traditional housing authority units.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase availability of affordable housing in combination with supportive services	Number of applicants newly receiving housing through agency referrals or waiting lists	0	75	92 in 2011 (70 through the expedited waiting list and 22 through agency vouchers)
Decrease costs	Staff time savings from agencies maintaining their own waiting lists	0	\$24,960	\$25,155

Data collection methods

Avoided costs from agencies maintaining their own waiting lists is calculated based on savings of \$195 per unit for 129 partnership and service-provider operated housing units in 2011. The \$195 per unit is derived from the agency's real cost in 2010 of \$879,050 to conduct regular admissions for 4,500 units.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #13 – Homeownership and Graduation from Subsidy

Status

Active - First included in the 2004 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing allocated MTW block grant funds to support homeownership through down payment assistance grants. Seattle Housing strives to support households who wish to purchase their own homes, while balancing the need to tailor homeownership strategies to serve the households that are most likely to succeed in private market housing and maintain their homeownership long-term.

In the 2012 Plan, Seattle Housing expanded the scope of this activity to encompass the multiple ways that households can successfully move away from housing subsidy – not only through homeownership, but also through unsubsidized rental units in the private market. As described in the plan for 2012, the agency is developing a savings match incentive program and re-categorizing EOP clock strategies. However, in order to maintain consistency for comparison between the plan and report for 2011, these changes are not implemented in this report for 2011.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment C (B)(1),(D)(8); Attachment D (B). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Homeownership Strategies

- Down payment assistance: allocates MTW Block Grant funds to offer a local down payment assistance program. (MTW Strategy #13.A.01. Implemented in 2004.)

Inactive

- Monthly mortgage assistance (MTW Strategy #13.H.01. Not yet implemented.)

Impact

Homeownership strategies promote housing choice by helping participants purchase homes and self sufficiency by helping households make prudent decisions that ensure that those who do purchase homes are able to maintain them over time.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Increase housing choice through homeownership	Number of participants who purchase homes	0	30 Down Payment Assistance (DPA) program participants purchase homes by 2014	0 in 2011 25 participants have purchased homes to date
Avoid assisting participants in purchasing homes they cannot afford long-term	Number of DPA participants experiencing foreclosure in first three years of homeownership	0	0	0

Challenges

No homes were purchased through the DPA program in 2011 because the final five homes for purchase have not yet been constructed. These homes will be located at Lake City Court.

Data collection methods

DPA program participation is tracked through spreadsheets maintained by Seattle Housing staff. Foreclosure information is obtained through County records.

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #14 – Related Nonprofits

Status

Inactive - First included in the 2004 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing is able to partner with related nonprofits to implement or develop MTW demonstration activities.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment C (B)(2). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Inactive

- Related Nonprofit Contracts: Seattle Housing may enter into contracts with any related nonprofit. (MTW Strategy #14.A.01. Not yet implemented.)

No metrics are reported because this activity is currently inactive.

MTW Activity #15 – Combined Program Management

Status

Active - First included in the 2008 MTW Annual Plan

Description

In some of its communities, Seattle Housing co-locates units funded through project-based vouchers and low income public housing. Combining program management and policies for both of these types of units within the same community makes sense and reduces costs by eliminating redundancies, including duplicative rent reviews and inspections. It also avoids unnecessary disparities between tenants of the two different types of units. Seattle Housing's current implementation of this activity calls for all units subsidized by project-based housing choice vouchers to be operated just like public housing subsidized units.

Authorization

MTW Agreement, Attachment C (C)(1), (C)(2), (C)(4), (C)(9), (C)(10), (C)(11), (D)(1), (D)(2), (D)(3), (D)(4), (D)(5), (D)(7); specific regulations waived include 24 CFR 983.51(b)(2). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Combined Program Management Strategies

- Combined program management: Combined program management for project-based vouchers and public housing in communities operating both subsidy types. (MTW Strategy #15.A.01. Implemented in 2008.)

Impact

Combined program management strategies are intended to increase cost effectiveness by decreasing staff time through the elimination of duplicated activities, such as inspections and waiting lists, and the streamlining of rent and other policies that would otherwise be similar, but different, if the units were operated under the separate subsidy programs.

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	2011 Results
Decrease staff time	Staff time saved by not duplicating rent reviews and inspections	0	388 hours	422 hours saved from avoided rent reviews

Data collection methods

Avoided staff time from streamlined rent reviews is based on 211 avoided reviews for new admissions, annual review, special review, and end of participation, which require an average of 2 hours each for these family units. The total number of avoided reviews for these categories for 2010 and 2011 are the same due to coincidence rather than error. Avoided time from inspections will be calculated at 1 hour each for annual and new move-in inspections once the streamlined inspection protocol for these units is implemented (planned for 2012).

No changes were made to data collection methods in 2011.

MTW Activity #16 – Local Asset Management Program

Status

Active - First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Each year Seattle Housing submits to HUD a Local Asset Management Program (LAMP) plan, which outlines how it will allocate its funds, including the agency's approach to project-based budgeting and

accounting, cost allocation, and classifications of costs and cost objectives. While there are many areas in which Seattle Housing's LAMP is consistent with HUD's asset management model, there are distinctions as well, including the ability to apply indirect service fees to all housing and rental assistance programs; expecting all properties, regardless of fund source, to be accountable for property-based management, budgeting, and financial reporting; creating management and operational efficiencies across programs; using MTW block grant flexibility to balance resources with local priorities; and maintaining selected central services, including procurement and specialty maintenance capacities, to most cost effectively serve the needs of the agency and its programs as a whole.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Section II (F) as amended by the First Amendment

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Local Asset Management Program Strategies

- Local Asset Management Program: Use asset management principles to optimize housing and services. (MTW Strategy #16. Implemented in 2010.)

Metrics are not required by HUD for this activity.

MTW Activity #17 – Performance Standards

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan

Description

Seattle Housing has used alternative performance measurements since becoming a Moving to Work agency in 1999. Because Moving to Work agencies are allowed to try out new strategies that fall outside of regular HUD activities, some of the standard measures that HUD uses to measure housing authorities' accomplishments may not apply to Moving to Work agencies. In 2011 Seattle Housing continued efforts to develop HUD-approved measures for Moving to Work agencies that can serve as an alternative to HUD's Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS). To inform the selection of alternative measures, Seattle Housing facilitated a discussion at the 2011 Annual MTW Conference.

Authorization

MTW Agreement - Attachment D (A)(1). Our MTW authority is used for the strategies described below.

No changes were made to authorizations in 2011.

Agency-wide Local Asset Management Program Strategies

- Local performance standards in lieu of HUD measures: Develop locally relevant performance standards and benchmarks to evaluate the agency performance in lieu of HUD's Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS). (MTW Strategy #17. Implemented in 1999.)

Evaluation of this activity is not required by HUD.

VII. Sources and Uses of Funding

This section describes Seattle Housing Authority's unaudited revenues and expenditures for 2011, local asset management program, and use of MTW single fund authority.

Sources and uses of MTW funds

The table below summarizes the MTW sources of funds in the original and revised budgets and actual expenditures for Calendar Year (CY) 2011. The CY 2011 budget has been revised from the budget submitted in Seattle Housing's 2011 Plan to reflect technical changes that occurred during 2011.

Table 3: Sources - MTW Funds

	CY 2011 Plan Budget	CY 2011 Revised Budget	CY 2011 Actual	Percent Variance ²
Dwelling Rental Income	\$11,225,000	\$11,225,000	\$11,380,000	1.4%
Investment and Interest Income	211,000	211,000	45,000	(78.7%)
Other Income	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,683,000	(3.8%)
MTW Block Grant ¹	120,878,000	120,878,000	122,096,000	1.0%
<i>LIPH Operating MTW Block Grant</i>	<i>19,468,000</i>	<i>19,468,000</i>	<i>21,673,000</i>	<i>11.3%</i>
<i>HCV MTW Block Grant</i>	<i>88,460,000</i>	<i>88,460,000</i>	<i>87,189,000</i>	<i>(1.4%)</i>
<i>Capital MTW Block Grant</i>	<i>12,950,000</i>	<i>12,950,000</i>	<i>13,234,000</i>	<i>2.2%</i>
Total Sources-MTW	\$134,064,000	\$134,064,000	\$135,204,000	0.9%

¹ The MTW Capital Grant budget amount reflects 50% of HUD's FY 2010 awarded capital allocation to Seattle Housing plus 50% of the 2011 estimated allocation. No funds from prior year capital grants are included in the budgeted amount but they are included in the 2011 actual.

