Housing Authority of the County of Tulare Fiscal Year 2014

Moving to Work

Submitted September 25, 2014

Building the foundation for a strong family unit!

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare

Table of Contents

Section I: Introduction

Background: The Housing Authority of the County of Tulare (HATC) was established in 1945. It initially sought to provide affordable housing for returning WWII veterans and their families. However, since its establishment, it has incorporated numerous, different programs into its housing portfolio. These programs are funded by various types of agencies that include the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Tax Credit Allocation Committee of the State Treasurer's Office (LIHTC), California's Rental Housing Construction Program (RHCP), HOME, City Redevelopment Agencies (RDA) and other local agencies. HATC is also a current participant of the Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration Program. This demonstration is an effort by HUD to facilitate program innovations that work towards enhancing the efficacy of PHAs. HATC has capitalized on the organizational and procedural flexibilities gained through its participation in the MTW Demonstration Program to become a more effective and efficient agency. Currently, HATC provides affordable and well-maintained rental housing to over 5,000 households throughout Tulare County.

Mission Statement: To provide affordable, well-maintained rental housing to qualified low and very low-income families. Priority shall be given to working families, seniors and the disabled. Tenant self-sufficiency and responsibility shall be encouraged. Programs shall be self-supporting to the maximum extent feasible.

Our mission statement was instituted prior to HATC's participation in the MTW Demonstration Program. However, the commencement of the MTW Demonstration Program provided HATC the opportunity to utilize the program flexibilities to provide our families with the necessary tools to establish responsibility and achieve self-sufficiency. Furthermore, the organizational vision of HATC has always worked to achieve administrative efficiency and effectiveness. HATC's mission, vision and strategic objectives are effectively aligned with the three primary MTW Demonstration Program statutory objectives:

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

Since its inclusion in the MTW Demonstration Program on May 1, 1999 HATC has worked to develop and implement policies that further promote the noted MTW Demonstration Program statutory objectives. The cohesiveness of HATC's internal mission, vision and goals, along with the three MTW statutory objectives, has constructed a detailed set of MTW short and long term goals and objectives for our agency. This report spans the 2013-2014 fiscal year (July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014). In this report, we evaluate the progress of our current short and long term goals and objectives. Through the following detailed analysis in this Report, HATC seeks to display the positive outcomes of our MTW Demonstration Program.

Section I: Introduction

•

Short Term Goals: HATC's 2013-2014 MTW Demonstration Program short term goals and objectives for its employees and its agency include:

1. Reducing cost by achieving greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.
2. Increase incentives for families to seek employment, meet educational goals, to participate in job-training programs to achieve economic self-sufficiency, and to decrease incentives for families to underreport income by establishing fixed subsidies and fixed rents.
3. Increase housing choices for program participants.
4. Increase organizational efficiency by improving productivity and work quality through the reduction of calculation errors and unnecessary work volume.

The achievement of these short term goals and objectives was assessed through a set of evaluating HUD Standard Metrics. HATC attained positive statistical outputs in the assessment of all of our short term goals and objectives. HATC will further elaborate on how these goals and objectives were met for this fiscal year in Section VI: Approved MTW Activities of this Report.

Long Term Goals: HATC has long worked towards developing and implementing a MTW Demonstration Program that emphasizes organizational efficacy, while establishing incentives for participants to become self-sufficient. Our MTW Demonstration Program is driven by the values outlined in the three primary MTW Demonstration Program statutory objectives. In the long term, our goal is to continue to seek program innovations that will further enhance the completion of these objectives.

HATC continuously works to achieve a MTW Demonstration Program that reduces cost through the streamlining and simplification of operations without jeopardizing program integrity. The data and narratives presented in this Report display the overall success and value of our MTW Demonstration Program. We continue to work with the goal of being an innovative MTW agency; one that demonstrates the value of the MTW Program Demonstration. Our long term goal is to establish a permanent MTW contract with HUD through the consistent achievement of the three MTW Demonstration Program statutory objectives. HATC has met all three of these objectives for this Fiscal Year; the agency continues to work on identifying and implementing new MTW activities that will further enhance our agency's productivity and overall effectiveness. Lastly, HATC is currently working on the execution of a new ten year MTW Agreement.

Section II: General Housing Authority Operating Information

II.4.Report.HousingStock

A. MTW Report: Housing Stock Information

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

Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project
N/A	0	0	N/A

Anticipated Total Number of New	0
Actual Total Number of New	0
Anticipated Total Number	0
Anticipated Total Number of	0
Actual Total Number of	0
Actual Total Number of Project-Based	0

* From the Plan

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

There was no changes to the housing stock during the Fisal Year 2013-2014.

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

General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

HATC continued to own and manage 710 Public Housing units. We did not develop additional public-housing units; nor did we remove any units from our inventory. There was a total expenditure of $1,176,732 in Capital Fund improvements for the Fiscal Year. The noted expenditures covered maintenance and rehabilitation of public-housing units within the following four AMPS: CA030000805 (Dinuba Area), CA030000810 (Tulare Area), CA030000815 (Visalia Area), and CA030000817 (Porterville Area). Capital Fund expenditures in CA030000805 covered the following rehabilitation projects: replacement of stoves and refrigerators, asphalt improvements, fence replacements, and landscaping improvements. Capital Fund expenditures in CA030000810 covered the following rehabilitation projects: flooring replacements, replacement of refrigerators, rehabilitation of interior paint, repair/replacements of ranges, landscaping improvements, improvements of cabinets and countertops, replacement of doors, and Air Conditioning unit improvements. Capital Fund expenditures in CA030000815 facilitated the completion of a large range of capital rehabilitation projects, including roofing replacements, landscaping improvements, carpet replacement along with Air Conditioning and Heating unit improvements. Lastly, Capital Fund expenditures in CA03000817 covered the following capital rehabilitation projects: gutter replacements, improvements of cabinets and countertops, dishwasher replacements, interior and exterior painting, carpet replacement as well as Air Conditioning and Heating unit improvements.

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

Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Tax Credit	813	HATC manages an extensive housing stock portofoilio of properties that operate under the Tax Credit Allocation Committeee of the State Treasurer's office (LIHTC). Although in some instances other funding streams were combined to cover the development costs, the projects were fundementally financed through the receipt of tax credits. For a detailed list of these projects please see Table 1.
State Funded	84	Please see Table 2
Non-MTW HUD Funded	192	Please see Table 3
Other	745	Please refer to Table 4 and Table 5 for a detailed list of the projects.
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	1,834	

*** Select Housing Program from:** Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.

If Other, please describe: In partnership with Kaweah Management Company (KMC), a non-profit, affordable development company HATC owns/manages several other properties throughout the county funded by various sources. These mixed funding units have developed using a combination of funds that include HOME, RDA tax-increment funding, bonds, HATC MTW program reserve funds and HATC administrative program reserve funds. This caterogy also includes our Farm Labor Housing Stock, which is funded by USDA. Please refer to Table 5 and Table 6 for a detailed list of the projects.

Table 1

LIHTC STOCK CALIFORNIA TAX CREDIT ALLOCATION FUNDING			
Complex	Location	Year Built/Acquired	No. of Units
Euclid Village	Dinuba	2011	57
Gateway Village	Farmersville	2008	48
Gateway Village II	Farmersville	2009	16
Village Grove	Farmersville	1984/2009	48
Palomar Court	Farmersville	2011	40
Lindsay Senior Apartments	Lindsay	2011	72
Sequoia Villas	Lindsay	2013	19
Poplar Grove	Poplar Grove	2003	50
Sultana Acres	Sultana	1992	36
Cypress Cove	Tulare	1993	52
Tule Vista	Tulare	2011	57
West Trail	Tulare	2011	49
Aspen Court	Tulare	2013	47
Country Manor	Tulare	2013	40
Westport Village	Visalia	1989	25
Fairview Village	Visalia	1994	8
Willowbrook	Visalia	1996	10
Kimball Court	Visalia	2000	95
Court & Paradise	Visalia	1980-2008/2011	20
Parkside Court	Woodlake	2007	24
Total Tax Credit Housing Units			813

Table 2

RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM UNITS STATE OF CALIFORNIA RHCP FUNDING			
Complex	Location	Year Built	No. of Units
Clark Court	Visalia	1983	24
Visalia Garden Villas	Visalia	1987	60
Total State Funded Units			84

Table 3

NON-MTW HUD FUNDED			
Complex	Location	Year Built/Acquired	No. of Units
Santa Fe Plaza (Section 8/202)	Porterville	1983	105
La Serena (Section 8 New Constructic	Porterville	1983	65
TMHSA East Tulare Cottages	Visalia	1979/2009	22
Total Non-MTW HUD Funded Units			192

Non-MTW HUD Funded: HATC manages by contract two multifamily complexes and one other complex with State funding both owned by separate non-profit boards. One complex, La Serena, provides affordable housing for low-income families, Santa Fe Plaza, provides affordable housing for qualified seniors and East Tulare Cottages is run jointly with the Tulare County mental health department.

