

**Louisville Metro Housing Authority**

# **Moving to Work Annual Report**

**Fiscal Year 2016**

**July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016**

Submitted to HUD on November 22, 2016



# Table of Contents

---

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| I. Introduction .....   | 3   |
| Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration Program Overview .....             | 3   |
| MTW Activity Overview .....   | 4   |
| Short and Long Term MTW Plan .....                                    | 7   |
| II. General Housing Authority Operating Information .....             | 11  |
| III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested .....            | 21  |
| IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted .....    | 22  |
| A. Implemented MTW Activities .....                                   | 22  |
| A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments .....        | 23  |
| A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration) .....           | 26  |
| A.3 HUD/MDRC HVC Rent Reform Demonstration .....                      | 41  |
| A.4 Occupancy Criteria for New Scattered Sites .....                  | 55  |
| A.5 Public Housing Development .....                                  | 61  |
| A.6 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities .....                        | 65  |
| A.7 Local Leased Housing Program .....                                | 71  |
| A.8 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs .....                     | 84  |
| B. Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities .....                           | 89  |
| C. MTW Activities On-Hold .....                                       | 90  |
| D. Closed Out MTW Activities .....                                    | 91  |
| V. Sources and Uses of Funds .....                                    | 97  |
| VI. Administrative.....   | 99  |
| A. HUD Reviews, Audits, and Physical Inspection Issues .....          | 100 |
| B. PHA-Directed Evaluations .....                                     | 101 |
| C. Certification of Conformance with MTW Statutory Requirements ..... | 102 |
| Appendix I. Waiting List Households by Bedroom Size.....              | 104 |

# I. Introduction

---

The Louisville Metro Housing Authority, formerly known as the Housing Authority of Louisville, is a nonprofit agency responsible for the development and management of federally assisted housing in the Louisville Metro area. In 2003, Louisville Metro Mayor Jerry Abramson and the Louisville Metro Council approved the merger of the Housing Authority of Louisville and Housing Authority of Jefferson County, thereby creating the Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA). A nine-member Board of Commissioners, appointed by the Metro Mayor, serves as the policy making body of the agency. LMHA has over 4,000 public housing units, and administers rental assistance for more than 9,000 families through its Section 8 programs.

## Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration Program Overview

LMHA, then the Housing Authority of Louisville, became one of a small group of public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration Program in 1999. The MTW Program, authorized by Congress and signed into Law as part of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996, offers public housing agencies (PHAs) the opportunity to design and test innovative, locally-designed housing and self-sufficiency strategies for low-income families. The program allows exemptions from existing low-income public housing (Section 9) and Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) rules, and it permits LMHA to combine public housing operating and capital funds, along with Housing Choice Voucher rental assistance funds, into a single agency-wide funding source.

Under the MTW Program, LMHA creates and adopts an MTW Annual Plan that describes new and ongoing activities that utilize authority granted to LMHA under its MTW Agreement with HUD. This Plan focuses primarily on the Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher (HCV), and Capital Fund programs, as these are the LMHA programs that fall under MTW. The Annual Plan also focuses on newly proposed MTW activities and MTW activities that are ongoing. In addition, it contains information about some of LMHA's non-MTW initiatives, such as public housing site improvements, resident self-sufficiency programs, and new or upcoming grant opportunities. The MTW Annual Report - prepared at the end of each Fiscal Year (FY) - is an update on the status and outcomes of those activities included in the MTW Annual Plan.

### MTW Objectives

MTW is a demonstration program that allows PHAs to design and test ways to achieve three statutory goals. Each one of LMHA's MTW activities must achieve at least one of these statutory objectives:

- Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures;
- Give incentives to residents, especially families with children, to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient; and
- Increase housing choices for low-income families.

At the inception of LMHA's status as an MTW agency, LMHA carefully evaluated its own goals and objectives against those of the demonstration. The outcome was six long-term goals for LMHA's participation in the MTW program.

### Locally Defined LMHA MTW Goals

These goals, as outlined in the FY 1999 MTW Annual Plan, are locally-driven refinements of HUD's objectives:

- Increase the share of residents moving toward self-sufficiency;
- Achieve a greater income mix at LMHA properties;
- Expand the spatial dispersal of assisted housing;
- Improve the quality of the assisted housing stock;
- Reduce and/or reallocate administrative, operational and/or maintenance costs; and
- Enhance the Housing Authority's capacity to plan and deliver effective programs.

Since that time LMHA has recognized a growing number of populations with specific needs that often go unmet by existing housing and support service infrastructure. The agency has revised and updated its goals to reflect changes in the local community and the evolution of the HUD MTW demonstration into a performance-driven program. In addition to the goals above, LMHA has set the goal to:

- Develop programs and housing stock targeted to populations with special needs, especially those families not adequately served elsewhere in the community.

## MTW Activity Overview

An MTW activity is defined as any activity LMHA engages in that requires MTW flexibility to waive statutory or regulatory requirements.

During FY 2016, LMHA proposed; HUD approved; and LMHA implemented one new MTW activity:

- Activity #45-2016: MTW Special Referral Program – Coalition for the Homeless “Move Up” Initiative

LMHA made significant changes to two MTW activities:

- Activity #13-2009: HCV Homeownership Program – Exception Payment Standards
- Activity #9-2007: Public Housing - Term Limits and Employment/Educational Work Requirements for New Scattered Sites

LMHA also closed out one MTW activity:

- Activity #21-2010: Public Housing – Occupancy Criteria Changes for New Scattered Sites – Mandatory Case Management

A complete list of LMHA's MTW activities (along with their current status) follows:

## Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix

| #  | Fiscal Year | MTW Activity   | Status  |
|----|-------------|--|---|
| 45 | 2016        | MTW Special Referral Program – Coalition for the Homeless “Move Up” Initiative   | Implemented   |
| 44 | 2015        | MTW Special Referral Programs  | Implemented   |
| 43 | 2015        | HCV Program - HUD/MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration   | Implemented   |
| 42 | 2015        | MTW Special Referral Program – Centerstone (formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.)  | Implemented   |
| 41 | 2014        | Public Housing - Special Occupancy Requirements for Floors 1-9 of Building C at Dosker Manor   | Proposed, Not Approved                              |
| 40 | 2014        | HCV Program - Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP  | Implemented   |
| 39 | 2014        | HCV Program - Rent Increase Limit  | Implemented   |
| 38 | 2013        | MTW Special Referral Program – Parkland Scholar House  | Implemented   |
| 37 | 2013, 2014  | Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Frazier Spinal Cord Rehab Institute   | Not Approved in 2013, Approved in 2014, Implemented |
| 36 | 2013        | MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Bashford Manor/Newburg  | Implemented   |
| 35 | 2012        | MTW Special Referral Programs – Allocation of MTW Housing Choice Vouchers  | Implemented   |
| 34 | 2012        | MTW Special Referral Program – Wellspring at Youngland Avenue  | Implemented   |
| 33 | 2012        | Public Housing - Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income   | Closed Out  |
| 32 | 2012        | HCV Program & Public Housing - Elimination of the Earned Income Disregard  | Implemented   |
| 31 | 2012        | MTW Special Referral Program - Stoddard Johnston Scholar House   | Implemented   |
| 30 | 2012        | MTW Special Referral Program – 100,000 Homes Initiative  | Implemented   |
| 29 | 2011, 2015  | Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville   | Not Approved in 2011, Approved in 2015, Implemented |
| 28 | 2011        | Public Housing - Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance, & Modernization  | Not Yet Implemented                                 |
| 27 | 2011        | HCV Program & Public Housing - Amend Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility | Implemented   |
| 26 | 2011        | Public Housing - Acquisition of Mixed-Income Sites   | Implemented   |
| 25 | 2010        | Public Housing - Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities  | On Hold   |
| 24 | 2010        | Public Housing - Increased Flat Rents for New Scattered Sites  | Closed Out  |
| 23 | 2010        | Public Housing - Lease-up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor   | Implemented   |
| 22 | 2010        | Public Housing - CFL Trade-in Pilot Program for Avenue Plaza Residents   | Single Budget Authority Only, Closed Out            |
| 21 | 2010        | Public Housing - Occupancy Criteria Changes for New Scattered Sites - Mandatory Case Management                                      | Closed Out  |
| 20 | 2010        | MTW Special Referral Program - Downtown Family Scholar House   | Implemented   |

**Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix Cont.**

| #  | Fiscal Year | MTW Activity  | Status  |
|----|-------------|---|---|
| 19 | 2010        | HCV Homeownership Program - Weatherization and Energy Efficiency Pilot  | Single Budget Authority Only, Closed Out          |
| 18 | 2009        | Public Housing - Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal   | Implemented                                       |
| 17 | 2009        | HCV Program & Public Housing - Multicultural Family Assistance Program  | Single Budget Authority Only, Implemented         |
| 16 | 2009        | Public Housing - Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies                                    | Closed Out  |
| 15 | 2009        | MTW Special Referral Program - Louisville Scholar House   | Implemented                                       |
| 14 | 2009        | Center for Women and Families at the Villager - Determinations for Program Eligibility  | Non-MTW   |
| 13 | 2009        | HCV Homeownership Program – Exception Payment Standards (Revised FY 2016)   | Implemented                                       |
| 12 | 2009        | HCV Program - Maintenance Specialist  | Single Budget Authority Only, Not Yet Implemented |
| 11 | 2009        | HCV Homeownership Program - Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications  | Implemented                                       |
| 10 | 2008        | Locally Defined Definition of Elderly   | Implemented                                       |
| 9  | 2007        | Public Housing - Employment/Educational Work Requirements for New Single-Family Scattered Site Homes (Revised FY 2014, FY 2016) | Implemented                                       |
| 8  | 2008        | HCV Program & Public Housing - Standard Medical Deduction   | Implemented                                       |
| 7  | 2008        | MTW Special Referral Program - Day Spring   | Implemented                                       |
| 6  | 2008        | HCV Program - Earned Income Disregard for Elderly Families  | Implemented                                       |
| 5  | 2007        | HCV Program - Spatial Deconcentration of HCV Assisted Units   | Closed Out  |
| 4  | 2007        | HCV Program & Public Housing - Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families (Revised FY 2012, FY 2014)        | Implemented                                       |
| 3  | 2006        | HCV Homeownership Program - Amount and Distribution of Homeownership Assistance   | Implemented                                       |
| 2  | 1999        | MTW Inspections Protocol  | Implemented                                       |
| 1  | 2005        | MTW Special Referral Program - Center for Women and Families  | Implemented                                       |

## Short and Long Term MTW Plan

The mission of the Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA) is to provide quality, affordable housing for those in need, to assist residents in their efforts to achieve financial independence, and to work with the community to strengthen neighborhoods. During FY 2016, LMHA focused on the **short term** goal of effectively implementing its FY 2016 Annual Plan. Key outcomes and accomplishments include:

- Continued to expand service-enriched housing choices for vulnerable populations whose needs are not adequately met elsewhere in the community by implementing a new MTW Special Referral Program with the Coalition for the Homeless. The “Move Up” program provides a limited HCV Program admissions preference (no more than 100 vouchers at any given time) for chronically homeless families, allowing them to transition from temporary homeless services vouchers to permanent housing in the private rental market.
- Finished enrolling participants in a HUD-directed, rent reform demonstration in the HCV Program, which has been designed to test and evaluate an alternative rent policy, in conjunction with several MTW public housing agencies, including the LMHA. The Housing Authority has modified its policies and rent calculation methodology for a group of program participants (the Alternate Rent Group), and will compare the results to a group of program participants who are assisted under the rent policies used for all other LMHA-assisted HCV households (the Control Group).
- Expanded the number of exception payment standard census tracts used in the HCV Homeownership Program, increasing the ability of families to purchase homes in areas of opportunity.

In the **long term**, LMHA will continue to focus on the goals below. Progress made toward these objectives during FY 2016 follow:

### Reposition and Redevelop the Conventional Public Housing Stock

The physical stock of the remaining original family developments owned and managed by LMHA needs to be completely redeveloped. These sites – large, dense, urban, and often isolated – need major renovation or replacement. LMHA’s goal is to transform these communities in the coming years, replacing the current public housing developments with mixed income communities, while at the same time providing replacement units so that the overall number of families served will not decrease. In the elderly developments, modernization efforts will proceed with an eye toward appropriate and expanded service provision. Key FY 2016 initiatives included:

- **Russell Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (Vision Russell)**  
Begun in 2010, the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI) is a HUD-funded grant program that replaces the HOPE VI Program. There are three types of CNI funding available: **Planning, Action, and Implementation.**
  - **Planning:** LMHA was awarded a \$425,000 Planning grant in January 2015. By January 2017, Louisville will complete a Transformation Plan for the Russell neighborhood (including the Beecher Terrace public housing development), which will concentrate on the following goals: transform Russell into a neighborhood of opportunity and choice; revitalize Beecher Terrace as part of an overall plan for improving the Russell neighborhood; and attract investments to Russell to improve quality of life for residents.

CNI Planning grant funds CANNOT be used for Beecher Terrace demolition, relocation, or replacement housing; rather, the planning process is examining options for the redevelopment of the Beecher Terrace site. Any future redevelopment would require one-for-one replacement of any units demolished. Displaced residents would be allowed to return either on-site or to off-site replacement housing as long as they were lease-compliant at the time of departure from the original site and remained lease-compliant during the relocation period (No work or minimum income requirements are permitted.). In addition, LMHA would be required to offer an admissions preference for returning residents for both on- and off-site replacement units.