² Percent Variance is calculated on the difference between the Revised Budget and CY 2011 Actual.

Dwelling Rental Income increased more than anticipated, despite the state of the economy in 2011. Historically low vacancy rates more than offset reductions in rent due to adverse changes in tenant incomes.

The properties, overall, experienced a decline in average per unit rental income as a result of decrease or loss of residents' income. The number of residents paying the \$50 minimum rent also increased more than anticipated, primarily as a result of decreases in or losses of state and local benefits.

Investment and Interest Income: Interest rates continue to be lower than budgeted projections. We anticipated that this market would make a slight recovery but in actuality rates continue to decline.

Other Income decreased due to lower than anticipated non-dwelling rental income from the new Respite Care Program at Jefferson Terrace. The program reached full occupancy later in 2011 than projected and as a result income was not generated for the full year. In addition, the Low Income Public Housing program experienced higher collection losses than anticipated in the budget. Increased rooftop antenna income has offset part of the decline in other income.

The **total MTW Block Grant** funding amount for 2011 Subsidy was slightly higher than budgeted mainly because of the amount received for LIPH Operating Subsidy MTW Block Grant. The initial 2011 operating subsidy projection assumed no increase from the 2010 eligibility level; however, full funding was granted and allocated to housing authorities in 2011. The Housing Choice Voucher MTW Block Grant was less than the revised budget primarily due to a lower than anticipated Annual Adjustment Factor and less favorable proration factor. This variance would have been greater if the agency had not received \$783,000 in set aside funding for unexpected circumstances related to state safety net cuts.

With regard to the Capital MTW Block Grant, there was an error by HUD in the funding calculation due to the accidental exclusion of nearly 600 units from the calculation. This resulted in a 2011 Capital MTW Block Grant award of \$10.2 million, which was 21 percent less than budgeted. Actual receipts reported in the preceding table appear favorable to budget, but this is the result of multiple capital subsidy drawdowns to cover expenditures incurred in 2011 under several different annual capital grants, not just the 2011 capital grant.

The sources table does not reflect the actual 2011 capital grant award. HUD did ultimately resolve the issue of the missing units and awarded Seattle Housing capital grant funds for the missing units in March 2012; these funds will be included in the 2012 ACC.

The following table shows planned expenditures by line item for the original and revised CY 2011 budget and CY 2011 actual.

Table 4: Expenses - MTW Funds

	CY 2011 Plan Budget	CY 2011 Revised Budget	CY 2011 Actual	Percent Variance
Program Operations and Administration	\$24,778,000	\$21,148,000	\$19,999,000	(5.4%)
Housing Assistance Payments	69,233,000	69,233,000	70,225,000	1.4%
Utilities	6,332,000	6,332,000	5,426,000	(14.3%)
Maintenance and Contracts	11,706,000	11,681,000	10,843,000	(7.2%)
Subtotal Operations	\$112,049,000	\$108,394,000	106,493,000	(1.8%)
Development and Capital Projects	10,977,000	10,977,000	10,539,000	(4.0%)
Capital Equipment	451,000	451,000	338,000	(25.1%)
Total Expenses-MTW¹	\$123,477,000	\$119,822,000	\$117,370,000	(2.0%)
Transfers to Local Low-Income Housing and Development Activities ²	8,236,000	11,891,000	13,671,000	15.0%
Contribution to Reserves ³	2,351,000	2,351,000	4,163,000	77.1%
Total Expenses and Transfers-MTW	\$134,064,000	\$134,064,000	\$135,204,000	0.9%

¹ In order not to double count expenditures in deriving agency-wide 2011 expenditures, use the Total MTW Expense line and add the Total Non-MTW Expense line from the Non -MTW Uses table. Also, to better reflect FDS reporting, the 2011 Budget was revised to transfer Community Service budget from the MTW to the Other Programs table.

² Transfers are from MTW Block Grant to local low-income housing and related activities.

³ This contribution to reserves will be used for our operating reserve and other designated activities.

MTW Program Operations and Administrative expenses are favorable particularly due to a hiring freeze and other cost saving efforts. In 2011 Seattle Housing implemented hiring freezes across the agency because of the uncertainty of our subsidy award. Departments carefully reviewed their needs for essential positions and cautiously implemented ways to increase efficiencies without impacting service to residents. The measures implemented resulted in cost saving from labor expenses and other operational costs including office administration expenses. The Housing Choice Voucher program saw savings associated with keeping the waiting list closed, such as lower postage, and lower contracts for research services. However, a large portion of the savings achieved in this department was offset by higher than expected portability administrative fees as the agency continues to see more voucher holders port out to other jurisdictions.

Housing Assistance Payment: Housing assistance payments were higher at year end than the budget anticipated. A dramatic increase in 2011 local Fair Market Rents (FMR) and cuts to state funded safety net programs drove the average cost per voucher up. To help control rising costs, the agency limited the issuance of new vouchers to fulfilling project-based commitments and special purpose (non-MTW) vouchers.

Utilities expense was below forecast primarily due to lower than projected sewer rate increases and the effort made to reduce solid waste. The recycling and waste reduction program was successful in promoting recycling at the high-rise communities and this resulted in reduced garbage tonnage and costs. Electricity and water expenses were also below projection.

Maintenance and Contract expenses were below budget primarily due to implementation of new vacate processes in Housing Operations, designed to both improve turnaround time and reduce costs. The new strategy re-engineered the vacate process by aligning the decision-making on vacate work with accountability for budget performance – with both assigned to property management staff. The change has resulted in a decrease in per unit vacate cost and decline in general maintenance and repair expenses. In addition, Housing Operations was able to negotiate and reduce elevator contract costs below the amount projected in the budget. These two measures taken during the year produced positive results and decreased costs in maintenance and contract expenses.

MTW Development and Capital Projects: Most of the spending for Development and Capital projects was used for debt service on homeWorks bonds, planning projects (including Yesler Terrace), hazmat abatement, and modifying units under the Voluntary Compliance Agreement.

Capital Equipment expenditures were lower than budgeted. Several projects, including expanding document imaging and security testing are still pending. The conversion to a new property management system will continue into 2012, with additional funds budgeted for that year and a projected go-live date of October 1, 2012.

Sources and uses of other funds

Seattle Housing operates a number of housing programs that are part of Seattle Housing's Primary Government budget, but not part of the Consolidated MTW Budget, including the Seattle Senior Housing Program, the Local Housing Fund Special Portfolio, Non-MTW Section 8, and HOPE VI Revitalization, Parks, Facilities, For Sale, and Community Services. Seattle Housing also operates Impact Property

Management (IPM) and Impact Property Services (IPS), which manage and maintain housing for Seattle Housing, tax credit limited partnerships, and other property owners.

The following table summarizes sources of funds projected for these activities.

Table 5: Sources – Other Programs

	CY 2011 Plan Budget	CY 2011 Revised Budget	CY 2011 Actual	Percent Variance
Dwelling Rental Income	\$14,696,000	\$14,696,000	\$15,207,000	3.5%
Investment and Interest Income	1,409,000	1,409,000	1,120,000	(20.5%)
Other Income	10,246,000	10,246,000	10,878,000	6.2%
Special Purpose Vouchers and Misc. Subsidy	7,549,000	7,549,000	7,864,000	4.2%
Grants	3,960,000	3,960,000	7,295,000	84.2%
Capital Sources:				
Other Capital	6,659,000	6,659,000	1,905,000	(71.4 %)
Prior Year Capital Sources – ARRA	10,375,000	10,375,000	15,116,000	45.7%
Prior Year Capital Sources - Mixed- Finance	21,545,000	21,545,000	30,347,000	40.9%
Total Sources-Other Programs	\$76,439,000	\$76,439,000	\$89,732,000	17.4%

Overall, 2011 **Dwelling Rental Income** increased primarily due to significantly improved occupancy rates at properties in Special Portfolio. Most of the properties were fully leased with a very small number of units vacant at the end of the year. In addition, the properties in SSHP had more tenants on the higher rent tier schedule than anticipated in the budget.

Investment and Interest Income was not favorable to budget due to lower than expected interest rates.

Other Income: Due to higher than expected cash flow, HOPE VI properties were able to pay more deferred developer fee than expected. In addition, unanticipated preliminary administrative fees associated with tenant protection vouchers were received along with an unbudgeted limited partnership operating lease payment. Lastly, the moderate rehabilitation program had higher utilization and administrative fees than expected when the budget was adopted.