Table 4

MIXED FUNDING UNITS				
Complex	Location	Year Built/Acquired	No. of Units	Funding Sources
Linmar Apartments	Dinuba	1982-1992	48	USDA
Ashland Apartments	Lindsay	1986/2013	10	HOME/RDA Succesor Agency/MTW
Lotas & Newcomb	Porterville	2013	11	MTW
North E Street	Tulare	1963/1980	1	HATC Non-Profit
Oakwood	Tulare	2009	20	MTW/Tulare RDA
Tulare NSP	Tulare	2011	5	Tulare RDA/NSP/MTW
Blain Units	Tulare/Porterville	1984-2001	14	HATC Non-Profit
County Center	Visalia	1974/2010	1	HATC Non-Profit/MTW
East Kaweah Ave	Visalia	2013	8	MTW/RDA/HOME
Encina Triplex	Visalia	1945/2008	3	Visalia RDA
Millcreek Parkway	Visalia	2008	70	MTW/Visalia RDA
Myrtle Court	Visalia	1998/2008	36	HATC Non-Profit/MTW
North Jacob	Visalia	1958/1993	1	HATC Non-Profit
Robinwood Court	Visalia	2007	10	HOME/Visalia RDA/MTW
South Crenshaw	Visalia	1983/1995	1	HATC Non-Profit
Tracy Court	Visalia	2010	3	HATC Non-Profit/MTW
Transitional Living Center	Visalia	1966/2005	32	Visalia RDA
West Oriole	Visalia	2010	8	MTW/Visalia RDA
Central	Visalia	2014	6	HATC/MTW
Liberty & Court	Visalia	2014	7	HATC/MTW
		Total Mixed Funding Units	295	

USDA - United States Department of Agriculture

RHCP -Rental Housing Construction Program (State of California)

RDA - Redevelopment Agency

CHFA - California housing Finance Agency

HATC will provide a more detailed financial analysis of housing projects in which MTW Demonstration Program funds were used for development costs, in Section Activity IV: Development of Additional Affordable Housing of this Report.

Table 5

FARM LABOR HOUSING STOCK USDA FUNDING			
Complex	Location	Year Built/Acquired	No. of Units
Terra Bella FLC	Terra Bella	1977	14
Sonora	Tulare	1985	52
Linnell FLC	Visalia	1938/1967/1972/1977	191
La Puente	Visalia	1980	15
Woodville FLC	Woodville	1938/1967/1977	178
Total USDA Funded Units			450

II.5.Report.Leasing

B. MTW Report: Leasing Information

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

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served* Planned	Number of Households Served* Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	N/A	29
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	N/A	300
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	0
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	N/A	329

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

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

Housing Program:	Unit Months Planned	Unit Months Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	N/A	349
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	N/A	3,594
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	0
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	N/A	3943

The request of the following data is a new component of Form 50900. Planned Number of Households to be served data was not required in the old Form and is not available for this Fiscal year. HATC has reported Actual data that was available at the end of this Fiscal Year.

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

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

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

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

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

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	X	X	X	224	X	X	X	X
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	145	X	X	X	X
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	65%	X	X	X	X

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

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

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	99	485	0	584	17
2 Person	102	456	0	558	16
3 Person	106	468	0	574	16
4 Person	156	665	0	821	23
5 Person	142	424	0	566	16
6+ Person	105	303	0	408	12
Totals	710	2801	0	3511	100

Explanation for Baseline	HATC does not have any Non-MTW adjustments to the distribution of household sizes.

Mix of Family Sizes Served

	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	17	16	16	23	16	12	100
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	713	461	494	709	564	459	3400
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	21	14	14	21	17	13	100
Percentage Change	4%	-2%	-2%	-2%	1%	1%	0

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5%	The percentages of households served by household size have remained static and there isn't variance at or above five percent, thus we meet the MTW Statutory objective of maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size).

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

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

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

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

Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End	
Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
N/A	N/A

Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End

Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Administrative Cost Savings and Self Sufficiency/ Activity One	263	Non-elderly or non-disabled households that time out after five years from a MTW Program (Section 8 HCV or Public Housing) and do not re-apply to a HATC program within three months.
Encourage Self Suffiency and Transition of Pre-1999 Families to the MTW Program / Activity Three	1	Subject non-elderly or non-disabled households that time out after five years from a MTW Program (Section 8 HCV or Public Housing) and do not re-apply to a HATC program within three months.

Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	1
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	263

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

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

Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site-Based	7930	Open	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide	16242	Open	Yes

More can be added if needed.

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

** *Select Wait List Types:* Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described

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

N/A

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A

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

There are no changes in the organizational structure of the wait list or its policies.

Section III: Proposed MTW Activities

(III) Proposed MTW Activities:

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

(IV) Approved MTW Activities			
Activity Number	Activity Name	Year Identified/ Implemented	Authorizations
One	Administrative Cost Savings and Self Sufficiency	1999/1999 and 2008/2009	Attachment C: Section C.11 and Section D.2
Two	Increase Housing Choices	2008/2009	Attachment C: Section D.2 (a)
Three	Encourage Self-Sufficiency and Transition of Pre-1999 Families to the MTW Program	2009/2009	Attachment C: Section C.11 and Section D.2
Four	Project Based Section 8	2008/2011	Attachment C: Section D.1 (e) and Section D.7
Five	Development of Additional Affordable Housing	2009/2009	Attachment C: Section B.1 (b) and Section B.2 and Attachment D of the Standard MTW Agreement

(IV) Approved MTW Activities: (A) Implemented Activities

Activity One – Administrative Cost Savings and Self Sufficiency:

From the beginning of the MTW Demonstration Program, HATC has participated in activities which help reduce administrative errors, increase efficiency and potentially reduce staffing in an effort to achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures. These objectives were accomplished through the implementation of the following components:

A. Fixed-proration amounts for mixed-family households with ineligible-alien-status family members. This was implemented at the onset of MTW in 1999 for program participants receiving fixed subsidies and subject to time limits; for all remaining families, this was planned in 2008 and implemented in 2009.

B. Requiring Section 8 landlords to use the HUD-model lease. This was planned and implemented in 1999.

C. Changing the definition of income to include “all income into the home of all MTW families.” This was planned in 2008 and implemented in 2009.

D. Elimination of UAP payments by the establishment of a $0 minimum rent. This was planned in 2008 and implemented in 2009.

E. Allowing qualified participants to select a flat- or fixed-medical deduction instead of going through the extensive medical-expense-verification process. This was planned in 2008 and implemented in 2009.

F. Fixed rents on the public-housing program for non-elderly or disabled families. This was planned and implemented in 1999.

G. Fixed subsidies on the Section 8 program for non-elderly or disabled families. This was planned and implemented in 1999.

H. A five-year time limit on assistance for non-elderly or disabled families. This was planned and implemented in 1999.

I. Converting all able-bodied families who entered our program before May 1999 to programs with fixed rents/subsidies and time limits. This was planned in 2008 and implemented in 2009

Revisions to Benchmarks/Metric and Data Collection Methodology: The new Form 50900 required the utilization of applicable Standard HUD Metrics as an evaluative procedure. This statistical analysis process allows to display in detail the impacts of this activity and whether the activity is on schedule. HATC had not been required to utilize this list of HUD Standard Metrics in the past, therefore the baselines and benchmarks of metrics that were not reported on before are newly constructed for this report. Each metric will outline the methodology utilized to calculate the baseline, benchmark and reported outcome.

Activity Assessment: A comparison of the achieved outcomes in comparison to the baselines and expected benchmarks will be conducted and discussed through the following applicable Standard HUD Metrics:

CE#2: Staff Time Savings
The implementation of components B, E & I helped achieve administrative efficiency and increase administrative savings. Requiring Section 8 landlords to use the HUD-model lease, allowing qualified participants to select a flat-or fixed medical deduction and converting all able bodied families to our MTW Section 8 HVC and Public Housing Programs with fixed subsidies/fixed rents and time limits present the opportunity for our staff to streamline the file review process for subject MTW households. The following metric calculated the amount an eligibility clerk and our Occupancy Program Specialist dedicate to process a file that doesn't utilize the noted components of this MTW activity.