- **Action:** In June 2016, LMHA was awarded \$1 million in CNI Action funds, which will be used to complete physical, community, and/or economic development projects that enhance and accelerate the transformation of the Russell neighborhood. By November 11, 2016, LMHA must submit a draft Action Activities Plan to HUD describing the Housing Authority's intended use of these funds. Funds must be expended by December 31, 2017.
- **Implementation:** LMHA submitted an application for \$29,575,000 in CNI Implementation funds for the transformation of Beecher Terrace (the target public housing project) and the surrounding Russell neighborhood in June 2016. Should the Housing Authority's application be unsuccessful, LMHA intends to re-apply in FY 2017.
- **Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization**  
LMHA received a \$22 million HOPE VI grant to revitalize the Sheppard Square public housing development in FY 2010. The decades old development, which was built in 1942, suffered from inherent design deficiencies, as well as numerous operations failures. On-site, the new Sheppard Square will consist of public housing, low-income housing tax credit, and market rate units in a variety of housing types including single-family homes, semi-detached and row townhouses, and multi-family apartment buildings. Off-site, the public housing replacement units will include service-enriched units and single-family homes and apartments in mixed-income communities. All new construction will meet Energy Star standards and the Enterprise Communities Green Community criteria. As with Liberty Green and all subsequent revitalization plans that require demolition of existing public housing units, LMHA has committed to one-for-one replacement of the 326 public housing units formerly on the Sheppard Square site.

As of June 30, 2016, LMHA had completed all on-site demolition work, and constructed 255 new rental units. During FY 2016, LMHA made great strides toward its off-site public housing replacement commitment, acquiring 37 of 84 planned scattered site units in areas of low poverty.

- **Liberty Green (Clarksdale) HOPE VI Revitalization**  
In redeveloping the Clarksdale public housing development, LMHA has to date received a total of \$40 million in Federal HUD HOPE VI Revitalization grant funds, obtained over \$200 million in physical development leverage, and partnered with several for-profit and non-profit developers to create more than 1,900 public housing, low-income tax credit, market rate rental, and homeownership units. All the rental units included in the original Revitalization Plan are complete. Following the economic downturn, the site plan was revamped to respond to evolving market conditions, and the unit mix was shifted toward market rate rental. During FY 2016, a local developer completed construction of 173 market rate rental units in three buildings, with a portion of the units designated for University of Louisville students, and has plans to build a HOME2 Suites by Hilton hotel containing approximately 100 rooms during FY 2017.
- **Redevelopment of the Friary**



During FY 2016, LMHA continued holding 24 units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA used as public housing until a few years ago when the site was emptied in preparation for comprehensive rehabilitation. During FY 2015, LMHA procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and during FY 2016, LMHA received HUD approval to sell the site to the private developer. The developer has obtained state historic tax credits to partially finance the rehab work, and plans to apply for low-income housing tax credits during FY 2017. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing. An additional six replacement public housing units will be acquired in non-impacted areas.

## **Increase Housing Choice through Stronger Rental Communities and Options, and Expanded Homeownership Opportunities**

Key FY 2016 initiatives included:

- **Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Homeownership Program:** Homeownership is an important housing option for many low-income families, and it is an affordable and secure way for qualified LMHA families to achieve self-sufficiency. LMHA had the first Section 8 closing in the nation in November of 1997, and the award winning program offers a comprehensive route to self-sufficiency for low-income families through mortgage assistance, counseling, and maintenance support. The HCV Homeownership option has helped LMHA families make the transition from renting to owning by allowing them to utilize their voucher to pay a portion of their mortgage for up to 15 years.

Participants challenge their over-representation in poverty statistics and under-representation in indicators of success. In addition to financial assistance, the program provides intensive pre and post purchase counseling and requires homebuyer participation in Individual Development Accounts with a two to one match for repairs and maintenance to help families navigate the process of buying and owning a home and increase their chances of success.

Through a significant change to MTW Activity #13-2009 implemented in April 2016, LMHA has expanded the number of HCV Homeownership Program exception payment standard areas. Setting the payment standard to 120% of Fair Market Rent (as opposed to the standard 110%) in additional non-impacted census tracts will encourage program participants to purchase homes in areas of opportunity.

- **Green / Healthy Homes Initiatives**
  - **Sheppard Square:** LMHA's greenest construction project to date, the Sheppard Square revitalization features mandatory recycling and composting; rain water retention, bio swales, and pervious pavers in the parking lots; photovoltaics; electric vehicle charging stations; a green roof; and four energy efficient / storm resistant houses. In addition to the Enterprise Green Community certification (Block B was certified during FY 2016 and an application for the remaining blocks is pending), LMHA is pursuing LEED Neighborhood certification, funded in part by a U.S. Green Building Council grant.

Thanks to funding from the Carol Mount Peterson Foundation, during FY 2016 LMHA expanded the St. Peter Claver Community Garden (located behind the Sheppard Square Management Office), adding 10 new raised beds to the 23 available previously. The grant also funded a new a "fitness garden" on the property with 10 fitness stations positioned along a walking path that connects to a newly designated "Mayor's Mile" within the footprint of Sheppard Square; a large, multi-purpose lawn area that provides space for activities such as

yoga, tai-chi, and other group fitness classes; and up cycled playground equipment for children.

Also in FY 2016, LMHA received a \$30,000 Place-Based Strategies Grant from Ohio Capital Impact Corporation, which will allow the Housing Authority to construct a splash pad on the St. Peter Claver site during FY 2017.

- **Parkway Place:** In FY 2016, LMHA secured a \$38,750 grant from the Humana Foundation grant to construct a walking path with fitness stations; create a soccer field; and make improvements to the on-site community garden.
- **Smoke-Free Housing:** In January 2016, LMHA updated its public housing *Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy* to begin phasing in a no-smoking requirement across all of its public housing stock. All newly admitted public housing families, as well as families transferring between public housing units, are now required to sign a no-smoking lease addendum indicating they will not smoke in their dwelling unit or in the common areas of their building. This policy will allow LMHA to gradually transition its public housing stock to no-smoking by prohibiting smoking in individual units whenever an existing family moves out and a new family moves in.
- **Community and Resident Safety**  
Promoting the safety and security of public housing residents is of the utmost concern to the LMHA. During FY 2015, LMHA received \$250,000 through HUD's Capital Fund Emergency Safety and Security Program to implement safety improvements at Dosker Manor Building A, a high-rise tower serving elderly and/or disabled households. During FY 2016, the Housing Authority began installing new locks and lighting, and the first-floor lobby security station will be relocated and upgraded during FY 2017.

## 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   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A  | 0  | 0   | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A  | 0  | 0   | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A  | 0  | 0   | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |   |  |  | Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year * | Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year * |  |  |
| Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *             |  |   | Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based |  |  | 0  | 0  |  |  |
| 0  |  |   |   |  |  | Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year        | Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year        |  |  |
|  |  |   |   |  |  | 0  | 0  |  |  |