The **Non-MTW Section 8** subsidy provided for 2011 was higher than budget. The Seattle Housing Authority was awarded a significant number of tenant protection vouchers that were not expected when the budget was adopted.

Grants represent HOPE VI capital and Community and Supportive Services funds. HOPE VI capital sources were not drawn down as expected in the prior year budget. Therefore, Lake City Court drew down more HOPE VI funding than expected in 2011. HOPE VI capital draws totaled \$6.5 million. Community Services grant income was slightly under budget. Results per grant typically approximated budget, but some were mixed. Most notably, our 2011-2012 ROSS grant exceeded expectations. However, Community Services HOPE VI activity at Lake City Court was delayed.

Other Capital sources are budget authority from reserves and local sources. SSHP's planned city sources made up more than sixty percent of the budget. These sources were not received in 2011 and are now expected in 2012.

Prior Year Capital Sources – ARRA were available and used for Denny Terrace's major rehabilitation, Rainier Vista Northeast Rental Housing, and Jefferson Terrace's respite care facility. Rainier Vista Northeast Rental Housing funding draws projected for 2010 occurred in 2011. Other projects were drawn down as anticipated in 2011.

Prior Year Capital Sources – Mixed-Finance were available for Rainier Vista Northeast and Lake City Court. Both projects are on budget and on time, the variance between years has to do with the actual timeline of the projects' progress compared to the planned timeline of the projects. Rainier Vista Northeast will be completed in 2012 while Lake City Court was completed in 2011 and will be fully leased in 2012. Final receipts for Rainier Vista Rental Northeast are expected to occur in 2012.

Table 6: Expenses – Other Programs

	CY 2011 Plan Budget	CY 2011 Revised Budget	CY 2011 Actual	Percent Variance
Program Operations and Administration	\$17,740,000	\$21,371,000	\$21,123,000	(1.2%)
Special Purpose Vouchers-Housing Assistance Payments	6,429,000	6,429,000	6,718,000	4.5%
Utilities	2,648,000	2,648,000	2,534,000	(4.3%)
Maintenance and Contracts	7,513,000	7,537,000	7,231,000	(4.1%)
Subtotal Operations	\$34,330,000	\$37,985,000	\$37,606,000	(1.0%)
Community and Supportive Services Grants	860,000	860,000	813,000	(5.5%)
Capital and Non-Routine Projects	8,095,000	8,095,000	6,365,000	(21.4%)
Prior Year ARRA	10,375,000	10,375,000	15,201,000	46.5%
HOPE VI Mixed Finance Redevelopments	24,320,000	24,320,000	36,541,000	50.3%
Total Expenses-Other	\$77,980,000	\$81,635,000	\$96,526,000	18.2%

Program Operations and Administration actual expenses were below expected amounts predominantly due to lower than anticipated administrative and general costs in Community Services, Special Portfolio, and the Seattle Senior Housing Program. These groups had significant labor costs savings throughout the year, including holding several community services positions held open during the hiring freeze.

Non-MTW Housing Assistance Payments were above budget expectations at year end. A new infusion of tenant protection vouchers was received resulting in slightly higher Housing Assistance Payments than anticipated. Additional subsidy was received to directly offset this expense. Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) and Family Unification Program (FUP) utilization rates started the year low due to the new awards in these programs but steadily increased throughout 2011. Moderate Rehabilitation vouchers had higher than anticipated utilization due to a large project becoming reoccupied sooner than

anticipated. High Fair Market Rents and cuts to safety net programs also increased the cost of special purpose Housing Assistance Payments.

Utility expenses were lower than projected mainly due to lower solid waste costs and lower than anticipated increase in sewer rates. The decrease in solid waste, especially at SSHP buildings, is due to the success of recycling efforts.

Maintenance and Contracts: The new vacate process has resulted in cost savings for the Special Portfolio and Seattle Senior Housing Program. The re-engineered vacate process along with the drop in vacancy rates contributed to the significant decrease in maintenance and contracts expenses. Elevator contract expenses were below projection mainly due to the new rates negotiated. In addition, less maintenance activity was required at Seattle Housing office and maintenance facilities.

Community and Supportive Services Grant expenditures were below budget expectations but results by program were mixed. Community services spending at the Lake City Court HOPE VI site began later than anticipated. These funds will be utilized in 2012 instead. Most other programs approximated budget. ROSS grant spending was higher due to an increased award amount. Gates Foundation grant spending was higher than expected. Communities Putting Prevention to Work spending was slightly lower than expected in order to extend the life of the program.

Capital and Non-Routine budget for 2011 primarily reflected work at Bitter Lake Manor, Blakeley Manor, and more modest projects in the high rises. The 2011 expenses primarily reflect projects budgeted in prior years such as envelope work at Wedgwood Estates and floors, blinds and carpet work at SSHP. The 2011 capital expenses also reflect resolution of a construction claim on the Rainier Vista Phase II infrastructure project.

Prior Year ARRA expenditures at Rainier Vista Northeast were planned for 2010 but most occurred in 2011. Other projects were expended as anticipated.

HOPE VI Mixed Finance Redevelopments represent construction at Rainier Vista Northeast and Lake City Court. Lake City Court was completed in 2011. Rainier Vista Northeast will continue into 2012. Both multi-year projects were on budget and on time even though the 2011 actual expenditures exceeded the 2011 estimates. The 2011 expenditures were about \$2 million higher than anticipated at both redevelopments.

Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP)

Seattle Housing continued to operate under its approved Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP) in 2010 and again in 2011. Seattle Housing's LAMP was submitted with our 2011 MTW Plan and approved by HUD in its letter dated January 2011.

Sources and uses of the COCC

In compliance with the First Amendment to the MTW Agreement and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87 requirements, Seattle Housing set up an indirect services fee. The indirect cost plan is described in more detail in Seattle Housing's LAMP, which can be found in Appendix A of the 2011 MTW Plan. Seattle Housing created a Central Services Cost Center to represent the fee charges and expenses for overhead costs.

Cost allocation or fee-for-service approach

As described above, Seattle Housing has developed an indirect services fee (ISF) in compliance with OMB Circular A-87 requirements. The fee is more comprehensive than HUD's asset management system. HUD's asset management system and fee for service focuses only on fees for services at the public housing property level. Seattle Housing's work is broader than public housing and therefore the agency's LAMP is also broader, including local housing and other activities not found in traditional HUD programs. Seattle Housing's ISF is based on anticipated indirect costs serving all direct service programs for the fiscal year. In accordance with the requirements of OMB Circular A-87, the ISF is determined in a reasonable and consistent manner based on total units and leased vouchers. The ISF is calculated as a per-housing-unit or per-leased-voucher fee, charged monthly to each program. Please see the AMP (available as an appendix to the 2011 Plan) to read more about Seattle Housing's Indirect Cost Plan.

Single-fund flexibility

Seattle Housing established a MTW Block Grant Fund under the original MTW Agreement in 1999. SHA continues to use single-fund flexibility under the First Amendment and Attachment D to Seattle Housing's MTW Agreement. The Authority's flexibility to use MTW Block Grant resources to support its array of low-income housing services and programs is central to the agency's LAMP. Seattle Housing's LAMP includes the whole of Seattle Housing operations and MTW Block Grant funds. During 2011, Seattle Housing exercised its authority and MTW flexibility to allocate MTW Block Grant revenues among the Authority's housing and administrative programs. This enabled Seattle Housing to further its mission and strategic plan by balancing the mix of housing types, services, capital investments, and administrative support to different low-income housing programs and different groups of low-income residents.

In 2011, Seattle Housing used its Block Grant flexibility to support the following local programs:

- Local low income housing operations and capital repairs
- Community services for tenants, including employment opportunity programs, recreation and youth educational programs; translation services; and, self-sufficiency programs
- Maintenance of parks in mixed income housing developments
- Support of homeownership opportunities at affordable process in mixed income communities
- Management efficiencies and improvements through technology
- Local low-income housing development

VIII. Administrative Information

This section provides documentation of Board of Commissioners action regarding this plan and certification of compliance with regulations.

Seattle Housing Board of Commissioners Resolutions

The Seattle Housing Authority Board of Commissioners approved the 2011 MTW Annual Report in Board Resolution No. 5009.

Certification of Compliance with Regulations

- At least 75 percent of families assisted by Seattle Housing are very low-income.
 - At the end of 2011, 96.5 percent of households served by Seattle Housing were very low-income (as detailed in Attachment C).
- Seattle Housing continues to assist substantially the same number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined.
 - Seattle Housing will submit supporting details in HUD's prescribed format separate from this report. For more information on households served by unit size, please see Appendix C.