The methodology of this metric was constructed by imputing a baseline that is derived based on the amount of time it takes to process a non MTW file for our La Serena Project, which is operated under Traditional Section 8 Regulations, and projecting how much time was saved based on to the number of subject MTW households that utilized the noted components of this activity during FY 2014. This baseline measures how much time it takes staff to conduct and calculate interim income verifications and conduct retroactive rents on Traditional Files that are prohibited from utilizing time savings components. The imputed baseline also factored in the amount of staff time that it takes to calculate medical allowances, this calculation was based on the number of families that choose to have flat medical allowances in subject MTW households for this fiscal year.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total number of hours spent to process a File without components of Activity One.	*Clerks hours to review Non MTW Case=* Interim IncomeVerification:**468** Retro Rents: **216** Medical Allowance:**167** *Occupancy Program Specialist hours to review Non MTW Case=* Retro Rents: **108** Leases: **60** **TOTAL STAFF HOURS SPENT PRIOR TO ACTIVITY=1,019**	*Expected Clerk hours to review MTW Case=* Interim Income Verification: **0** Retro Rents: **0** Medical Allowance:**0** *Expected Occupancy Program Specialist hours to review MTW Case=* Retro Rents: **0** Leases: **0** **ANTICIPATED TOTAL STAFF HOURS= 0**	*Actual Clerk hours to review MTW Case=* Interim Income Verification: **0** Retro Rents: **0** Medical Allowance**: 0** *Actual Occupancy Program Specialist hours to review MTW Case=* Retro Rents: **0** Leases: **0** **ACTUAL TOTAL STAFF HOURS= 0**	The outcome meets the time savings anticipated. HATC saved an estimated total of 1,109 Staff Hours as result of the activity. The noted savings would not be feasible without the MTW Program time saving modifications described in Activity One.

CE#1: Agency Cost Savings

Components B, E & I of Activity One help achieve administrative cost effectiveness and reduce overall federal expenditures. By utilizing the projected amount of total time savings (CE#2) we calculated the average amount of money that is being saved through the implementation of Activity One to subject MTW households. We had previously utilized a similar methodology to calculate the achieve agency cost savings in our past MTW Reports and Plans. This methodology was updated to include an increase in applicable staff salary ranges and a Cost-Of-Living-Adjustment. The projection was based on the amount that is being saved in comparison to the amount of time that would be spend on managing and processing a non MTW file at La Serena, which is operated under traditional Section 8 Regulations.

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost to process a File without components of Activity One in dollars (decrease).	Clerk Labor→851Total Hours (See CE#2) x $41.91 per hour = **$35,665** Occupancy Program Specialist Labor→ 168 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $57.49 per hour= **$ 9,658** **TOTAL COST PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = $ 45,323**	Expected Clerk Labor→0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $41.91 per hour = **$0** Expected Occupancy Program Specialist Labor→ 0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $57.49 per hour= **$0** **ANTICPATED TOTAL COST AFTER IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITY = $0**	Actual Clerk Labor→0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $41.91 per hour = **$0** Actual Occupancy Program Specialist Labor→ 0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $57.49 per hour= **$0** **ACTUAL TOTAL COST AFTER IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITY = $0**	The outcome meets the anticipated cost savings. HATC saved an estimated total of $43,323 as result of the activity. The savings was due to the time savings achieved in processing an MTW File as outlined in CE#2. The noted savings would ne be feasible without the programmatic modifications reported in Activity One.

CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution
The implementation of components B, C, D, E F, G & I of Activity One work towards achieving administrative efficiency by simplifying case processing. The implementation of the noted elements helps towards decreasing the overall error rate of eligibility clerks in the processing of cases. HATC had not been required to track such data in prior years; therefore HATC developed administrative mechanisms to begin to track errors in the processing of MTW cases for the FY 2015.

Our Occupancy Program Specialist will inspect and oversee the effective filing of new MTW cases and review case files during interim examinations. The Occupancy Program Specialist will track all errors and present a monthly report to our Executive Director, which displays an average error rate (*number of errors/number of MTW cases reviewed*). The monthly reports will be calculated to achieve a yearly figure of average error rate. Data compiled in the next fiscal year will be utilized to develop a statistically significant baseline. Our projection is that data will show that our error rate will be low, and that it will remain the same or decrease as it's measured in the future. We do not expect high decreases in errors, as the noted components of Activity One have been implemented for a number of years.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a MTW File, as a percentage. (decrease)	Average error rate in processing MTW Files. **TO BE TRACKED AND REPORTED IN THE FY 2014-2015 MTW REPORT**.	**ANTICIPATED AVERAGE ERROR RATE OF PROCESSING MTW FILES = 5%**	**ACTUAL AVERAGE ERROR RATE= TO BE REPORTED IN THE FY 2014-2015 MTW REPORT.**	We currently cannot evaluate whether the outcome meets the anticipated decrease in staff errors. HATC had not been required to track such data in prior years; therefore HATC has begun to track errors in the processing of new MTW cases as of May 22, 2014. During this time we came across nine errors. This limited data for FY 2014, is not sufficient to calculate a statistically significant baseline or to gauge whether the outcome was achieved. This outcome will be effectively assessed in the 2014-2015 MTW Report.

SS#1: Increase in Household Income

From the onset of the HATC MTW Program in 1999, families have been encouraged to become self-sufficient. This objective was accomplished through the implementation of components G, H, & I of Activity One. HATC has collected household income data on all MTW participants since the inception of the activity. We continuously collect this data at the participants' annual reexaminations. HATC's baseline is the average income that our participants had when they entered our MTW programs. Its benchmark was a snap shot of the current gross-income increase/decrease of MTW program participants.

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average earned income of households affected by this policy In dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of this activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of households enrolled in a MTW Program (increase).	Average earned income of households prior to participating in a MTW Program. **TOTAL INCOME= $15,055**	10% average earned income increase from the time they first enrolled in a MTW Program. $15,055 x .10= $1,505 $15,5055+$1,505= **ANTICIPATED TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME= $16,560**	**ACTUAL AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD INCOME = $24,363**	The outcome exceeded the benchmark in this category. On average earned household incomes increase by $9,308. That's a 62% average earned income increase from the time they first enrolled in a MTW Program. The noted outcomes, display the effectiveness that our MTW Demonstration has in increasing the self-sufficiency of program participants.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status:
One of HATC's objectives is to increase incentives for families to seek employment, meet educational goals or to participate in job-training programs in order to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The implementations of components F, G & H of Activity One have assisted in the achievement of positive employment status for participants of our MTW programs.

HATC has gathered data of MTW program participants as they entered our program to determine their employment status. HATC has tracked the employment status of head of household(s) in two categories: 1) employed full-time 2) employed part-time. HATC imputed a baseline to calculate the percentage of head of household(s) that participate in a MTW Program that were consider to be: 1) employed full-time 2) employed part-time prior to them participating in a MTW program. This baseline was compared to the current percentage of MTW head household(s) that report their employment status to be 1) employed full-time 2) employed part-time. Our benchmark expected an increase of ten *pp* (percentage points) in the number of MTW head(s) of households that increased their employment status to be employed full-time, and a five *pp increase* in the total of MTW head(s) of households that reported to be employed part-time.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (Full-Time)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full- Time	Head(s) of households employed Full-Time prior to implementation of Activity One. This number may be zero.	Expected Head(s) of households employed Full-Time prior to implementation of Activity One.	Actual head(s) of households employed Full-Time after implementation of Activity One.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	367 PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across **1,117** households) = 33% **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY ONE= 33%**	Expected 10 (*pp*) Increase in PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across total **1,117** households) =33% 33*pp* + 10*pp*= 43*pp* **TOTAL ANTICIPATED DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=43%**	**941** PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across **2,230** households) = 42% **ACTUAL TOTAL = 42%**	*****The outcome did not meet the benchmark anticipated, it fell one percentage point below the benchmark. However, there was a significant 9% increase of PH & Section 8 work-able heads of households employed Full-Time.

**** There is a near 50% increase of participating MTW Households in comparison to the initial number of participating households as HATC entered the MTW Demonstration. This made it difficult to project an achievable benchmark. The increase in full-time employment among participants is a testament to the effectiveness of our MTW Program, which has been designed to promote self-sufficiency among its participants***.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (Part-Time)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category: (2) Employed Part- Time	Head(s) of households employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the Activity One. This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households employed Part-Time after implementation of the Activity One.	Actual head(s) of households employed Part-Time after implementation of the Activity One.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	144 PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across **1,117** households) = 13% **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY ONE= 13%**	Expected 5 *(pp)* Increase in PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across total **1,117** households) =13% 13*pp* + 5*pp* = 18*pp* **TOTAL ANTICIPATED DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=18%**	**271** PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across **2,230** households) = 12% **ACTUAL TOTAL = 12%**	The outcome did not meet the anticipated benchmark. HATC projected that this activity would lead to a slight increase in this category. The minimal decrease in this category can be explained by the significant increase in participants that gained full-time employment.