**LMHA Note:** The Housing Authority does not currently have any project-based vouchers under lease.

| Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization:</b> In 2010, LMHA was awarded a HOPE VI grant for the revitalization of Sheppard Square, a 326-unit family development. The revitalization effort, which includes a mix of market rate, tax-credit, and public housing rental units, as well as homeownership opportunities, is occurring in a series of phases. By FYE 2016, LMHA had constructed 255 of 310 planned on-site units.</p> <p>As with all redevelopment efforts subsequent to the Park DuValle HOPE VI Revitalization, LMHA is committed to one-for-one replacement of the 326 public housing units razed at Sheppard. In FY 2012, LMHA received approval from HUD to acquire existing, off-site scattered-site units to replace a portion of the units that were demolished at Sheppard Square. By FYE 2015, 21 of 84 planned off-site public housing replacement units had been acquired, and an additional 16 were acquired during FY 2016. LMHA plans to acquire the remaining 47 units during FY 2017.</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Wilart Arms:</b> LMHA acquired 15 units within the 66-unit Wilart Arms Apartments (formerly known as Hallmark Plaza Apartments) as part of a Mixed-Finance initiative between the Kentucky Housing Corporation (the Commonwealth's tax credit administrator), LMHA, the Housing Partnership, Inc. (HPI), and HUD'S Federal Housing Administration Office of Multifamily Housing. The property, located off Dixie Highway in the Shively community, will be managed by non-profit HPI. The bedroom distribution of the units is as follows: 2 one-bedroom, 10 two-bedroom, and 3 three-bedroom. Two of the units are both accessible and adaptable to persons with hearing and/or visual impairments. Of the remaining 51 units at Wilart Arms, 11 units are tax credit units and 40 are Section 8 Multi-Family units.</p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>The Friary:</b> During FY 2016, LMHA continued holding 24 units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA used as public housing until a few years ago when the site was emptied in preparation for comprehensive rehabilitation. During FY 2015, LMHA procured a private developer to redevelop the site, and during FY 2016, LMHA received HUD approval to sell the site to the private developer. The developer has obtained state historic tax credits to partially finance the rehab work, and plans to apply for low-income housing tax credits during FY 2017. Once the building has been renovated, LMHA plans to use 18 units for public housing. An additional six replacement public housing units will be acquired in non-impacted areas.</p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Disposition of Units Under Abatement:</b> LMHA held 21 scattered site units in KY001000017 (Fegenbush-Whipps Mill) offline during the fiscal year pending HUD approval of a disposition application (which was received on August 4, 2016). While the units have undergone extensive lead and mold abatement work, yet more work would have been required to put them back into productive use at a cost that LMHA determined was not feasible. Instead, the units will be sold via a closed bidding process during FY 2017 with proceeds used to purchase replacement units in non-impacted census tracts.</p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) Disposition:</b> LMHA held one single family home off-line in KY001000047 (Clarksdale I Scattered 69) pending disposition to MSD. Located in a Special Flood Hazard area, the property will be sold to MSD as part of the Maple Street Drainage Acquisition Project funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). HUD approval of the sale was received on August 4, 2016. Sale proceeds will be used to purchase a replacement unit in a non-impacted census tract.</p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Disposition of Kentucky Street Units:</b> LMHA held 23 units located on Kentucky Street (13 units in KY001000017 and 10 units in KY001000034) off-line pending disposition to Simmons College, a pre-eminent, non-profit, historically black college located in Louisville. Disposition approval was received from HUD on December 7, 2015. Sales proceeds will be used to purchase replacement units in non-impacted census tracts.</p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>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.</p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Scattered Sites (KY 1-056, KY 1-038, KY1-034, KY 1-024 and KY1-017)</b><br/>           HVAC Replacement – Bland Street, Del Maria<br/>           Purchase of Wilart Arms property<br/>           Sprinkler system at the Friary<br/>           960 South Sixth Street Renovations<br/>           Repair Fire Damage 1141 South 6th Street</p> <p><b>Avenue Plaza/550 Apartments (KY1-014)</b><br/>           HVAC Replacement</p> <p><b>Dosker Manor (KY 1-012)</b><br/>           Sump Pump Replacement bldgs A and C<br/>           PTAC Replacement<br/>           Parking Lot Repair</p> <p><b>Parkway Place (KY1-003)</b><br/>           Community Center and Maintenance Garage Sprinkler<br/>           Window Replacement</p> <p><b>Beecher Terrace (KY1-002)</b><br/>           Baxter Community Center and Maintenance Garage Sprinkler<br/>           Domestic Hot Water Pipe Replacement</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| 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  | 21          | In 2013, LMHA acquired full ownership of all rental units constructed through Phase I of the Park DuValle HOPE VI Revitalization, including 59 public housing units, 21 tax credit units, and 20 market rate units.   |
| Market Rate   | 20          | Same as above   |
| Other   | 83          | The Louisville Metro Housing Authority Development Corp. (formerly Louisville Housing Services) developed affordable condominium homeownership, providing construction, financing, and property management expertise. LMHADC (using LMHA staff) continues to manage the condominium regime for each of the following sites: HPP I (36 units); HPP II (15 units); HPP III (20 units); and Parkland Place (12 units). |
| Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed  | 124         |   |
| <p>* <b>Select Housing Program from:</b> Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.</p> <p>If Other, please describe:</p> <div>Most of the funding for the developments was in debt with local banks. The developments were also partially funded by City HOME Fund loans at a reduced 3% rate, more than 20 years ago.</div> |             |   |

## 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                      | Actual   |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ** | 2                            | 3        |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **   | 0                            | 0        |
| Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)  | 0                            | 0        |
| <b>Total Projected and Actual Households Served</b>  | <b>2</b>                     | <b>3</b> |

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

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

| Housing Program:  | Unit Months |           |
|---|-------------|-----------|
|   | Planned     | Actual    |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs *** | 24          | 35        |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***   | 0           | 0         |
| Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)   | 0           | 0         |
| <b>Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased</b>   | <b>24</b>   | <b>35</b> |

LMHA served more families than anticipated through the YouthBuild Louisville local non-traditional MTW partnership.

\*\*\* 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

LMHA Note: As Frazier Rehab subleases 2 public housing units whether or not they are occupied, when looked at by unit month, the number of households served (0.74) is less than the number of units leased (2), as shown in the previous tables. Because YouthBuild Louisville only subleases units when they are occupied, the number of households served (1) is equal to the number of units leased (1).

|   | 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  |      |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |  |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|--|
| <p>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:</p> |      |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |  |
| Fiscal Year:  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016* | 2017 | 2018 |  |
| Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1.21 | 1.74 | 1.59  | X    | X    |  |
| Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1.21 | 1.74 | 1.59  | X    | X    |  |
| Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 100  | 100  | 100   | X    | X    |  |
| <p>* As Frazier Rehab subleases 2 public housing units whether or not they are occupied, when looked at by unit month, the number of households served (0.67) is less than the number of units leased (2), as shown in the previous tables. Because YouthBuild Louisville only subleases units when they are occupied, the number of households served (0.92) is equal to the number of units leased (0.92).</p>  |      |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |  |

## 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     | 2496   | 54   | 0  | 2550  | 54.89   |
| 2 Person     | 555  | 33   | 0  | 588   | 12.66   |
| 3 Person     | 689  | 32   | 0  | 721   | 15.52   |
| 4 Person     | 436  | 22   | 0  | 458   | 9.86  |
| 5 Person     | 158  | 20   | 0  | 178   | 3.83  |
| 6+ Person    | 137  | 14   | 0  | 151   | 3.25  |
| Totals       | 4471   | 175  | 0  | 4646  | 100   |

Explanation for  
Baseline Adjustments  
to the Distribution of  
Household Sizes  
Utilized

"Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW" and "Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW" come from the Housing Authority of Louisville's MTW application, which was prepared in 1997. The application reported household size data in the following categories: 1-2 people, 3-4 people, and 5+ people. For purposes of this report, the historic data was prorated, in order to conform with the categories above, based on the characteristics of the 2014 population of households served.