Correction of Observed Deficiencies

Seattle Housing did not receive any significant findings or observed deficiencies from HUD audits or monitoring visits in 2011.

Agency-Directed Evaluations

Seattle Housing is not currently engaged in any agency-wide evaluations of its MTW program.

Performance and Evaluation Report for Capital Fund Activities

Please see Appendix D.

Appendices

The appendices of this report include:

- Appendix A: New Public Housing Units
- Appendix B: New Project-based Voucher Units
- Appendix C: Housing and Applicant Demographics
- Appendix D: Capital Performance and Evaluation Report

Appendix A – New Public Housing Units

The following is a description of new public housing units added during 2011. Seattle Housing added 42 public housing units (17 more than projected) at Rainier Vista, where the agency made good progress on development, and decided not to introduce public housing subsidy to 39 units in a tax credit limited partnership property (Ravenna School Apartments) in the Seattle Senior Housing Program portfolio. The agency may revisit this decision in the future.

Lake City Court								
	Public Housing				Straight Tax Credit / Other Affordable			
Structure Type	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR
Elevator	1	39	9	2	2	26	5	2
Subtotal	1	39	9	2	2	26	5	2
Total	51				35			
Accessible Features	6 of the total 86 units are fully UFAS accessible. 22 additional units are adaptable to the UFAS accessible standard. 20 additional units are “visitable.” These units include entry on an accessible path of travel, an accessible toilet facility, and doorways with a minimum clear width of 32 inches.							

Rainier Vista Northeast (Phase III)										
	Public Housing					Straight Tax Credit/Project-based Housing Choice Vouchers				
Structure Type	1 BR	2BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR
Row		9	20	2	1		6	10	2	1
Semi-Detached		3	3	1			1	1		1
Single Family		3					2			
Subtotal	0	15	23	3	1	0	9	11	2	2
Total	42					24				
Accessible Features	Ten of the units completed in 2011 are “visitable,” with entrances that are without steps or at a minimal grade, bathrooms on the ground level, and exterior doors that are 36 inches wide. There will be seven fully accessible UFAS units by project end.									

Seattle Senior Housing Program						
	Public Housing			Other Affordable– Tax Credit		
Structure Type	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms
Row						
Walk Up						
Elevator	801	93				
Subtotal	801	93	0	0	0	0
Total	894			0		
Accessible Features	All buildings have elevators and wheelchair access, including wider doorways, halls, and bathrooms. All buildings are ADA accessible and accommodations for individual residents are made as they are requested.					

Appendix B – New Project-based Voucher Units

In the 2011 Plan, Seattle Housing anticipated project-basing 127 MTW vouchers. In actuality, 165 MTW project-based vouchers were committed during the year. The primary factors contributing to the difference are the faster than projected rate of progress at Rainier Vista and community partner units that came online in 2011 that were previously projected in 2010.

Please note that not all of the vouchers project-based in 2011 and described below are MTW. When also including VASH and conversion vouchers, the number of new project-based vouchers in 2011 totals 300. The 125 project-based vouchers at Four Freedoms are enhanced vouchers for tenants who chose to project-base their vouchers at a Section 536 Flexible Subsidy Project that underwent conversion to market rate in 2011. Gossett Place Apartments has ten VASH vouchers that were project-based in addition to MTW project-based vouchers.

Haddon Hall						
Project description	Haddon Hall, owned by Plymouth Housing Group (PHG), is a 54 unit apartment complex located in downtown Seattle. The tenants who will be served in the project-based units are participants in PHG's Options Program, a "graduation" program to move stabilized tenants out of an intensively staffed 24-hour supportive housing building into a more conventional apartment building.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	Studios	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	Total
54	1	9	0	0	0	10

Brettler Family Place						
Project description	Brettler Family Place, managed by Mercy Housing, offers 51 permanent housing units for formerly homeless families. Families receive onsite supportive case management services, resources and referrals. Classes are offered for both children and adults focusing on employment, increasing education, English language skills, parenting and financial fitness.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	Studios	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	Total
51	0	0	32	14	5	51

Monica's Village Place I						
Project description	Monica's Village Place I is owned and operated by Catholic Housing Services in Central Seattle. Project-based vouchers were awarded in conjunction with Sound Families service funding. Sound Families funds programs with supportive services for homeless families or families in danger of becoming homeless.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	Studios	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	Total
51	0	1	28	9	0	38

Rose Street Apartments						
Project description	Rose Street Apartments, owned and operated by Bellwether Housing (formerly Housing Resources Group) in Seattle's Rainier Beach neighborhood, was awarded four project-based vouchers as part of Seattle Housing's commitment to replace High Point units.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	Studios	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	Total
71	0	0	4	0	0	4

Avalon Place						
Project description	Avalon Place, owned and operated by Transitional Resource in West Seattle, received an award of 9 project-based vouchers through the 2010 Combined Funder's NOFA, providing braided funding for services, operating, and rental assistance for homeless housing projects. These vouchers represent Seattle Housing's commitment to projects receiving capital funding from the City of Seattle Housing Levy.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	TBD	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	Total
9	0	9	0	0	0	9

Gossett Place Apartments						
Project description	Gossett Place, owned and operated by Low Income Housing Institute in Seattle's University District, was awarded 12 project-based vouchers as part of Seattle Housing's commitment to replace High Point units and an additional award of 28 project-based vouchers through the 2010 Combined Funder's NOFA, providing braided funding for services, operating, and rental assistance for homeless housing projects. These vouchers represent Seattle Housing's commitment to projects receiving capital funding from the City of Seattle Housing Levy. An additional ten VASH vouchers were also committed to this project in 2011.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	Studios	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	Total
62	13 total (3 MTW, 10 VASH)	37	0	0	0	50 total (40 MTW, 10 VASH)

Rainier Vista Northeast						
Project description	Rainier Vista Northeast has 118 units of various types located in Rainier Vista Phase II. All 118 units are part of a tax credit limited partnership, of which Seattle Housing is the general partner. The project based units are floating and are a mix of bedroom sizes.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	5 Bedrooms	Total
118	0	2	8	2	1	13

Four Freedoms						
Project description	Four Freedoms is a Section 536 Flexible Subsidy Project that underwent conversion to market rate in 2011. Seattle Housing received 182 conversion vouchers for this project. Residents were provided an option of choosing to project-base their enhanced voucher, with 125 residents making that choice.					
Total units in property	Project-based units					
	Studios	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	Total
302	105 conversion	20 conversion	0	0	0	125 conversion

Appendix C – Household and Applicant Demographics

This appendix provides specific data on changes in the number and characteristics of households housed in Seattle and applicants. Unless otherwise noted, data represents year-end information (December 31, 2011). Slight variations in totals from table to table indicate detailed data is missing for a few households. Additional data notes are provided at the end of this appendix.

Existing Households

Race of head of household

Low-Income Public Housing Residents as of 12/31/2011

Community Type	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian / Asian American	Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	Total
Garden Communities	127	679	22	515	8	1,348
High-Rises	1,650	794	66	442	4	2,956
Mixed Income	22	36	-	3	-	61
Partnership Units	18	28	-	4	-	50
Scattered Sites	175	370	18	93	5	661
SSHP-LIPH	664	87	9	105	2	867
Townhouses	14	36	1	10	2	63
LIPH Total	2,670	2,030	116	1,172	18	6,009
Percent of Total	44.4%	33.8%	1.9%	19.5%	0.3%	
2010 Year-end	2,017	1,841	107	1,056	19	5,040
Percent of Total	40.0%	36.5%	2.1%	21.0%	0.4%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	32.1%	10.3%	8.4%	10.8%	-5.3%	19.0%
Difference in Ratios	4.4%	-2.7%	-0.2%	-1.4%	-0.1%	

Section 8 Program Participants as of 12/31/2011

Program	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian / Asian American	Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	Total
HCV Tenant-based	1,847	2,339	120	591	31	4,928
HCV Project-based	1,243	1,070	62	237	30	2,642
S8 Mod Rehab	371	165	42	147	4	729
S8 New Construction	67	19	5	5	-	96
Section 8 Total	3,528	3,593	229	980	65	8,395
Percent of Total	42.0%	42.8%	2.7%	11.7%	0.8%	
2010 Year-end	3,356	3,375	201	950	69	7,951
Percent of Total	42.2%	42.4%	2.5%	11.9%	0.9%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	5.1%	6.5%	13.9%	3.2%	-5.8%	5.6%
Difference in Ratios	-0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	-0.3%	-0.1%	