SS#4: Households Removed from TANF

Our agency has worked to accomplish the objective of increasing incentives for families to seek employment, meet educational goals and/or to participate in job-training programs to achieve economic self-sufficiency. Our goal is that the implementation of components F, G & H from Activity One help non-elderly or non-disabled families to achieve self-sufficiency and eliminate their need to rely on any type of governmental monetary assistance once timed out of the MTW Demonstration Program.

The methodology to develop a historical baseline was calculated by reporting on the number of households receiving TANF assistance prior to our agency participating in our MTW Program; this figure was based on the total amount of TANF beneficiaries in the month of February. HATC will ensure that there is data consistency, by always calculating the outcome from the data reported in the month of February. Reporting on the month of February will ensure that months that are statistical outliers are not interfering with the effective reporting that our agency is trying to achieve. This is necessary, as our agency serves populations that are employed in the agricultural sector; which tends to have erratic employment patterns due to high employment months during the time of harvest, and minimal employment opportunities during the winter months. Our benchmark was based on the projection that there was going to be a 15 percent decrease in the current number of MTW households that receive TANF assistance.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the Activity One.	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of Activity One.	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of Activity One.	Where the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households (across 1,117 households) receiving TANF prior to implementation of Activity One= 632 **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY ONE= 632**	Expected 15% decrease in the Households (across 1,117 households) receiving TANF prior to implementation of Activity One=632 632 x .25= 95 632-95= 537 **TOTAL ANTICIPATED DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=537**	Actual Households (across 2,230 households) receiving TANF after the implementation of Activity One= 835 **ACTUAL TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING TANF ASSISTANCE= 835**	*Given the inadequate methodology to calculate this outcome, HATC did not meet the decrease total number of current households receiving TANF. This is attributed to a near 50% increase in households subject to this activity. HATC finds a comparison of the percentage, of current subject households receiving TANF to the percentage of such households prior to the implementation of Activity One a more effective methodology to calculate this metric.

Based on the data reported above there is a 19 percentage point decrease in the subject households receiving TANF, this output displays a more statistical significant measure of the effectiveness of this activity, as it relates to promoting self-sufficiency to subject households. *(Methodology: 632/1,117 = 56% Households Receiving TANF Prior to Activity One, 835/2,230= 37% Actual Households Receiving the Implementation of Activity One, .56 -.37 = .19)*

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households

The implementation of component G of Activity One is programmatically designed to try to reduce the per unit subsidy costs for families that participate in our MTW Section 8 HCV Program. Unfortunately, HATC had not been required to track such data in prior years; therefore HATC did not have statistically valid data to calculate a historical baseline. HATC constructed an imputed a baseline that was utilized to display if there was a reduction in the per unit subsidy costs for participating Section 8 HCV MTW households. The baseline was derived by using the per unit subsidy cost for the noted program at the Fresno Housing Authority.

We compared their per unit subsidy costs for their traditional Section 8 HCV Program and compare it to our 2013-2014 average per unit subsidy costs for our modified MTW Section 8 HCV Program. We projected that our per unit subsidy costs was going to be 15 percent lower for the year 2013-2014, in comparison to the per unit subsidy costs of the traditional Section 8 HCV Program managed by the

Fresno Housing Authority. The data to develop the baseline was provided by the Fresno Housing Authority's Information Technology Department.

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (Section 8)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual Average subsidy per household affected by this policy of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by Activity One.	Current average Section 8 subsidy per household for Fresno Housing Authority participants. **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACVITVITY ONE=$490**	Expected 15% decrease in the average Section 8 subsidy per household for HATC participants. 490 x .15= 74 490-74= 416 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=$416**	**ACTUAL TOTAL AVERAGE SECTION 8 SUBSIDY= $472**	The outcome did not meet the decrease in average Section 8 Average we expected. While the noted subsidy is less than the current average Section 8 subsidy for Fresno Housing Authority participants by $18, did not reach a 15% decrease. In retrospect, the benchmark we set forward in the initial metric methodology is not a feasible output. The components of this Activity are not designed to have a substantial impact on the overall reduction in subsidy pay outs to subject Section 8 participants.

SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue:

Component F of Activity One systematically increases the agency's rental revenue. Unfortunately, HATC had not been required to track such data in prior years; therefore HATC did not have statistically valid data to calculate a historical baseline. HATC imputed a baseline to display an increase in agency rental revenue due as a direct result of the implementation of Activity One.

HATC developed the baseline by utilizing data from the Fresno Housing Authority, which operates a Public Housing Program under traditional HUD Regulations. We compared the current average rental revenue of the Fresno Housing Authority's Public Housing Program and compared it to our 2013-2014 average rental revenue for our modified MTW Public Housing Program. We projected that the rental revenue from our MTW Public Housing Program was going to be 15 percent higher for the year 2013-2014, in comparison to the rental revenue the Fresno Housing Authority collects in 2014 from their traditional Public Housing Program. The data to develop the baseline was provided by the Fresno Housing Authority's Information Technology Department.

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue (Public Housing)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increases).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
PHA rental revenue in dollars. (Per Unit Average)	Fresno Housing Authority's per unit rental revenue from its Public Housing Program. **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACVITVITY ONE=$165**	Expected 15% increase in HATC's per unit rental revenue from its MTW Public Housing Program. 165 x .15= 25 165 + 25 =190 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=$190**	Actual HATC per unit rental revenue from its MTW Public Housing Program. **ACTUAL PER UNIT RENTAL REVENUE= $422**	The outcome significantly exceeded the expected per unit rental revenue (a per unit increase of $257). HATC did not anticipate such significant increase in rental revenue, when comparing it to the traditional Public Housing Program administered by the Fresno Housing Authority. HATC will continue to monitor and compare its own historical per unit rental revenue in future years.

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

HATC has been committed to develop and manage programs that encourage and facilitate self-sufficiency to its participants. Components F, G & H of Activity One directly work towards the accomplishment of the MTW statutory objective, "give incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, seeking work, or is preparing for work by participants in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient". HATC collaborates with local non-profits in order to provide the necessary supportive programs that will assist program participants to achieve self-sufficiency. All interested participants are referred to the local non-profits that provide educational enhancement programs, first time home buyers programs, financial literacy programs and employment assistance programs.

As noted in Section (II) Operating Information, self-sufficiency is defined by HATC in this Plan as those non-elderly or non-disabled households that time out after five years from a MTW Program (Section 8 HCV or Public Housing) and do not re-apply to a HATC program within three months. HATC projected that 25 percent of those timing out in 2013-2014 were not going to re-apply to another HATC program within three months of timing out.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operation Information the space provided.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of Activity One. This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after the implementation of Activity One.	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of Activity One.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Local Definition (from Section II): Number of non-elderly or non-disabled households that time out after five years from a MTW Program (Section 8 or Public Housing) and do not re-apply to a HATC program within three months.	PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 263 households)= 0 **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 0**	PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 263 households) 363 x .25 = 66 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL = 66**	PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 263 households)= 195 **ACTUAL TOTAL= 195**	The outcome here significantly exceeded the benchmark. There was a 75 percent increase of those that timed out in 2013-2014 that did not re-apply to another HATC program within three months.

HC#3: Decrease in Wait List Time

Unlike other PHAs in our area, HATC currently maintains open waiting lists for both Section 8 HCV and Public Housing Programs. We strongly believe that the implementation of five-year time limits on assistance for non-elderly or non-disabled families has enabled us to continuously maintain open waiting lists. External economic variables beyond our agency's control have driven the demand and need for Section 8 and Public Housing Programs. In the year 2000, a year into the participation of the MTW demonstration, our agency had 3,064 applicants for the Public Housing Program and 5,256 applicants for the Section 8 HCV Program.

HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected Average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual Average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on public housing wait list= **13 months** Average applicant time on HCV wait list= **36 months** 13 + 36=49 49/2 =25 **AVERAGE TIME PRIOR TO ACTIVITY= 25 months**	Expected average applicant time on public housing wait list= **13 months** Expected average applicant time on HCV wait list= **36 months** 13 + 36=49 49/2 =25 **EXPECTED AVERAGE TIME PRIOR TO ACTIVITY= 25 months**	Actual average applicant time on public housing wait list= **28 months** Actual average applicant time on HCV wait list= **75 months** 28 + 75=103 103/2 =52 **ACTUAL AVERAGE TIME = 52 months**	***The outcome did not meet the benchmark. As projected, the demand for Rental Assistance Programs in our area has doubled the average applicant time on the Public Housing and HCV wait list. This increase in demand has double the time applicants spend on our waiting list.