In 2003, the Housing Authority of Louisville (HAL) merged with the Housing Authority of Jefferson County (HAJC) to form LMHA. Though the original agencies' Public Housing and Section 8 programs were merged that year, demographic information (by household size) is not available for the families who were then served by HAJC, and is not represented above.



| 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 **  | 54.89   | 12.66    | 15.52    | 9.86     | 3.83     | 3.25      | 100.01 |
| Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***  | 5377  | 2531     | 2202     | 1525     | 765      | 547       | 12947  |
| Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****   | 41.53   | 19.55    | 17.01    | 11.78    | 5.91     | 4.22      | 100.00 |
| Percentage Change  | -24.34%   | 54.41%   | 9.59%    | 19.46%   | 54.27%   | 30.00%    | -0.01% |
|  |   |          |          |          |          |           |        |
| Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages  | Unlike with the MTW Baseline Project (HUD Notice PIH 2013-02), HUD has not fully articulated a methodology for monitoring and evaluating compliance with the MTW objective to serve substantially the same mix of families by family size. LMHA will investigate changes to demographics, housing stock, and policies that may explain the variations from the baseline percentages, as shown above, and will report justifications and explanations for family size variations of over 5% from the baseline percentages once HUD has published a methodology for monitoring and evaluating compliance with this objective. |          |          |          |          |           |        |
|  |   |          |          |          |          |           |        |
| * “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  |  |
| Public Housing<br>(Dosker Manor)   | <p>LMHA had been experiencing lower than normal occupancy rates at many of its mixed population high-rises; therefore, LMHA used its MTW authority to locally reduce the age of elderly to 55. Subsequently, occupancy rates significantly improved at all affected sites, although occupancy rates at Dosker Manor did not reach levels deemed acceptable by LMHA. As a result, LMHA began offering lease-up incentives at this site.</p> <p>During FY 2015, the agency was awarded Emergency Safety and Security Grants funding for Dosker Manor, and the Housing Authority began implementing security upgrades at the site during FY 2016. LMHA will continue to consider if an official elderly and/or disabled-only designation of one or more buildings at the site is appropriate.</p> |  |
| MTW Housing Choice Voucher<br>(HCV) Program  | <p>LMHA has been experiencing lower than normal leasing rates in its HCV Program. Strategies to increase leasing include: absorbing incoming ports; accepting new families off the wait list; accepting homeless veteran and Special Referral Program referrals; and hiring new staff for vacant positions including Housing Specialists, Rental Assistance Monitors, and Housing Clerk Typists. In addition, during FY 2016 Metro Government hired two additional housing inspectors, who will be dedicated to HCV units. This will reduce the average number of days it takes to complete initial inspections, allowing units to be added to the HCV Program more quickly.</p>   |  |

| Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End |                                     |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Activity Name/#  | Number of Households Transitioned * | Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency  |
| #9-2007 (Employment Requirements for Scattered Sites)                    | 55                                  | The ability to obtain and maintain suitable employment                                   |
| #29-2015: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville   | 1                                   | The ability to obtain and maintain suitable employment                                   |
| #43-2015: HUD / MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration for HCV Households        | 161                                 | The ability to obtain and maintain suitable employment                                   |
| #44-2015: Special Referral MTW HCV Programs                              | 32                                  | The ability to obtain and maintain suitable employment                                   |
| <b>Households Duplicated Across</b>                                      | 0                                   | * The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used. |
| <b>ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF</b>  | 249                                 |  |

**LMHA Note:** The Housing Authority defines self-sufficiency as follows: “The ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment.”

“Suitable employment” provides an annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

## 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 Housing Choice Voucher Program                                    | Community-Wide            | 17502                             | Open   | No  |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units  | Community-Wide            | 3901                              | Open   | No  |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units  | Site-Based                | 5091                              | Open   | No  |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units  | Program Specific          | 154                               | Open   | No  |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units / Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program | Merged / Program Specific | 979                               | Open   | No  |
| Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program           | Program Specific          | 5                                 | Open   | No  |

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 Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.

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

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

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
| N/A |
| N/A |

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

LMHA has two local, non-traditional MTW activities. One subleases two units at the Liberty Green Community Center to low-income, Frazier Rehab spinal cord injury out-patients. The other subleases up to three public housing units to YouthBuild Louisville for homeless program participants. At FYE, there were 5 households on the Frazier Rehab waitlist.

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
| N/A |

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
| N/A |
| N/A |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative |  |
|--|--|

The following changes to LMHA's public housing Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP) became effective January 1, 2016:

- The admissions preference for involuntarily displaced applicants was changed from a Category 3 to a Category 1 preference;
- The admissions preferences for applicants living in substandard housing and for those who are excessively rent-burdened were removed;
- The admissions preference for victims of physical violence was update to denote that most recent incident must have occurred no more than 30 calendar days before the date the applicant begins the full application process;
- The admissions preference for homeless applicants was updated to indicate that homeless status will be verified through the Kentucky Homeless Management Information System, and that the applicant must have experienced homelessness within the 30 calendar days immediately prior to the date they begin the full application process; and
- The provision that individuals who are elderly, disabled, and/or displaced will be offered housing before other single persons was removed.

*Please note:* These changes do not apply Park DuValle Phases II-IV, Liberty Green, or Sheppard Square.

### **III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested**

All activities proposed in the FY 2016 Plan that were granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as “Approved Activities.”

## **IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted**

---

This section of the Annual Report describes approved MTW activities. It includes a brief description, information on the activity's impact and status, and fiscal year outcomes. Activities are organized by status:

- A. Implemented;
- B. Not yet implemented;
- C. On hold; and
- D. Closed out.

### **A. Implemented MTW Activities**

For each previously approved and implemented activity, LMHA has provided:

- 1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;
- 2) A description of the activity, information on its impact, and an update on its status;
- 3) A description of any benchmarks that were not achieved;
- 4) A description of any metrics that have been revised; and
- 5) A description of any changes to the data collection methodology.

Within this Report, implemented MTW activities have been grouped by topic area as follows:

- A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments
- A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)
- A.3 HUD/MDRC HCV Rent Reform Demonstration
- A.4 Occupancy Criteria for New Scattered Sites
- A.5 Public Housing Development
- A.6 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities
- A.7 Local Leased Housing Program
- A.8 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

## A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments

LMHA had experienced decreasing occupancy rates at several of its elderly/disabled sites for many years, with an average occupancy rate of 90.8% in FY 2008. Through a combination of MTW initiatives implemented beginning that year, LMHA has increased occupancy across these sites to an average of 93.6% at the end of FY 2016. Higher occupancy rates improve LMHA's operating revenues (which achieves greater cost effectiveness federal expenditures), and increase housing choices for 0- and 1-bedroom qualified applicants age 55 to 61.

### ACTIVITY #10-2008: Local Definition of Elderly

#### 1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #10-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

#### 2. Description and Impact

This activity allows LMHA to use the following local definition of elderly: any family whose Head of Household, Cohead, or Spouse is age 55 or above. LMHA had been experiencing decreased occupancy rates at its elderly/disabled high-rises prior to adopting a local definition of elderly for these communities. The MTW age criterion is used to determine eligibility for residency at Avenue Plaza, Dosker Manor, Lourdes Hall, and Will E. Seay Plaza (formerly Bishop Lane Plaza).