SSHP Residents as of 12/31/2011

Program	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian & Pacific Islander	Total
SSHP Total	67	6	0	29	96
Percent of Total	63.5%	6.3%	0.0%	30.2%	
2010 Year-end	726	86	7	132	951
Percent of Total	76.3%	9.0%	0.7%	13.9%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	-90.8%	-93.0%	342.9%	-100.0%	-89.1%
Difference in Ratios	-11.9%	-3.3%	29.1%	-13.9%	

Other Non-Federal Program Residents as of 12/31/2011

Program ¹	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian & Pacific Islander	Total
HOPE VI Tax Credit	34	123	-	32	189
Special Portfolio – Seattle Housing	30	88	-	11	129
Special Portfolio – Privately Managed ²	205	26	-	38	269
Other Non-Federal Total	269	237	30	81	587
Percent of Total	45.8%	40.4%	5.1%	8.7%	
2010 Year-end	270	232	1	64	567
Percent of Total: Projected	47.6%	40.9%	5.1%	11.3%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	-0.4%	2.2%	-100.0%	26.6%	3.5%
Difference in Ratios	-1.8%	-0.5%	-0.2%	2.5%	

¹Excludes households in these portfolios represented in other housing programs, such as those with Housing Choice Vouchers or in Low Income Public Housing units. ² Excludes 6 Special Portfolio - Privately Managed households whose race is unknown.

Ethnicity of head of household³

Ethnicity – Hispanic / Non-Hispanic as of 12/31/2011

Program	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Total
Low Income Public Housing	203	4,936	5,139
SSHP-LIPH	30	837	867
HCV Tenant-Based	227	4,701	4,928
HCV Project-Based	129	2,513	2,642
Section 8 Mod Rehab	43	686	729
Section 8 New Construction	6	90	96
Seattle Senior Housing Program	5	91	96
Other Non-Federal Programs 3	30	561	591
Total Households	673	14,415	15,088
Percent of Total	4.5%	95.5	
2010 Year-end	618	13,899	14,517
Percent of Total	4.2%	95.7%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	8.9%	3.7%	-0.1%
Difference in Ratios	0.2%	-0.2%	

³Excludes two (2) household whose ethnicity is unknown.

Income distribution as a percent of median income

Median Incomes Levels for the Seattle-Bellevue Area -Effective 12/1/2011

Family Size	30% Median	50% Median	80% Median
Single Individual	\$18,500	\$30,800	\$45,500
Family of Two	\$21,150	\$35,200	\$52,000
Family of Three	\$23,800	\$39,600	\$58,500
Family of Four	\$26,400	\$44,000	\$65,000
Family of Five	\$28,550	\$47,550	\$70,200
Family of Six	\$30,650	\$51,050	\$75,400
Family of Seven	\$32,750	\$54,600	\$80,600
Family of Eight	\$34,850	\$58,100	\$85,800

Distribution of Household Annual Income as of 12/31/2011

Program	Below 30% Median Income	30% - 50% Median Income	50% - 80% Median Income	Over 80% Median Income	Total
Low Income Public Housing	4,552	487	92	8	5,139
SSHP-LIPH	675	154	35	3	867
HCV Tenant-Based	4,266	588	72	2	4,928
HCV Project-Based	2,464	156	21	1	2,642
Section 8 Mod Rehab	702	20	4	3	729
Section 8 New Construction	89	7	-	-	96
Seattle Senior Housing Program	84	8	3	1	96
Other Non-Federal Programs	128	167	158	121	574
Total Households	12,960	1,587	385	139	15,071
Percent of Total	86.0%	10.5%	2.6%	0.9%	
2010 Year-end	12,380	1,525	370	162	14,437
Percent of Total	85.8%	10.6%	2.6%	1.1%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	4.7%	4.1%	4.1%	-14.2%	4.4%
Difference in Ratios	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	

Total population by age group (minors, adults and elderly)

Low-Income Public Housing Residents as of 12/31/2011

Development	Non-Elderly Minors	Non-Elderly Adults	Elderly Adults	Total Individuals	Elderly >70
Garden Communities	1,734	1,834	501	4,069	258
High-Rises	54	1,875	1,274	3,203	677
Mixed Income	60	64	8	132	2
Partnership Units	91	99	9	199	3
Scattered Sites	1,060	1,022	110	2,192	45
SSHP-LIPH	-	98	847	945	612
Townhouses	181	135	7	323	-
LIPH Total	3,180	5,127	2,756	11,063	1,597
Percent: Actual	28.7%	46.3%	24.9%		14.4%
2010 Year-end	3,089	4,888	1,823	9,800	947
Percent of Total	31.5%	49.9%	18.6%		9.7%
Percent Change from Prior Year	2.9%	4.9%	50.7%	12.8%	68.0%
Difference in Ratios	-2.8%	-3.5%	6.2%		4.7%

Section 8 Participants as of 12/31/2011

Program	Minors	Non-Elderly Adults	Elderly Adults	Total Individuals	Elderly >70
HCV Tenant-based	4,188	5,431	1,444	11,063	735
HCV Project-based	1,690	2,567	633	4,890	335
Section 8 Mod Rehab	71	628	199	898	84
Section 8 New Construction	-	68	31	99	12
Section 8 Total	5,949	8,694	2,307	16,950	1,166
Percent of Total	35.1%	51.3%	13.6%		6.9%
2010 Year-end	5,937	8,371	2,059	16,367	1,035
Percent of Total	36.3%	51.1%	12.6%		6.3%
Percent Change from Prior Year	0.2%	3.9%	12.0%	3.6%	12.7%
Difference in Ratios	-1.2%	0.1%	1.0%		0.6%

SSHP Residents as of 12/31/2011

	Minors	Non-Elderly Adults	Elderly Adults	Total Individuals	Elderly >70
SSHP Total	0	9	109	118	81
Percent of Total	0.0%	7.6%	92.4%		68.6%
2010 Year-end	0	119	938	1,057	693
Percent of Total	0.0%	11.3%	88.7%		65.6%
Percent Change from Prior Year	0.0%	-92.4%	-88.4%	-88.0%	-88.3%
Difference in Ratios	0.0%	-3.6%	3.6%		3.1%

Other Non-Federal Program Residents as of 12/31/2011

Program	Minors	Non-Elderly Adults	Elderly Adults	Total Individuals	Elderly >70
HOPE VI Tax Credit	275	353	28	656	11
Special Portfolio – Seattle Housing	47	171	4	222	1
Special Portfolio – Privately Mngd	104	363	51	518	-
Other Non-Federal Total	426	887	83	1,396	12
Percent of Total	30.5%	63.5%	5.9%		.9%
2010 Year-end	424	807	51	1,282	12
Percent of Total	33.1%	62.9%	4.0%		0.9%
Percent Change from Prior Year	0.5%	9.9%	62.7%	8.9%	0.0%
Difference in Ratios	-2.6%	0.6%	2.0%		-0.1%

People with disabilities

Low-Income Public Housing Residents as of 12/31/2011

Development	Disabled Minors	Non-Elderly Disabled	Elderly Disabled	Total Disabled	Total Individuals
Garden Community	5	180	228	413	4,069
High-Rises	-	1,420	626	2,046	3,203
Mixed Income	-	14	3	17	132
Partnership Units	-	5	1	6	199
Scattered Sites	19	179	47	245	2,192
SSHP-LIPH	-	54	99	153	945
Townhouse	1	9	1	11	323
LIPH Totals	25	1,861	1,005	2,891	11,053
Percent of Total	0.2%	16.8%	9.1%	26.1%	
2010 Year-end	29	1,839	862	2,730	9,804
Percent of Total	0.3%	18.8%	8.8%	27.8%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	-13.8%	1.2%	16.5%	5.9%	12.7%
Difference in Ratios	-0.1%	-1.9%	0.3%	-1.7%	

Section 8 Participants as of 12/31/2011

Program	Disabled Minors	Non-Elderly Disabled	Elderly Disabled	Total Disabled	Total Individuals
HCV Tenant-based	272	1,944	1,119	3,335	11,063
HCV Project-based	67	1,169	393	1,629	4,890
Section 8 Mod Rehab	4	362	153	519	898
Section 8 New Construction	-	45	15	60	99
Section 8 Total	343	3,520	1,680	5,543	16,950
Percent of Total	2.0%	20.8%	9.9%	32.7%	
2010 Year-end	296	3,451	1,552	5,299	16,367
Percent of Total	1.8%	21.1%	9.5%	32.4%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	15.9%	2.0%	8.2%	4.6%	3.6%
Difference in Ratios	0.2%	-0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	