*** We currently have twice as many applicants for Public Housing (7,786) and over three times as many applicants for Section 8 (16,360). Thus, we anticipated that even with the implementation of time limits, the average wait list time will not be reduced. However, our agency is confident that the participation in the MTW Demonstration Program allows us to keep our waiting lists open. The additional turnover as a result of time limits provides a fairer method of distributing housing subsidies and serves to keep waiting lists shorter in duration then what they would otherwise be.*

MTW Hardship Policy: This activity utilizes elements of rent reform; the following is HATC's Hardship Policy:

The Housing Authority recognizes that substantial, unforeseen hardships may arise, such that families cannot pay their full rent. In such cases, the families may apply to the Housing Authority for relief. Relief may consist of deferral of a portion of the rent. The Housing Authority shall consider such a request, taking into consideration other local resources available to the family. Such requests must be in writing, stating the reason for the hardship, and the expected duration. Consideration will be given for hardship when a family has suffered a catastrophic change, which caused the death, illness or long-term disability of an adult family member, which resulted in the loss of income to the family. These families will be referred to CSET for an assessment of options and links to other community resources for recovery. A contract will be signed with the family stipulating the change to their Moving-to-Work assistance and the steps the family will take to work toward self-sufficiency. The contract will specify the amount by which the family's Public Housing Program rent will be decreased, and for what duration. The amount by which the rent will be changed will be determined by Housing Authority staff on a case-by-case basis. If all possible wage earner(s) for a family become(s) permanently disabled, the family will be changed to a traditional income-based program with no time limit.

In cases where a CSET evaluation is not possible or productive, and where there are still possible wage earners, the hardship request will be presented to a Hardship Committee made up of community citizens who have sufficient knowledge of the MTW program to make informed decisions as to the disposition of rental assistance for such families. Decisions of the Hardship Committee will be final.

This policy is not intended to apply to seasonal-income fluctuations, nor minor or temporary reductions of income.

Since the commencement of the MTW Demonstration Program, HATC has had a total of 237 hardship requests. Participants are allowed to request more than one hardship so the total number includes second- and third-time requests. The committee will at times only allow certain participants the right to request multiple hardships. However, they may rule that the one hardship given is the only extension allowed and no further request will be honored. During FY 2014, we had a total of 61 requests. These requests solicited different types of actions, such as requesting to be converted to the income-based program or requesting additional time on the program. Families that submitted these requests had medical problems or they felt that they did not have enough income to pay the total contract rent due to changes in familial status.

Of the 61 requests, no action was taken on 15 families; 33 families were given extensions; 10 families were denied and three families were switched to the income-based program. Of the families given extensions, ten were referred to CSET, which is a local agency that also tries to promote self-sufficiency by offering services, such as job training and job placement.

Conclusions: The analysis of the outcomes to baselines and benchmarks indicate that this activity is effective in achieving administrative cost savings and encouraging and facilitating participants to become self-sufficient.

Activity Two-Increasing Housing Choices:

In the 2008/2009 Plan, HATC discussed the necessity of increasing the housing choices for program participants. HATC believes that the elimination of the 40% rule for families on the income-based program will achieve the MTW statutory objective on increasing housing choices for low-income families. This activity was approved in 2008/2009 and implemented in 2009.

Revisions to Benchmarks/Metric and Data Collection Methodology: The new Form 50900 required the utilization of applicable Standard HUD Metrics as an evaluative procedure. This statistical analysis process allows to display in detail the impacts of this activity and whether the activity is on schedule. HATC had been previously reporting this metric in previous plans and reports, there is no revisions to previous utilized methodology.

Activity Assessment: A comparison of the achieved outcomes in comparison to the baselines and expected benchmarks will be conducted and discussed through the following applicable Standard HUD Metrics:

HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit/and or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the Activity Two.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the Activity Two.	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of Activity Two.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the elimination of the 40% rule for income based- participants	**TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS= 0**	**EXPECTED TOTAL= 40**	**ACTUAL TOTAL= 22**	***The expected outcome was not achieved. However, the activity did produce positive results. There were a total of 22 additional households that were able to choose units they would not have been allowed to rent without this activity; the total outcome was lower than expected.

***There was a reduction of 31 households that utilized this activity when comparing this year's total to the total achieved in the FY 2012-2013. Such outcomes can be rationalized as subject households opt to reduce their gross rent payments rather than having higher rental payments in units that the gross rent exceeds 40% of their income*.**

Conclusions: The outcomes display an increase in housing choices for low-income families. HATC will continue to closely monitor and assess the overall effectiveness of this activity in the future.

Activity Three- Encourage Self-Sufficiency and Transition of Pre-1999 Families to the MTW Program:

This Activity transitioned families who are not elderly or disabled and who began Section 8 HCV or Public Housing assistance in Tulare County prior to May 1, 1999 to the MTW Program. These families chose to not be transitioned into the MTW Program, allowing them to be excluded from the rent reform provisions enforced on all MTW Program participants. In 2009 our agency concluded that all able body participants should strive to become self-sufficient regardless of when they had been enrolled in one of our programs; therefore the remaining 73 families were to be transitioned into our MTW Program. This activity administers the same rental assistance model outlined in Activity One, with the objective of promoting administrative cost savings and self-sufficiency for its participants. This activity was approved in 2009-2010 and implemented in 2009.

Revisions to Benchmarks/Metric and Data Collection Methodology: The new Form 50900 required the utilization of applicable Standard HUD Metrics as an evaluative procedure. This statistical analysis process allows to display in detail the impacts of this activity and whether the activity is on schedule. HATC had not been required to utilize this list of HUD Standard Metrics in the past, therefore the baselines and benchmarks of metrics that were not reported on before are newly constructed for this report. Each metric will outline the methodology utilized to calculate the baseline, benchmark and reported outcome.

Activity Assessment: Activity Three, administers the same rental assistance model outlined in Activity One, with the objective of promoting administrative cost savings and self-sufficiency for its participants. The activity will be assessed through the same applicable Standard HUD Metrics utilized in Activity One. The same methodology to develop the baselines will be used. However, baselines will be revised to reflect the effects on the remaining 49 families. A comparison of the achieved outcomes in comparison to the baselines and expected benchmarks will be conducted and discussed through the following applicable Standard HUD Metrics:

CE#2: Staff Time Savings (Pre-1999 Families)

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total number of hours spent to process a File without components of Activity One.	*Clerks hours to review Non MTW Case=* Interim Income Verification: **10** Retro Rents: **5** Medical Allowance:**0** *Occupancy Program Specialist hours to review Non MTW Case*: Retro Rents: **3** Leases: **35** **TOTAL STAFF HOURS SPENT PRIOR TO ACTIVITY=53**	*Expected Clerk hours to review MTW Case=* Interim Income Verification: **0** Retro Rents: **0** Medical Allowance: **0** *Expected Occupancy Program Specialist hours to review MTW Case:* Retro Rents: **0** Leases: **0** **ANTICIPATED TOTAL STAFF HOURS= 0**	Actual Clerk hours to review MTW Case= Interim Income Verification: **0** Retro Rents: **0** Medical Allowance:**0** Actual Occupancy Program Specialist hours to review MTW Case: Retro Rents: **0** Leases: **0** **ACTUAL TOTAL STAFF HOURS= 0**	The outcome meets the anticipated time savings. HATC saved an estimated total of 53 Staff Hours as result of the activity. The noted savings would not be feasible without the programmatic modifications described in Activity Three.

CE#1: Agency Cost Savings (Pre-1999 Families)

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost to process a File without components of Activity One in dollars (decrease).	Clerk Labor→15 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $41.91 per hour = **$628** Occupancy Program Specialist Labor→ 38 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $57.49 per hour=**$2,184** **TOTAL COST PRIOR TO ACTIVITY =$2,812**	Expected Clerk Labor→0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $41.91 per hour = **$0** Expected Occupancy Program Specialist Labor→ 0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $57.49 per hour= **$0** **ANTICIPATED TOTAL COST = $0**	Actual Clerk Labor→0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $41.91 per hour = **$0** Actual Occupancy Program Specialist Labor→ 0 Total Hours (See CE#2) x $57.49 per hour= **$0** **ACTUAL TOTAL COST AFTER IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITY = $0**	The outcome meets anticipated cost savings. HATC saved an estimated total of $2,184 as result of the activity. The savings was due to the time savings achieved in processing a MTW File as outlined in CE#2. The noted savings would not be feasible without the programmatic modifications reported in Activity Three.

CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution (Pre-1999 Families)
The same reporting administrative mechanisms will be utilized to track errors discussed in Activity One to track and report this data for the 2014-2015 FY. Our Occupancy Program Specialist will evaluate and assess the effective filing of the remaining 43 families.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a MTW File, as a percentage. (decrease)	**TO BE TRACKED AND REPORTED IN THE FY 2014-2015 MTW REPORT**.	**ANTICIPATED AVERAGE ERROR RATE OF PROCESSING MTW FILES = 5%**	**ACTUAL AVERAGE ERROR RATE= TO BE REPORTED IN THE FY 2014-2015 MTW REPORT.**	We currently cannot evaluate whether the outcome meets the anticipated decrease in staff errors. HATC had not been required to track such data in prior years; therefore HATC has begun to track errors in the processing of new MTW cases as of May 22, 2014. During this time we came across zero errors from the 43 subject files. This limited data for FY 2014, is not sufficient to calculate a statistically significant baseline or to gauge whether the outcome was achieved. This outcome will be effectively assessed in the 2014-2015 MTW Report.