Opening up these sites to non-disabled persons between ages 55 and 61 has helped raise occupancy rates and increased the pool of 1-bedroom and efficiency units available to these applicants. While these sites had an average occupancy rate of 90.8% when this activity was implemented in FY 2008, at the end of FY 2016, the average occupancy rate was 93.6%. Higher occupancy rates improve the agency's operating revenues and maximize the cost effectiveness of federal funding.

This activity was implemented in FY 2008; it is on schedule.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b><i>Housing Choice #4: Displacement Prevention</i></b>   |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Number (#) of households (HHs) at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).<br><br>This activity affects families whose Head, Cohead or Spouse is age 55+. | HHs losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (#).      | Expected HHs losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual HHs losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2007: 0</b>  | 0   | 0   | Yes   |
|  | Annual # of HHs at each site losing assistance/moving prior to implementation. | Expected # of HHs at each site losing assistance/moving annually.               | Actual # of HHs at each site losing assistance/moving annually.               | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB   |  |   |   |   |

| <b><i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i></b> |                 |                  |                |                            |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                     | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b> | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |

| Number (#) of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit <sup>1</sup> &/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.                       | Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).   | Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#).   | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|--|---|---|---|---|
|  | <b>As of FY 2007: 0</b>   | 100   | 128   | Yes   |
|  | Prior to implementation, # of non-disabled HHs where head, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61. | Expected # of non-disabled HHs where head, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 living at an affected site at FYE. | Actual # of non-disabled HHs where head, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, & neither the head, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 living at an affected site at FYE. | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB   |   |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup>Better unit is defined as a unit at one of the sites affected by the activity.

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This is not a rent reform activity.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. This activity has proven effective, and all benchmarks have been met.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No benchmark had been established previously for standard metric Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## **ACTIVITY #23-2010: Lease-Up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor**

*1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #23-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010.

*2. Description*

This activity provides lease-up incentives to new residents at Dosker Manor, an elderly/disabled high-rise located in downtown Louisville. New residents receive a waiver of the initial deposit and the first month's rent free.

Before the initiative's implementation in FY 2010, occupancy at Dosker Manor had consistently averaged below 90% for some time. In FY 2009, the year before implementation, occupancy was 87%. At the end of FY 2016, occupancy at this site was 92.3%.

This activity was implemented in FY 2010; it is on schedule.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

### ***Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue***



| Unit of Measurement                   | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|                                       | As of FY 2013: <sup>1</sup><br>\$1,212,767                           | \$1,250,000  | \$1,396,080  | Yes   |
|                                       | Annual Dosker Manor rental revenue prior to implementation           | Expected gross annual Dosker Manor rental revenue                          | Actual gross annual Dosker Manor rental revenue                          | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): PHA financial records |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2013 is the earliest year for which data is available.

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This is not a rent reform activity.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No benchmark had been established previously for standard metric Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)

The MTW Demonstration also allows LMHA to rethink other policies – like the rent policy for the Public Housing and HCV programs – to encourage families to work towards financial self-sufficiency. Alternate rent structures also ease the burden on residents and the agency. As part of LMHA’s rent reform goals, the Authority will continue to use HUD’s Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) System in its day-to-day operations.

### ACTIVITY #40-2014: Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP – HCV Program

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #40-2014 was proposed and approved in FY 2012. The activity was implemented in FY 2016.

2. *Description and Impact*

When calculating an HCV participant’s Total Tenant Payment (which is based on their annual income), this activity allows LMHA to disregard financial aid exceeding amounts received for tuition and fees for all households regardless of age or family status where the head of household is a student. Typically, PHAs are only allowed to disregard this type of financial assistance in cases where the student is both over the age of 23 and has dependent children.

This activity was implemented in January 2016, but has not yet been used. Housing Specialists will continue to screen student heads of household for eligibility at admission and recertification.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>           |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                   | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).   | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).   | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY2015:</b> \$25.07/ household (HH) (\$25.07/staff hour * 1.0 hr)   | \$26.90/ HH (\$26.90/staff hour * 1.0 hr) <sup>1</sup>   | \$0/ HH (\$26.90/staff hour * 1.0 hr)   | No  |
|   | Average cost per household of calculating TTP annually for households (HHs) receiving financial aid disregard where HoH is under the age of 24 or does not have dependent children prior to implementation | Anticipated average cost of calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children during FY | Actual average cost of calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children during FY | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records |  |  |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> This activity is not expected to affect agency cost. LMHA estimates the average cost will continue to be (average staff cost per hour) \* (1.0 hours) with the benchmark adjusted each year to account for variations in staff cost.

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>            |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).  | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (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. |
|   | <b>As of FY2015:</b> 1.0 hr/HH  | 1 hr (1 HH * 1.0 hr)  | 0 hr (0 HHs * 1.0 hr)  | No  |
|   | Average amount of staff time spent prior to implementation calculating TTP annually per student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children | Anticipated amount of staff time spent during FY calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children | Actual amount of staff time spent during FY calculating TTP annually for student-headed HHs where the student is either not over the age of 23 or does not have dependent children | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records |   |   |  |   |

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i> |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline  | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).    | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).                             | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).          | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).          | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY2015:</b> Not tracked  | Not tracked  | Not tracked  | Not tracked   |
|  | Average error rate, as a %, of tracking/calculating HH TTP for affected HHs prior to implementation | Expected error rate, as a %, of tracking/calculating HH TTP for affected HHs during FY | Actual error rate, as a %, of tracking/calculating HH TTP for affected HHs during FY | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; Emphasys                                   |   |  |  |   |

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i> |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline  | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase).                           | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).                  | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV Program.                       |  |  |   |
|   | Gross annual rent revenue from activity-eligible HHs prior to activity implementation | Expected annual rent revenue from activity-eligible HHs during FY          | Actual annual rent revenue from activity-eligible HHs during FY          | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records                 |   |  |  |   |

### 2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were received during FY 2016.

### 3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

This activity was not implemented until halfway through FY 2016 (January 2016), and no eligible families have yet benefited from the financial aid disregard.

4. *Revised Metrics*

The metrics included above are new. LMHA proposed this activity before HUD Standard Metrics were required, and in previous years reported on this activity in the “MTW Activities Not Yet Implemented” section, which does not call for the presentation of metrics.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

Data is recorded by staff at the time of the household’s admission and during all subsequent recertifications.

## **ACTIVITY #32-2012: Elimination of the Mandatory Earned Income Disregard**

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #32-2012 was proposed and approved in FY 2012. It was implemented in the HCV Program in FY 2012 and in the Public Housing Program in FY 2014.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity eliminates the Earned Income Disregard (EID), which allows tenants who have been out of work to accept a job without having their rent increase right away. During the first year of employment, all earnings are excluded from the calculation of the tenant’s rent. During the second year of employment, only half of the tenant’s earnings are excluded from this calculation. A tenant may only benefit from the EID for a maximum of 48 months during their lifetime.