SSHP Residents as of 12/31/2011

	Disabled Minors	Non-Elderly Disabled	Elderly Disabled	Total Disabled	Total Individuals
SSHP Totals	0	5	17	22	118
Percent of Total	0.0%	4.2%	14.4%	18.6%	
2010 Year-end	0	82	147	229	1,057
Percent of Total	0.0%	7.8%	13.9%	21.7%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	0.0%	-93.9%	-88.4%	-90.4%	-88.8%
Difference in Ratios	0.0%	-3.5%	0.5%	-3.0%	

Other Non-Federal Program Residents as of 12/31/2011

Program	Disabled Minors	Non-Elderly Disabled	Elderly Disabled	Total Disabled	Total Individuals
HOPE VI Tax Credit	-	2	4	6	656
Special Portfolio – Seattle Housing	-	1	-	1	222
Special Portfolio – Privately Managed	N/A	24	N/A	24	518
Section 8 Total	-	27	4	31	1,396
Percent of Total	0.0%	1.9%	0.3%	2.2%	
2010 Year-end	-	35	5	40	1,282
Percent: Projected	N/A	2.7	0.4%	3.1%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	0.0%	-22.9%	-20.0%	-22.5%	8.9%
Difference in Ratios	0.0%	-0.8%	-0.1%	-0.9%	

Households served in Seattle by unit size at year end – comparing Seattle Housing’s first year of MTW (1999), the prior year (2010), and the current year (2011)

Program	Year	0-Br	1-Br	2-Br	3-Br	4-Br	5+-Br	Total
Low Income Public Housing	1999	257	3,158	1,470	935	231	36	6,087
	2010	795	2,402	946	680	180	37	5,040
	2011	819	2,422	988	688	186	36	5,139
Seattle Senior Housing Low-Income Public Housing	2011 only	0	788	79	0	0	0	867
Housing Choice Voucher Tenant- & Project-based Assistance ⁵	1999	250	1,117	1,079	872	279	82	3,679
	2010	1,547	1,991	1,839	1,228	388	139	7,132
	2011	1,788	2,126	1,874	1,236	399	147	7,570
Section 8 New Construction	1999	10	141	0	0	0	0	151
	2010	0	97	0	0	0	0	97
	2011	0	96	0	0	0	0	96
Seattle Senior Housing Program	1999	161	913	85	0	0	0	1,159
	2010	0	862	89	0	0	0	951
	2011	0	86	10	0	0	0	96
Other Non-Federal	1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2010	55	194	269	51	7	0	576
	2011	44	151	252	124	20	2	593
Total	1999	678	5,329	2,634	1,807	510	118	11,076
	2010	2,397	5,546	3,143	1,959	575	176	13,796
	2011	2,651	5,669	3,203	2,048	605	185	14,361
Distribution of Unit sizes	1999	6.1%	48.1%	23.8%	16.3%	4.6%	1.1%	
	2010	17.4%	40.2%	22.8%	14.2%	4.2%	1.3%	
	2011	18.5%	39.5%	22.3%	14.3%	4.2%	1.3%	

⁵Excludes Mod Rehab units.

Average Length of Participation by Housing and Household Type

Elderly/Disabled Households (elderly or disabled head of household) as of 12/31/2011

Program	Households	Average Number of Years	2 Years or Less	2-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-20 Years	20 Years or More
Public Housing	4,185	9	22%	14%	23%	28%	13%
HCV Tenant-Based	2,939	8	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
HCV Project-Based	1,716	3	54%	19%	23%	3%	0%
Section 8 Mod-Rehab	535	6	43%	12%	18%	22%	5%
S8 New Construction	73	10	18%	3%	26%	44%	10%
Seattle Senior Housing Program	101	8	26%	14%	22%	31%	8%
Other Non-Federal	80	7	34%	13%	29%	18%	8%
Total Elderly/Disabled	9,629	8	29%	14%	26%	23%	8%

Family Households (non-elderly, non-disabled head of household, including single individuals) as of 12/31/2011

Program	Households	Average Number of Years	2 Year or Less	2-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-20 Years	20 Years or More
Public Housing	1,813	6	36%	19%	24%	15%	6%
HCV Tenant-Based	1,989	6	30%	19%	30%	18%	3%
HCV Project-Based	926	2	73%	15%	11%	1%	0%
Section 8 Mod-Rehab	194	4	55%	13%	18%	11%	3%
S8 New Construction	23	3	57%	26%	13%	4%	0%
Seattle Senior Housing Program	3	2	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Other Non-Federal	513	3	61%	14%	19%	5%	1%
Total Family	5,461	5	43%	17%	23%	13%	3%

All Households as of 12/31/2011

Program	Households	Average Number of Years	2 Year or Less	2-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-20 Years	20 Years or More
Public Housing	5,998	8	27%	15%	24%	24%	11%
HCV Tenant-Based	4,928	7	24%	15%	32%	23%	5%
HCV Project-Based	2,642	3	61%	18%	19%	2%	0%
Section 8 Mod-Rehab	729	6	46%	12%	18%	19%	4%
S8 New Construction	96	8	27%	8%	23%	34%	7%
Seattle Senior Housing Program	104	8	26%	15%	21%	30%	8%
Other Non-Federal	593	4	58%	14%	20%	7%	2%
Total Combined	15,090	7	34%	15%	25%	19%	6%

Applicant Demographics

Low-Income Public Housing Applicants as of 12/31/2011

Unit Size	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian & Pacific Islander	Total
0/1 bedroom	1,797	1,590	131	685	4,203
2 bedroom	379	764	37	347	1,527
3 bedroom	93	231	5	92	421
4 bedroom	15	56	3	16	90
5 bedroom	-	21	-	-	21
LIPH Total¹	2,284	2,662	176	1,140	6,262
Percent of Total	36.5%	42.5%	2.8%	18.2%	
2010 Year End	2,115	2,692	158	1,174	6,139
Percent of Total	34.5%	43.9%	2.6%	19.1%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	8.0%	-1.1%	11.4%	-2.9%	2.0%
Difference in Ratios	2.0%	-1.3%	0.2%	-0.9%	

¹ Applicants to HOPE VI communities are not included in this analysis.

SSHP-LIPH Applicants as of 12/31/2011

Unit Size	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian & Pacific Islander	Total
0/1 bedroom	539	152	17	78	786
2 bedroom	7	5	-	4	16
SSHP Total	546	157	17	82	802
Percent of Total	68.1%	19.6%	2.1%	10.2%	
2010 Year End	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percent of Total	58.0%	21.6%	2.1%	18.4%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Difference in Ratios	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Housing Choice Voucher Applicants as of 12/31/2011

Unit Size	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian & Pacific Islander	Total
All bedroom sizes ⁷	273	544	25	116	958
Percent of Total	28.5%	56.8%	2.6%	12.1%	100.0%
2009 Year End	563	992	55	211	1,821
Percent of Total	30.9%	54.5%	3.0%	11.6%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	-51.5%	-45.2%	-54.5%	-45.0%	-47.4%
Difference in Ratios	-2.4%	2.3%	-0.4%	0.5%	

⁷ Seattle Housing no longer tracks Housing Choice Voucher applicants by bedroom size.