SS#1: Increase in Household Income (Pre-1999 Families)

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average earned income of households affected by this policy In dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of this activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of households enrolled in a MTW Program (increase).	Average earned income of households prior to participating in a MTW Program. **TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME= $14,546**	10% average earned income increase from the time they first enrolled in a MTW Program. $14,546 x .10= $1,454 $14,546 + 1,454=$16,000 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME=$16,000**	**ACTUAL AVERAGE EARNED HOUSEHOLD INCOME= $20,699**	The outcome exceeded the benchmark in this category. On average earned household incomes increase by $6,153. That's a 30% average earned income increase from the time they first enrolled in a MTW Program. The noted outcomes, display the effectiveness that our MTW Demonstration has in increasing the self-sufficiency of program participants.

SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (Pre-1999 Families)

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (1)Full-Time				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full- Time	Head(s) of households employed Full-Time prior to implementation of Activity One. This number may be zero.	Expected Head(s) of households employed Full-Time prior to implementation of Activity One.	Actual head(s) of households employed Full-Time after implementation of Activity One**.**	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	12 PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across **73** households) = 16% **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY ONE= 16%**	Expected 10 (*pp*) Increase in PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across total current households) =16% 16 + 10= 26 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=26%**	**14** PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across **43** households) = 33% **ACTUAL TOTAL = 33%**	The outcome exceeds the anticipated benchmark, it increased by 17 percentage points from the baseline figure. The increase in full-time employment among subject participants is a testament to the effectiveness of the components of the activity that promote self-sufficiency.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status (2)Part-Time				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Report the following information separately for each category: (2) Employed Part- Time	Head(s) of households employed Part-Time prior to implementation of the Activity One. This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households employed Part-Time after implementation of the Activity One.	Actual head(s) of households employed Part-Time after implementation of the Activity One.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	14 PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across **73** households) = 19% **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY ONE= 19%**	Expected 5 (pp) increase in PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across total current households) =19% 19*pp* + 5*pp*= 24*pp* **ANTICIPATED TOTAL DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=24%**	**9** PH & Section 8 work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across **43** households) = 21% **ACTUAL TOTAL = 21%**	The outcome did not meet the benchmark. The data displays an increase of 2 percentage points from the baseline figure. The inability to achieve the expected benchmark can be explained by the increase of subject participants that gained full-time employment. Although we did not meet the benchmark, the data presents positive outputs in employment status (both full-time and part-time). This displays the effectiveness of the self-sufficiency components of this activity.

SS#4: Households Removed from TANF (Pre-1999 Families)
This metric was assessed through a historical baseline that captured the number of applicable pre 1999 households that were receiving TANF as they were to be transitioned into the MTW Program. The outcome captured whether subject households were still receiving TANF as they exited the program.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the Activity One.	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of Activity One.	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of Activity One.	Where the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households (across **73** households) receiving TANF prior to implementation of Activity One= **39** **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY ONE= 39**	Expected 15% decrease in the Households (across 73 households) receiving TANF prior to implementation of Activity One=39 39 x .15= 6 39-6= 33 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=33**	Actual Households (across 43 households) receiving TANF after the implementation of Activity One= **16** **ACTUAL TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING TANF ASSISTANCE= 16**	***The outcome exceeds the anticipated benchmark. The reduction of subject households receiving TANF assistance can be attributed to the components of this activity that promote self-sufficiency.

***As subject households continue to time out, there has been a reduction of 39 households to the current number of subject households in comparison to the baseline figure. Such reduction affects the significant reduction of current households receiving TANF assistance. HATC further analyzed the data above to evaluate whether there was a statistical correlation between the activity and the outcome. The data reported above displays is a 16 percentage point decrease in the subject households receiving TANF; this output displays a more statistical significant measure of the effectiveness of this activity, as it relates to promoting self-sufficiency to subject households.** *(Methodology: 39/73 = 53% Households Receiving TANF Prior to Activity One, 16/43= 37% Actual Households Receiving the Implementation of Activity One, .53 -.37 = .16)*

SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (Pre-1999 Families)

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual Average subsidy per household affected by this policy of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by Activity One.	Current average Section 8 subsidy per household for Fresno Housing Authority participants. **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACVITVITY ONE= $490**	Expected 15% decrease in the average Section 8 subsidy per household for pre-1999 HATC participants. 490 x .15= 74 490-74= 416 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE= $416**	**ACTUAL TOTAL AVERAGE SECTION 8 SUBSIDY= $454**	The outcome did not meet the expected decrease in the average Section8 subsidy. While the noted subsidy is less than the current average Section 8 subsidy for Fresno Housing Authority participants by $36, it did not reach a 15% decrease. In retrospect, the benchmark we set forward in the initial metric methodology is not a feasible output. The components of this activity are not designed to have a substantial impact on the overall reduction in subsidy pay outs to subject Section 8 participants.

SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue (Pre-1999 Families)

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increases).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
PHA rental revenue in dollars.	Fresno Housing Authority's per unit rental revenue from its Public Housing Program. **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACVITVITY ONE=$165**	Expected 15% increase in HATC's per unit rental revenue from its MTW Public Housing Program. 165 x .15= 25 165 + 25 =190 **TOTAL ANTICIPATED DUE TO ACTIVITY ONE=$190**	Actual HATC per unit rental revenue from its MTW Public Housing Program. **TOTAL PER UNIT RENTAL REVENUE= $408**	The outcome significantly exceeded the expected per unit rental revenue (a per unit increase of $243). HATC did not anticipate such significant increase in rental revenue, when comparing it to the traditional Public Housing Program administered by the Fresno Housing Authority. HATC will continue to monitor and compare its own historical per unit rental revenue in future years.

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency (Pre-1999 Families)
This metric was assessed on the number of pre-1999 families that timed out of the MTW Program during the year 2013-2014 and did not re-apply to a HATC program within three months of timing out.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operation Information the space provided.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of Activity One. This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after the implementation of Activity One.	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of Activity One.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Local Definition (from Section II): Number of non-elderly or non-disabled households that time out after five years from a MTW Program (Section 8 or Public Housing) and do not re-apply to a HATC program within three months.	PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 1 household)= 0 **TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 0**	PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 1 household) 1 x .25 = .25 **ANTICIPATED TOTAL = 0**	PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 1 households)= 195 **ACTUAL TOTAL= 1**	The outcome exceeded the benchmark. The sole subject household did not re-apply to another HATC program within three months after timing out.

HC#3: Decrease in Wait List Time (Pre-1999 Families)
After careful examination, HATC concluded that the implementation of the transition of 73 families to the MTW Programs in 2009 had minimal impact on our wait list time. There is no direct correlation between this activity and the wait list time as rent reforms activities had been implemented since 1999. For a more accurate analysis of the effects of our participation in the MTW Demonstration on wait list time, please refer to metric HC#3 in Activity One.

MTW Hardship Policy: This activity utilizes elements of rent reform; however there were no subject households that requested hardship.

Conclusions: The analysis of the outcomes to baselines and benchmarks indicate that this activity is effective in achieving administrative cost savings and encouraging and facilitating subject households to become self-sufficient.

Activity Five - Development of Additional Affordable Housing:

This activity allows combining of funding and partnerships with non-profit agencies and contributions of MTW funds to these projects are authorized to make use of the “Broader Uses of Funds” in HATC’s Attachment D of the Standards MTW Agreement. This activity was approved in 2009-2010 and implemented in 2009.

The historical impact of this activity on the development of additional affordable housing has been significant. Our ability to utilize MTW Reserves to finance the acquisition of additional affordable housing units through our partnership with Kaweah Management Company, a non-profit agency managed by HATC, has resulted in an addition of 399 units to our housing stock portfolio. This is critical to our agency’s ability to meet the demand for more affordable housing within our county. The table below displays a historical outlook on the number of additional affordable housing units that have been acquired through the utilization of MTW reserves.