### HCV Program

This activity was implemented on schedule in the HCV program in FY 2012.<sup>1</sup> The 15 families actively taking advantage of the EID benefit at that time were allowed to continue receiving the disregard under the rules applicable to traditional PHAs. During FY 2012, the Housing Authority saved \$391 in administrative costs by eliminating the calculation of EID, and annual rent revenue increased by approximately \$7,646. Full savings from the activity were not realized that year, as some families continued to receive the EID (Over the course of the year, the number of households receiving the EID decreased from 15 to 5).

By the end of FY 2014, no HCV program households were receiving the EID, saving the agency \$447 in administrative costs and increasing annual rent revenue by approximately \$23,246 when compared to the FY 2011 benchmark. These savings continued through FY 2016.

### Public Housing Program

LMHA stopped processing the EID for newly-eligible families in the Public Housing program as of April 1, 2014. At baseline, 62 households were receiving the EID. Annual administrative costs to the agency were \$2,154, and the agency forewent approximately \$93,300 in annual rent revenue.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under MTW activity #6-2008, elderly families, whose only other source of income (in addition to earnings from employment) is their Social Security entitlement, are eligible for a \$7,500 annual EID. These families are excluded from activity #32-2012.

By June 30, 2016, only 10 families were receiving the EID, saving the Housing Authority \$1,781 in administrative costs, and increasing annual rent revenue by \$73,873 when compared to benchmark.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>           |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                  | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                   | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>  |   |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2011:</b> \$447 (15 households (HHs) * \$29.80)  | \$0 (0 HHs * \$0)   | \$0 (0 HHs * \$0)   | Yes   |
|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>   |   |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2014:</b> <sup>1</sup> \$2,154 (62 HHs * \$34.74)  | \$0 (0 HHs * \$0)   | \$373 (10 HHs * \$37.33 (1.05 hr * \$35.55/hr))   | No  |
|   | # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average cost per HH to track/calculate annually prior to implementation | Anticipated # of HHs that will receive EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average anticipated cost per HH to track/calculate annually | Actual # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the actual average cost per HH to calculate/track annually | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records |   |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</b>            |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total time to complete 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. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>   |   |  |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2011:</b> 20.1 hrs (15 households (HHs) * 1.34 hrs)   | 0 hrs (0 HHs * 0 hrs)   | 0 hrs (0 HHs * 0 hrs)  | Yes   |
|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>  |   |  |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2014:</b> <sup>1</sup> 65.1 hrs (62 HHs * 1.05 hrs)   | 0 hrs (0 HHs * 0 hrs)   | 10.5 hrs (10 HHs * 1.05 hrs)   | No  |
|   | # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually prior to implementation | Expected # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually | Actual HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records |  |   |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>  |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). The task is tracking/calculating a household's (HH's) TTP according to the mandatory EID rules. | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%).  | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).                                | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).         | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>   |  |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2011:</b> Not tracked   | N/A (EID no longer calculated)   | N/A (EID no longer calculated)  | N/A   |
|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>  |  |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2014:</b> <sup>1</sup> Not tracked  | Not tracked  | Not tracked   | Not tracked   |
|   | Average error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules prior to implementation | Expected error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules annually | Actual error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP annually | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; Emphasys  |  |  |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b> |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                      | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase).                           | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).              | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).   | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>  |   |  |   |
|   | N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV Program.                   |   |  |   |
|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>   |   |  |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2014:</b> <sup>1</sup> \$93,300  | \$93,300  | \$73,873   | No  |
|   | Gross annual rent revenue foregone from HHs receiving EID prior to implementation | Expected increase in annual rent revenue increase due to elimination of EID | Actual increase in annual rent revenue during FY due to elimination of EID | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records                 |   |   |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

#### 2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were received during FY 2016.

#### 3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

The benchmarks for this activity reflect full implementation, at which point zero households will receive the EID. While this activity has been fully implemented in the HCV Program (and all benchmarks have been achieved), 10 Public Housing families who were receiving the EID when

this activity was first implemented, continue to benefit from the disregard. Once the EID eligibility window for these families has expired, LMHA expects the benchmarks will be fully met.

4. *Revised Metrics*

HCV Program metrics were not revised. No benchmarks had previously been established for the Public Housing Program.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. There were no changes to data collection methodology.

## ACTIVITY #8-2008: Standard Medical Deduction

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #8-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. *Description and Impact*

Under this activity, disabled and elderly (age 62+) families in both the Public Housing and HCV programs are eligible to receive a \$1,600 standard medical deduction. Families electing the deduction do not have to furnish documentation of medical expenses, such as bills, receipts, records of payment, dates of trips, mileage log, or receipts for fares and tolls. The standard medical deduction is not mandatory; if the families' health care costs exceed the \$1,600 exemption, the family can choose to have their expenses itemized.

This activity continued to result in administrative cost savings during FY 2016. Foregoing the verification of medical expenses for the 4,773 households that took the standard medical deduction resulted in savings of \$45,899.

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>  |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>   | <b>Benchmark<sup>2</sup></b>   | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of verifying household (HH) medical expenses & calculating HH medical deductions 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. |
|  | <b>HCV Program</b>  |  |   |   |
|  | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> \$29,714 (3,529 HHs * \$8.42)   | \$2,158 (243 HHs * \$8.88 (0.33 hrs * \$26.90/hr))                             | \$2,158 (243 HHs * \$8.88 (0.33 hrs * \$26.90/hr))                        | Yes   |
|  | <b>Public Housing Program</b>   |  |   |   |
|  | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> \$5,246 (623 HHs * \$8.42)  | \$141 (12 HHs * \$11.73 (0.33 hrs * \$35.55/hr))                               | \$141 (12 HHs * \$11.73 (0.33 hrs * \$35.55/hr))                          | Yes   |
|  | <b>Agency-Wide</b>  |  |   |   |
|  | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> \$34,960  | \$2,299  | \$2,299   | Yes   |
|  | # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving the itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by the average</i> | Anticipated # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving the itemized medical deduction | Actual # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving the itemized medical deduction | Explanation to be provided                          |

|   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|   | cost per HH to calculate/verify medical expenses annually prior to implementation | <i>multiplied by the average cost per HH</i> | <i>multiplied by the average cost per HH during FY</i> |  |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records |   |  |  |  |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available. Staff cost averages hourly rate with benefits for HCV Specialist and Public Housing Service Specialist (\$25.25 / hour).