Section 8 New Construction Applicants as of 12/31/2011

Unit Size	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian & Pacific Islander	Total
0/1 bedroom	138	88	10	24	260
Section 8 New Construction Total	138	88	10	24	260
Percent of Total	53.1%	33.8%	3.8%	9.2%	
2010 Year End	138	86	11	18	253
Percent of Total	54.5%	34.0%	4.3%	7.1%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	0.0%	2.3%	-9.1%	33.3%	2.8%
Difference in Ratios	-1.5%	-0.1%	-0.5%	2.1%	

SSHP Applicants as of 12/31/2011

Unit Size	Caucasian	African / African American	Native American	Asian & Pacific Islander	Total
0/1 bedroom	96	41	7	64	208
2 bedroom	-	2	-	1	3
SSHP Total	96	43	7	65	211
Percent of Total	45.5%	20.4%	3.3%	30.8%	
2009 Year End	363	135	13	115	626
Percent of Total	58.0%	21.6%	2.1%	18.4%	
Percent Change from Prior Year	-73.6%	-68.1%	-46.2%	-43.5%	-66.3%
Difference in Ratios	-12.5%	-1.2%	1.2%	12.4%	

Income distribution as a percent of median income

Applicant Household Annual Incomes as of 12/31/2011

Program	Below 30% Median Income	30% - 50% Median Income	50% - 80% Median Income	Over 80% Median Income	Total
Low Income Public Housing	5,986	238	21	17	6,262
HCV Tenant-based	687	92	23	0	802
Section 8 New Construction	834	102	20	2	958
Seattle Senior Housing Program ⁸	257	3	-	-	260
Unique Households⁹	192	16	3	-	211
Percent of Total	7,049	396	59	19	7,523
2009 Year End	93.7%	5.3%	0.8%	0.3%	
Percent of Total	7,696	390	69	24	8,179
Percent Change from Prior Year	94.1%	4.8%	0.8%	0.3%	
Difference in Ratios	-8.4%	1.5%	-14.5%	-20.8%	-8.0%

⁸Applicant households may appear on more than one wait list; therefore the unique households row does not equal the sum of the program rows.

Data notes – the following notes apply to all tables within this appendix:

- Low Income Public Housing excludes occupants of employee and agency units.
- Low Income Public Housing added 894 senior housing units.
- Housing Choice Vouchers excludes households that have left Seattle Housing’s jurisdiction (1,771 port-out households); excludes households using vouchers in the SSHP program (14 households accounted for in the SSHP demographics); and includes households that have entered Seattle Housing’s jurisdiction (460 port-ins households).
- Other Non-Federal excludes occupants of units managed by Seattle Housing for other owners (14 households).

Appendix D – Capital Performance and Evaluation Report

Please see the following pages for Seattle Housing’s Capital Performance and Evaluation Report.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number:		FFY of Grant: 2009
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA00100009009T		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:		
Seattle		Date of CFFP:		
WA, 98109				

Type of Grant		<input type="checkbox"/> Original Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Amendment (revision no.)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 ARRA RAINIER VISTA CAPITAL REPORT			

Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost ¹	
		Original	Revised ²	Obligated	Expended
1	Total non-CFP Funds				
2	1406 Operations (may not exceed 20% of line 21) ³				
3	1408 Management Improvements				
4	1410 Administration (may not exceed 10% of line 21)				
5	1411 Audit				
6	1415 Liquidated Damages				
7	1430 Fees and Costs	0	\$ 1,476,661.84	\$ 1,476,661.84	\$ 1,476,661.84
8	1440 Site Acquisition				
9	1450 Site Improvement				
10	1460 Dwelling Structures	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 8,523,338.16	\$ 8,523,338.16	\$ 8,523,338.16
11	1465.1 Dwelling Equipment—Nonexpendable				
12	1470 Non-dwelling Structures				
13	1475 Non-dwelling Equipment				
14	1485 Demolition				
15	1492 Moving to Work Demonstration				
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs				
17	1499 Development Activities ⁴				

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number:		FFY of Grant: 2009
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA00100009009T		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:		
Seattle		Date of CFFP:		
WA, 98109				
Type of Grant				
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Amendment		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Amendment (revision no.)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 ARRA RAINIER VISTA CAPITAL REPORT				
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost¹
		Original	Revised²	Obligated
18a	1501 Collateralization or Debt Service paid by the PHA			
18ba	9000 Collateralization or Debt Service paid Via System of Direct Payment			
19	1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line 20)			
20	Amount of Annual Grant:: (sum of lines 2 - 19)	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities			
22	Amount of line 20 Related to Section 504 Activities			
23	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Soft Costs			
24	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Hard Costs			
25	Amount of line 20 Related to Energy Conservation			
Signature of Executive Director		Signature of Public Housing Director		Date
[Signature]		[Signature]		02/29/2012

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

[illegible]

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

¹ Obligation and expenditure end dated can only be revised with HUD approval pursuant to Section 9j of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
 Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
 Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Office of Public and Indian Housing
 OMB No. 2577-0226
 Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number:		FFY of Grant: 2009
PHA Name: Seattle Housing		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA00100003909G		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009
120 Sixth Avenue North Seattle WA, 98109		Date of CFFP:		
Type of Grant				
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Amendment		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Amendment (revision no.)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 ARRA LAKE CITY CAPITAL REPORT				
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost ¹
		Original	Revised ²	Obligated
1	Total non-CFP Funds			Expended
2	1406 Operations (may not exceed 20% of line 21) ³			
3	1408 Management Improvements			
4	1410 Administration (may not exceed 10% of line 21)	\$381,618.00		\$381,618.00
5	1411 Audit			
6	1415 Liquidated Damages			
7	1430 Fees and Costs	\$2,440,183.00	\$1,365,183.00	\$1,140,332.00
8	1440 Site Acquisition	\$0.00	\$1,075,000.00	\$1,075,000.00
9	1450 Site Improvement			
10	1460 Dwelling Structures	\$5,180,708.00		\$5,180,708.00
11	1465.1 Dwelling Equipment—Nonexpendable			
12	1470 Non-dwelling Structures			
13	1475 Non-dwelling Equipment			
14	1485 Demolition	\$11,462.00		\$884.00
15	1492 Moving to Work Demonstration			
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs			
17	1499 Development Activities ⁴			

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)		FFY of Grant: 2009	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA00100003909G		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009	
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			
Seattle		Date of CFFP:			
WA, 98109					
Type of Grant					
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Amendment		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Amendment (revision no.)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 ARRA LAKE CITY CAPITAL REPORT					
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost¹	
		Original	Revised²	Obligated	Expended
18a	1501 Collateralization or Debt Service paid by the PHA				
18ba	9000 Collateralization or Debt Service paid Via System of Direct Payment				
19	1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line 20)				
20	Amount of Annual Grant: (sum of lines 2 - 19)	\$ 8,013,971		\$ 8,003,393.00	\$ 7,778,542.00
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities				
22	Amount of line 20 Related to Section 504 Activities				
23	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Soft Costs				
24	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Hard Costs				
25	Amount of line 20 Related to Energy Conservation				
Signature of Executive Director		Signature of Public Housing Director		Date	
James M. Tink				02/29/2012	

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

FFY of Grant: 2009
FFY of Grant Approval:

FFY of Grant: 2009
FFY of Grant Approval:[illegible]

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

¹ Obligation and expenditure end dated can only be revised with HUD approval pursuant to Section 9(j) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number		FFY of Grant: 2009
PHA Name: Seattle Housing		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA00100001709R		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:		
Seattle		Date of CFFP:		
WA, 98109				
Type of Grant				
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement		<input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 ARRA DENNY TOWER CAPITAL REPORT		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no:)		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Final Performance Evaluation Report		
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost ¹
		Original	Revised ²	Obligated
1	Total non-CFP Funds			
2	1406 Operations (may not exceed 20% of line 21) ³			
3	1408 Management Improvements			
4	1410 Administration (may not exceed 10% of line 21)	450,000	267,986.23	267,986.23
5	1411 Audit			
6	1415 Liquidated Damages			
7	1430 Fees and Costs	850,000	1,087,746.00	1,087,746.00
8	1440 Site Acquisition			
9	1450 Site Improvement			
10	1460 Dwelling Structures	8,645,000	8,644,267.77	8,644,267.77
11	1465.1 Dwelling Equipment—Nonexpendable			
12	1470 Non-dwelling Structures			
13	1475 Non-dwelling Equipment			
14	1485 Demolition			
15	1492 Moving to Work Demonstration			
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs	55,000	0	
17	1499 Development Activities ⁴			

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number		FFY of Grant: 2009	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA00100001709R		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009	
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			
Seattle		Date of CFFP:			
WA, 98109					
Type of Grant					
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement		<input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no:)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 ARRA DENNY TOWER CAPITAL REPORT		<input type="checkbox"/> Final Performance Evaluation Report			
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost	Revised²	Obligated	Total Actual Cost¹
		Original			Expended
18a	1501 Collateralization or Debt Service paid by the PHA				
18ba	9000 Collateralization or Debt Service paid Via System of Direct Payment				
19	1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line 20)				
20	Amount of Annual Grant:: (sum of lines 2 - 19)	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities				
22	Amount of line 20 Related to Section 504 Activities				
23	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Soft Costs				
24	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Hard Costs				
25	Amount of line 20 Related to Energy Conservation				
Signature of Executive Director		Signature of Public Housing Director		Date	
James M. T. 1/16/2012				02/29/2012	