MTW Financed Units				
Complex	Location	Year Built/Acquired	No. of Units	Funding Sources
Robinwood Court	Visalia	2007	10	HOME/Visalia RDA/MTW
Millcreek Parkway	Visalia	2008	70	Visalia RDA/MTW[1]
Myrtle Court	Visalia	1998/2008	36	HATC Non-Profit/MTW
Oakwood	Tulare	2009	20	MTW/Tulare RDA[2]
County Center	Visalia	1974/2010	1	HATC Non-Profit/MTW
Tracy Court	Visalia	2010	3	HATC Non-Profit/MTW
West Oriole	Visalia	2010	8	MTW/Visalia RDA[3]
Tulare NSP	Tulare	2011	5	Tulare RDA/NSP/MTW
West Trail	Tulare	2011	49	USDA/ CTAC/MTW
Tule Vista	Tulare	2011	57	USDA/CTCAC/BOND/Tulare RDA/MTW[4]
W. Inyo St.	Tulare	2013	1	HATC/MTW
232 S. Sacramento	Tulare	2013	1	HATC/MTW
Lotas & Newcomb	Porterville	2013	11	MTW[5]
East Kaweah Ave.	Visalia	2013	8	MTW/RDA/HOME[6]
Aspen Court	Tulare	2013	47	RDA/HATC/MTW/TCAT[7]
Country Manor	Tulare	2013	40	MTW[8]
Sequoia Villas	Lindsay	2014	19	MTW/RDA Successor Agency9
Central	Visalia	2014	6	HATC/MTW
Liberty & Court	Visalia	2014	7	HATC/MTW
		Total MTW Financed Units	399	

[1] HATC used MTW reserve money to provide Gap financing between the bank loan from US Bank and trust and the total development costs. The MTW money allowed for the project to be attractively financed at a below market rate interest and the ability to build the $13,500,000 project. The MTW funds will still earn much more than would have been earned on them had they been invested in a traditional bank savings account.

[2] The Housing Authority board approved the use of MTW reserve funds in the amount of $950,000 to purchase the 20-unit project in the City of Tulare redevelopment area in cooperation with the City of

Tulare Redevelopment Agency, which authorized the use of tax-increment funds to be granted to Kaweah Management Company. MTW flexibility allowed for the quick closing on this project to help fight blight in the City of Tulare.

[3] This project was the purchase of two foreclosed fourplex properties in the City of Visalia Redevelopment Target Area. The initial purchase of each property was at $365,000. The two properties were than financed by our local banking partner Valley Business Bank in the amount of $250,000 per property at 5% interest for 25 years, allowing for the MTW proceeds to be used again for another project.

[4] The Tule Vista project is financed by multiple sources. One source is MTW reserve funds in the amount of $3,900,000 to be used as a bridge loan during the 15-year, tax-credit-compliance period. The project is 57 units of single family homes with ARRA Bond financing, 4% tax credit proceeds, Housing Authority MTW Financing, HOME program financing and City of Tulare redevelopment grants and loans. The total project development costs were approximately $14,381,000. The project is the first in the State of California to have approval to convert to home-ownership for qualifying families at the end of the 15 year tax credit compliance period thus than providing for a first time home buyer program. Once, (if), the units are sold, the sale proceeds will be repaid to HATC.

[5] The Lotus & Newcomb property is an existing apartment complex that came up for sale as part of an estate sale. The property consists of four buildings: the estate owner's principal residence (three bedrooms and two baths 1,800 sq. ft.); the detached garage that has been converted into two studio apartments, approximately 300 sq. ft. each (we count this as two buildings); then there and two fourplex buildings, eight units total that are 870 sq. ft. with two bedrooms and one bath. We successfully negotiated with the estate trustee and court to purchase this property with MTW funds for $562,500 plus closing costs. The advantage to this property is that the estate owner's property sits on over ½ an acre and has multi-family zoning which could allow for the development of 8 units on that parcel.

[6] Kaweah Management Company bought two triplexes in the City of Visalia on East Kaweah Avenue for $240,000 (about the value of the lots) with the idea of a major renovation project. The City of Visalia Redevelopment Agency committed $480,000 of Low-Mod Redevelopment funds to reimburse Kaweah Management Company for the purchase price of $240,000 and another $240,000 for renovation. After much review, it has been determined that it is cheaper to tear down the triplexes and reconstruct a new designed 8 unit project on the site and meet all the new City planning and design ideas. The project construction was completed and units were available to rent as of December 2012. The units were fully occupied by the end of January 2013. The total Construction cost was approximately $1,210,000 of which the MTW funds of$730,000 were combined with the City of Visalia funds of $480,000.

[7] The Aspens project is a 47-unit project utilizing multiple layers of financing, including two million dollars of MTW funding as a project-residual-receipts loan. The project was built on once was 13 individual lots, now all combined into one lot, all in an excellent location utilizing the full cul-de- sac of the street. The project includes 16 two-bedroom units and 31 three-bedroom units, along with a community center that is 2,000 square feet in size. The project construction was completed and units were available to rent as of December, 2013. The project was fully leased as of February, 2014. The total development cost for the project was $11,375,000.

[8] Country Manor is a 40-unit project in the City of Tulare. The project is a Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Property that had reached the end of 15 year tax credit compliance period. HATC saw the opportunity to purchase the property in order to maintain the property available for households at or below 80% AMI. The purchase was feasible by utilizing MTW reserves in the sum of $1,300,000 for the acquisition of the property. The purchase was finalized in December, 2013.

[9] The Sequoia Villas project is a 9% TCAC project that utilized MTW funding of approximately $700,000 as a long term permanent financing. The City of Lindsay Redevelopment Agency was left with a defunct and abandoned single family subdivision of two completed homes which were never sold and 17 developed lots that were never finalized. The City was in jeopardy of having to repay $885,000 of Block Grant funds used on the site for infrastructure as the non-completion of the project meant that the funds were not properly utilized. The HATC agreed to assume the development from the City redevelopment agency and do a 9% tax credit rental project instead of a single family for sale project if the site would be given to the HATC free of any encumbrances. The City and redevelopment agency agreed the homes and lots were then transferred to the new partnership at full market value which gave credit for local contribution on the TCAC scoring. The MTW funds allowed leveraging of a total development project of approximately $4,375,000. The project construction was completed and units were available to rent as of December, 2013. The project was fully leased as of March, 2014. The MTW funding was $700,000

Revisions to Benchmarks/Metric and Data Collection Methodology: The new Form 50900 required the utilization of applicable Standard HUD Metrics as an evaluative procedure. This statistical analysis process allows to display in detail the impacts of this activity and whether the activity is on schedule. HATC had not been required to utilize this list of HUD Standard Metrics in the past, therefore the baselines and benchmarks of metrics that were not reported on before are newly constructed for this report. Each metric will outline the methodology utilized to calculate the baseline, benchmark and reported outcome.

Activity Assessment: A comparison of the achieved outcomes in comparison to the baselines and expected benchmarks will be conducted and discussed through the following applicable Standard HUD Metrics:

HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

HATC had been previously utilizing this metric in previous annual plans and reports. The methodology to measure this objective is establishing a zero baseline and measuring the number of new housing units that were made available during the current fiscal year. HATC projected in the 2013-2014 MTW Plan that there would not be any additional housing units made available as a result of MTW funding flexibility.

However, HATC completed the development and/or acquisition of five additional housing projects; Aspen Court, Sequoia Villas, Country Manor, Central and Laurel & Liberty. All housing projects were leased during this Fiscal Year and made available to households at or below 80% AMI, which added a total of 119 housing units to our operating housing stock. The six units located on S. Central St. in the City of Visalia were acquired on May 30, 2004 through the utilization of MTW Reserve Funds. HATC also added two units in the City of Tulare (W. Inyo St. & S. Sacramento St.); these units were added to our available housing stock portfolio. We have also added seven new units in the City of Visalia (Laurel Ave. and Liberty Ct.) to expand our partnership with the Tulare County of Mental Health and Human Services. These units are immediately adjacent to the Tulare County Transitional Living Center.

Furthermore, HATC has also received an award letter from the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) for the proposed project, Newcomb Court Apartments. The project is an 81-unit, new-construction, rental project situated near the southwest corner of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street in the City of Porterville, Tulare County. With a mix of 16 one-bedroom units (approximately 700 sq. ft.), 40 two-bedroom units (approximately 900 sq. ft.) and 24 three-bedroom units (approximately 1,100 sq. ft.), the proposed project will target families earning up to 60% of the area median income for Tulare County. The project is the first component of a larger master plan which includes commercial and retail space, as well as market rate apartments. HATC will be working to begin construction within the 2014-2015 year. The proposed units will not be allocated to this year's report; they will be counted as they come on line and are leased.

HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase).	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of Activity Five.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of Activity Five.	Actual Housing units of this type after implementation of Activity Five.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the Activity Five.	**TOTAL UNITS= 0**	**EXPECTED TOTAL = 0**	Sequoia Villas = 19 Aspen Court = 47 Country Manor= 40 Tulare Units= 2 Central= 6 Laurel & Liberty= 7 **ACTUAL TOTAL NEW UNITS = 121**	The outcome here exceeded the benchmark. HATC was able to make available a total of 121 housing units as a result of MTW funding flexibility.

HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved

HATC has utilized MTW funds to purchase existing housing units that are made available for households at or below 80% AMI. In many instances these housing units are coming to the end of existing HUD contracts or Tax Credit Limited Partnerships. Our agency has been able to purchase these units and assure that they continue to be made available for households at or below 80% AMI. This is the first utilization of this metric as an evaluator of this activity; the methodology was developed for this report. The methodology utilized to report this objective is to calculate the number of existing units (below 80% AMI) that will be purchased this year with MTW funds. The baseline for this metric will be zero due to the fact that HATC would not be able to engage in this activity without the flexibility gained through its MTW participation. HATC did not project to complete the acquisition of any additional units to be preserved.

HATC is currently working to complete the acquisition of the Visalia Gardens; a HUD-mortgaged project which has only months left on the HUD loan. The owner put the project on the market to sell. HATC saw a chance to keep a low-income project affordable and used MTW reserves of $600,000 to option the property. The first payment was made in 2012, and a second was made in 2013, with the project deeded to HATC at the end of the HUD loan and a final option payment of $600,000. As the acquisition is finalized, these units will be included in future calculations of this metric.

Lastly, HATC has acquired the Ashland Apartments; 10 units comprised of two five-plex buildings. Constructed in 1986 as part of the State Home programs, the 10 units were owned by the City of Lindsay Redevelopment Agency. With the termination of redevelopment agencies in the State of California, the City of Lindsay decided to not create a successor agency to handle the limited number of projects for the Redevelopment Agency. As the law was implemented, the City of Lindsay offered the project to the Housing Authority. After review and inspection, the Housing Authority agreed to assume ownership of the project subject to the existing debt from the State HOME Program. The units need major rehabilitation, which has not been completed during this Fiscal Year. These units will be included in the future calculation of this metric as they become available for leasing.

HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase).	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of Activity Five.	Expected housing preserved after implementation of Activity Five.	Actual housing units preserved after the implementation of Activity Five.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available.	**Total Units= 0**	**Expected Total= 0**	**Country Manor= 40** **Actual Total of Units Preserved = 40**	The outcome exceeded the anticipated benchmark. HATC did not anticipate finalizing the acquisition of 40 housing units to be preserved. Furthermore, HATC is working on the completion of additional units to be made available in the upcoming Fiscal Year.

HC#4: Displacement Prevention

As previously noted in *HC#2*, HATC has utilized MTW funds to purchase existing housing units that were made available to households at or below 80 AMI but were in danger of being purchased by market rate management companies. Through the acquisition of Country Manor (40 units) we have been able to prevent the displacement of 40 households at or below 80 AMI that would not be able to afford market rents.

We assessed the achievement of this objective by reporting the number of households (at or below 80 AMI) that would of lost rental assistance and/or be forced to move. The baseline was calculated by reporting the number of existing units that were acquired this year to assure that they are available for households at or below 80 AMI. Our projection was that zero of those households at or below 80 AMI will lose rental assistance and/or be forced to move, this was our benchmark.

HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of Activity Five.	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of Activity Five.	Actual households losing assistance/moving after the implementation of Activity Five.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	The acquisition of Country Manor apartments; allowed 40 Households at or below 80% AMI to continue to receive assistance and/or were not forced to move. **TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS = 40**	**ANTICIPATED HOUSEHOLDS= 0**	**ACTUAL TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS LOOSING ASSITANCE= 0**	The outcome meets the anticipated benchmark. No households lost assistance and/or were required to move due to the acquisition of the Country Manor apartments.

CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged

Through the utilization of the financing flexibilities outlined in this MTW activity, HATC has displayed financial efficacy in the maximization of its financial resources. This has been accomplished by investing MTW reserves and achieving return rates ranging from 8 percent to 10 percent. HATC was not required to report this data in previous reports or in the 2013-2014 MTW Annual Plan. We will establish the methodology for this Standard Metric and report the outcome in the 2014-2015 MTW Report. The baseline for this metric will be zero, as without the inclusion of this Activity our agency will not be able to increase the amount of resources leveraged. HATC projects that it will be able to leverage $500,000 for the 214-2015 year through MTW reserve fund returns alone, this will be our benchmark.

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	**Baseline**	**Benchmark**	**Outcome**	**Benchmark Achieved?**
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars.	**TOTAL = $0**	**EXPECTED TOTAL=$500,000**	**To be reported in the FY 2014-2015 Annual MTW Report.**	**To be reported in the FY 2014-2015 Annual MTW Report**.

Conclusions: The analysis of the outcomes to baselines and benchmarks indicate that this activity is extremely effective in increasing housing choices for low income families.

(IV) Approved MTW Activities: (B) Not Yet Implemented Activities

Not Applicable, no activities under this criterion.

(IV) Approved MTW Activities: (C) Activities on Hold

Activity Four – Project Based Section 8: In our 2009-2010 MTW Plan, HATC discussed the building of 30 single-family units in the city of Tulare that would allow HATC to participate in the project-based HCV program for the first time. This complex, Tule Vista, was built in conjunction with the City of Tulare Redevelopment Agency. HATC was authorized to undertake such initiative by its Moving-to-Work Agreement, Attachment C, Section (D)(1)(e) and D (7). These regulations authorize waiving the requirements for a Request for Proposal by an agency planning to project base and Section 8 vouchers and review of proposals for various owners. They also, authorize waiving the limitation on only allowing 25% of units in a complex to be project based. These subsidies were essential in order to make the project financially viable. This Activity was implemented in 2011, Tule Vista was constructed and all 30 project–based vouchers are under lease. HATC has not project based any additional vouchers since the completion of Tule Vista.

HATC reported in the approved Moving to Work FY 2013-2014 Annual Plan, that it planned to put this activity on hold. Furthermore, given the new Form 50900, HATC will utilize the now official ability to put this activity on hold. HATC did not utilize this activity during the FY 2013- 2014. There are no reportable actions to reactive this activity. HATC will reassess whether to reactivate this Activity in the 2015-2016 MTW Annual Plan.

(IV) Approved MTW Activities: (D) Closed Out Activities

Not Applicable, no MTW activities have been closed out.

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

A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Fund

Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year
PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA

Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility
All approved MTW activities used other MTW waivers.

V. 4. Report. Local Asset Management Plan

A. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?	Yes		
Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?		or	No

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?	N/A	or	

N/A

V. 5. Report. Unspent MTW Funds

A. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds

In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.

Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
Type	Description	$ X	$ X
	Total Obligated or Committed Funds:	0	0

*As intructed in the HUD Webcast Training for HUD Form 50900, this section is to not be completed until further methodology from HUD is released.

Note : *Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of*

Deficiencies have not been cited or observed in any of our HUD reviews, audits or physical inspections during the report year.

As part of the administrative procedures of the MTW Plan, HATC did not do any specific evaluations or assessments with regards to the MTW Demonstration Program.

The agency has met all three of the statutory requirements of 1) assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; 2) continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and 3) maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size_ are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration. The agency certification that the agency has met all three noted statutory requirements is included as item “A” in the end of Section VI of this report.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OF THE
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF TULARE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

-oOo-

IN THE MATTER OF APPROVING CERTIFICATIONS OF COMPLIANCE FOR THE ANNUAL MOVING TO WORK REPORT	)))))	**RESOLUTION NO. 2014-11**

-oOo-

At a duly constituted meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, a public body corporate and politic (the "Housing Authority"), held on September 17, 2014, the following resolution was adopted:

The Executive Director is authorized to act on behalf of the Board of Commissioners for the "Housing Authority", to approve the submission of the Annual Moving to Work Report for the PHA fiscal year beginning July 1, 2013, hereinafter referred to as "the Report", of which this document will be made a part and to make the following certifications to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in connection with the submission of the Report:

1. "The Housing Authority" has met the statutory requirement to house at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the agency who have income in the "very low" category,
2. "The Housing Authority" has met the statutory requirement to continue to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined;
3. "The Housing Authority" has met the statutory requirement to maintain a comparable mix of families (by family size) as would have been served had the amounts not been used under the MTW demonstration Program.

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare	CA030
PHA Name	PHA Number/HA
KEN KUGLER	Executive Director
Name of Authorized Official	Title
Ken Kugler	September 17, 2014
Signature	Date

4. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

The foregoing resolution was adopted upon a motion presented by Commissioner Hess, and seconded by Commissioner Kilgore, at a regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners held on the 17th day of September 2014. Motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	Saltzman, Snyder, Romero, Rodrigues
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Ybarra, Hess, Kilgore

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE

COUNTY OF TULARE

STEVEN B. SALTZMAN, Chairperson

MW/Resolutions/2014-11