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.
² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.
³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.
⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report

Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and

Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB No. 2577-0226

Expires 4/30/2011

Part II: Supporting Pages									
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority 120 Sixth Avenue North Seattle WA, 98109			Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA00100001709R CFFP (Yes / No): Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			FFY of Grant: 2009			
Development Number Name/PHA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Development Account No.	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Work	
				Original	Revised ¹	Funds Obligated ²	Funds Expended ²		
Denny Terrace									
	Construction & Program Staff	1410		450,000	267,986.23	267,986.23	267,986.23	completed	
	Salaries and Benefits								
	Architectural, Engineering Costs	1430		850,000	1,087,746.00	1,087,746.00	1,087,746.00	completed	
	and Permit Costs								
	Ventilation improvements, new	1460		8,645,000	8,644,267.77	8,644,267.77	8,644,267.77	nearly completed	
	insulated exterior cladding and								
	windows, roof repairs, unit interior								
	upgrades, common area interior								
	upgrades, intercom system, and								
	electrical modifications								
	Temporary Relocation of Residents	1495		55,000	0				

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

¹ Obligation and expenditure end dated can only be revised with HUD approval pursuant to Section 9j of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number		FFY of Grant: 2010	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19C001501-10		FFY of Grant Approval: 2011	
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			
Seattle		Date of CFFP: 6/8/2011			
WA, 98109					
Type of Grant					
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement		<input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no:)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 CAPITAL FUND REPORT - YESLER STEAM PLANT					
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost ¹	
		Original	Revised ²	Obligated	Expended
1	Total non-CFP Funds	1,874,729	1,874,729		
2	1406 Operations (may not exceed 20% of line 21) ³				
3	1408 Management Improvements				
4	1410 Administration (may not exceed 10% of line 21)	74,862	120,000		
5	1411 Audit				
6	1415 Liquidated Damages				
7	1430 Fees and Costs	296,330	389,000	8,843	8,843
8	1440 Site Acquisition				
9	1450 Site Improvement	88,587	0		
10	1460 Dwelling Structures				
11	1465.1 Dwelling Equipment—Nonexpendable				
12	1470 Non-dwelling Structures	1,817,900	1,375,269		
13	1475 Non-dwelling Equipment				
14	1485 Demolition	531,521	1,225,002		
15	1492 Moving to Work Demonstration				
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs	62,385	0		
17	1499 Development Activities ⁴				

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary		FFY of Grant: 2010	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing 120 Sixth Avenue North Seattle WA, 98109	Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19C001501-10 Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: Date of CFFP:	FFY of Grant Approval: 2011	
Type of Grant			
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 CAPITAL FUND REPORT - YESLER STEAM PLANT <input type="checkbox"/> Final Performance Evaluation Report		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no:)	
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost	Total Actual Cost¹
		Original	Obligated
18a	1501 Collateralization or Debt Service paid by the PHA		
18ba	9000 Collateralization or Debt Service paid Via System of Direct Payment		
19	1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line 20)	237,686	0
20	Amount of Annual Grant:: (sum of lines 2 - 19)	3,109,271	8,843
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities		
22	Amount of line 20 Related to Section 504 Activities		
23	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Soft Costs		
24	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Hard Costs		
25	Amount of line 20 Related to Energy Conservation		
Signature of Executive Director <i>James M Turner</i>		Signature of Public Housing Director	Date <i>02/29/2012</i>

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

¹ Obligation and expenditure end dated can only be revised with HUD approval pursuant to Section 9j of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)		FFY of Grant: 2009	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19S00150109		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009	
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			
Seattle		Date of CFFP:			
WA, 98109					
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Amendment (revision no.)					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2011 ARRA FORMULA CAPITAL GRANT REPORT					
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost ¹	
		Original	Revised	Obligated	Expended
1	Total non-CFP Funds				
2	1406 Operations (may not exceed 20% of line 21) ³				
3	1408 Management Improvements				
4	1410 Administration (may not exceed 10% of line 21)		47,349.38	47,349.38	47,349.38
5	1411 Audit				
6	1415 Liquidated Damages				
7	1430 Fees and Costs		300,748.21	300,748.21	300,748.21
8	1440 Site Acquisition				
9	1450 Site Improvement	\$ 6,500,000	10,380,697.00	10,380,697.00	10,380,697.00
10	1460 Dwelling Structures	\$ 3,500,000	6,314,148.82	6,314,148.82	6,314,148.82
11	1465.1 Dwelling Equipment—Nonexpendable				
12	1470 Non-dwelling Structures				
13	1475 Non-dwelling Equipment		14,530.47	14,530.47	14,530.47
14	1485 Demolition				
15	1492 Moving to Work Demonstration				
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs		12,414.12	12,414.12	12,414.12
17	1499 Development Activities ⁴	\$ 7,069,888	0.00		

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Part I: Summary		Grant Type and Number: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)		FFY of Grant: 2009	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19S00150109		FFY of Grant Approval: 2009	
120 Sixth Avenue North		Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			
Seattle		Date of CFFP:			
WA, 98109					
Type of Grant					
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Amendment		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Amendment (revision no.)			
2011 ARRA FORMULA CAPITAL GRANT REPORT					
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost	Revised²	Obligated	Total Actual Cost¹
		Original			Expended
18a	1501 Collateralization or Debt Service paid by the PHA				
18ba	9000 Collateralization or Debt Service paid Via System of Direct Payment				
19	1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line 20)				
20	Amount of Annual Grant:: (sum of lines 2 - 19)	\$ 17,069,888	\$ 17,069,888	\$ 17,069,888	\$ 17,069,888
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities				
22	Amount of line 20 Related to Section 504 Activities				
23	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Soft Costs				
24	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Hard Costs				
25	Amount of line 20 Related to Energy Conservation				
Signature of Executive Director		Date		Signature of Public Housing Director	
<i>James M. T. [Signature]</i>		02/29/2012			

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
 Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
 Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Office of Public and Indian Housing
 OMB No. 2577-0226
 Expires 4/30/2011

Part II: Supporting Pages									
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority 120 Sixth Avenue North Seattle WA, 98109		Grant Type and Number: American Recovery and Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19S00150109 CFFP (Yes / No): No Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			FFY of Grant: 2009				
Development Number Name/PHA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Development Account No.	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Work	
				Original	Revised 4	Funds	Obligated 2	Funds	Expended 2
Bell Tower	New windows; Exterior waterproofing either by recoating or recladding; 15 UFAS unit modifications as well as common area UFAS upgrades; Ventilation system improvements; Correct water line problems	1460		3,500,000.00	3,124,957.82	3,124,957.82	3,124,957.82	3,124,957.82	Completed
Bell Tower	Construction Project Manager To Oversee Upgrades	1410			47,349.38	47,349.38	47,349.38	47,349.38	Completed
Bell Tower	Architectural Design and Permit Fees	1430			300,748.21	300,748.21	300,748.21	300,748.21	Completed
Bell Tower	Community Room Furniture	1475			\$ 14,530.47	\$ 14,530.47	\$ 14,530.47	\$ 14,530.47	Completed
Bell Tower	Temporary Moving of Residents and Parking Reimbursements	1495			\$ 12,414.12	\$ 12,414.12	\$ 12,414.12	\$ 12,414.12	Completed

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

Part II: Supporting Pages									
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority 120 Sixth Avenue North Seattle WA, 98109			Grant Type and Number: American Recovery and Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19S00150109 CFFP (Yes / No): No Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			FFY of Grant: 2009			
Development Number Name/PHA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Development Account No.	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Work	
				Original	Revised ¹	Funds Obligated ²	Funds Expended ²		
Rainier Vista Phase II North A	Infrastructure Improvements to allow future construction of low income units including public housing units; Rental Term Sheet for Phase II has been submitted to HUD	1450		\$ 6,500,000	\$ 10,380,697	\$ 10,380,697	\$ 10,380,697	Completed	
Rainier Vista Phase II South	Two uses of funds in Mixed Finance	1499		\$ 7,069,888	\$ -				
Tamarack Place	transaction to fill gap from tax equity reduction and bridge financing for future program income from sale of land been submitted to HUD								
Tamarack Place	Architectural, Permits and other Soft Costs	1430		\$ -	\$ -				
Tamarack Place	Construction of low income housing units	1460		\$ -	\$ 3,189,191	\$ 3,189,191	\$ 3,189,191	Completed	

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 4/30/2011

Page 5