<sup>2</sup> Benchmarks will be adjusted annually to account for variations in staff cost.

| <b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>  |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline <sup>1</sup>   | Benchmark   | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total time to complete verifications of medical expenses & calculations of medical deduction 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. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>  |   |  |   |
|   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 1,176 hrs (3,529 households (HHs) * 0.33 hrs)   | 80 hrs (243 HHs * 0.33 hrs)   | 80 hrs (243 HHs * 0.33 hrs)  | Yes   |
|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>   |   |  |   |
|   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 208 hrs (623 HHs * 0.33 hrs)  | 4 hrs (12 HHs * 0.33 hrs)   | 4 hrs (12 HHs * 0.33 hrs)  | Yes   |
|   | <b>Agency-Wide</b>  |   |  |   |
|   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 1,384 hrs   | 84 hrs  | 84 hrs   | Yes   |
|   | # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to calculate/ verify medical expenses annually before implementation | Anticipated # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time per HH | Actual # of elderly/disabled HHs receiving itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time per HH | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records   |   |   |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>  |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Average error rate in completing the calculation of a household's (HH's) medical deduction, as a percentage (decrease). | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%). | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>  |   |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2009:</b> Not tracked  | Not tracked   | Not tracked   | Not tracked   |
|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>   |   |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2009:</b> Not tracked  | Not tracked   | Not tracked   | Not tracked   |
|   | <b>Agency-Wide</b>  |   |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2009:</b> Not tracked  | Not tracked   | Not tracked   | Not tracked   |



|                                      |   |  |  |                            |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------------|
|                                      | Average error rate, as a %, of calculating a HH's medical deduction prior to implementation | Expected error rate, as a %, of calculating a HH's medical deduction | Actual error rate, as a %, of calculating a HH's medical deduction | Explanation to be provided |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs |   |  |  |                            |

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase).                           | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).               | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>   |  |  |   |
|   | N/A. LMHA does not receive rental revenue from the HCV Program.                    |  |  |   |
|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>  |  |  |   |
|   | As of FY2009: Not tracked  | \$4,265,448  | \$4,265,448  | Yes   |
|   | Sum of gross annual rent revenue from elderly/disabled HHs prior to implementation | Expected sum of gross annual rent revenue from elderly/disabled HHs        | Actual sum of gross annual rent revenue from elderly/disabled HHs        | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records                 |  |  |  |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

No hardship requests were made during FY 2016. Twelve families in the Public Housing Program and 243 families in the HCV Program with medical expenses exceeding \$1,600 chose to have their medical expenses itemized.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No benchmarks had been established previously for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. No changes have been made to the data collection methodology.

## **ACTIVITY #4-2007: Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families**

*1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #4-2007 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008. Activity was significantly amended in FY 2012.

*2. Description and Impact*

This activity allows LMHA to conduct a re-certification of elderly and disabled families in the Public Housing and HCV programs once every two years instead of annually.

In the HCV program, eligible households receive a full reexamination every odd numbered fiscal year. In even numbered years, families are required to complete a mini-recertification packet, which

they return to the agency by mail. In the Public Housing program, each year 50% of eligible families receive a full reexamination of eligibility on the anniversary of their lease-up date.

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008. Originally, the only households eligible for biennial recertifications were elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+. The activity was significantly amended in FY 2012 to include all disabled families, and HCV staff began conducting biennial recertifications for all disabled families that year. In the Public Housing Program, biennial recertifications for all disabled families did not begin until FY 2016 (with recertifications effective October 1, 2015).

As FY 2016 was an even numbered fiscal year, LMHA conducted mini-recertifications for all elderly (age 55+) and disabled families in the HCV Program, saving the agency \$84,130 in administrative costs.

In the Public Housing program during FY 2016, the agency spent \$25,383 to conduct full reexaminations of 952 of the 1,903 families that were either elderly (age 55+) or disabled. Had LMHA done a full reexamination of all 1,903 of these Public Housing families, the cost would have been \$50,739. Thus, this activity produced \$25,356 in administrative cost savings in the Public Housing program during the fiscal year.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>          |  |   |  |   |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                 | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark<sup>3</sup></b>  | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).  | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$).   | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).  | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$).                       | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>HCV Program</b>   |   |  |   |
|  | <b>As of FY2008:<sup>1</sup></b> \$5,799 (919 mini-recertifications * 0.25 staff hours * \$25.24/hour)         | <b>Even FYs:</b> \$28,043 (4,170 mini-recerts * 0.25 staff hrs * \$26.90/hr)<br><b>Odd FYs:</b> \$112,173 (4,170 full recerts * 1.0 staff hrs * \$26.90/hr) | \$28,043 (4,170 mini-recerts * 0.25 staff hrs * \$26.90/hr)                          | Yes   |
|  | <b>Public Housing Program</b>  |   |  |   |
|  | <b>As of FY2008:<sup>2</sup></b> \$16,695 (894 full recertifications * 0.75 staff hours * \$24.90/hour)        | \$25,383 (952 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs * \$35.55/hr)   | \$25,383 (952 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs * \$35.55/hr)                            | Yes   |
|  | <b>Agency-Wide</b>   |   |  |   |
|  | <b>As of FY2008:</b> \$22,494  | <b>Even FY:</b> \$53,426<br><b>Odd FY:</b> \$137,556  | \$53,426   | Yes   |
|  | # of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost to conduct a recert prior to implementation | Expected # of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per recert  | Actual # of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per recert | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs. |  |   |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 919 mini-recertifications were conducted that year. Please note that in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2012 to include all disabled families.

<sup>2</sup> FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 894 full reexaminations were conducted that year. Please note that: 1) biennial recertifications had already been implemented at that time, and 2) in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2016 to include all disabled families.

<sup>3</sup> Benchmarks will be indexed annually to account for variations in staff cost.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</b>                 |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                       | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total time to complete 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. |
|  | <b>HCV Program</b>  |  |   |   |
|  | <b>As of 2008:</b> <sup>1</sup> 578 hrs (2,312 mini-recerts * 0.25 hrs)   | <b>Even FYs:</b> 1,043 hrs (4,170 mini-recerts * 0.25 staff hrs)<br><b>Odd FYs:</b> 4,170 hrs (4,170 full recerts * 1.0 staff hrs) | 1,043 hrs (4,170 mini-recerts * 0.25 staff hrs)   | Yes   |
|  | <b>Public Housing Program</b>   |  |   |   |
|  | <b>As of FY2008:</b> <sup>2</sup> 671 hrs (894 full recerts * 0.75 hrs)   | 714 hrs (952 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs)  | 714 hrs (952 full recerts * 0.75 staff hrs)   | Yes   |
|  | <b>Agency-Wide</b>  |  |   |   |
|  | <b>As of FY2008:</b> 1,249  | <b>Even FYs:</b> 1,757 hrs<br><b>Odd FYs:</b> 4,884 hrs  | 1,757 hrs   | Yes   |
|  | # of recerts of eligible HHs <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per recert before activity implementation | Expected # of recerts of eligible HHs during FY <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per recert                    | Actual # of recerts of eligible HHs during FY <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per recert | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs; PHA financial records |   |  |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 919 mini-recertifications were conducted that year. Please note that in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2012 to include all disabled families.

<sup>2</sup> FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 894 full reexaminations were conducted that year. Please note that: 1) biennial recertifications had already been implemented at that time, and 2) in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2016 to include all disabled families.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                      | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase).                           | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>HCV Program</b>   |  |  |   |
|   | N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.           |  |  |   |

|   | <b>Public Housing Program</b>                                       |  |  |                             |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> Not tracked                                   | \$4,750,000  | \$4,777,668  | Yes                         |
|   | Gross annual rent revenue from eligible HHs prior to implementation | Expected gross annual rent revenue from eligible HHs | Actual gross annual rent revenue from eligible HHs | Explanation to be provided. |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records |   |  |  |                             |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

No hardship requests were made during FY 2016. Elderly (age 55+) and/or disabled families that experience a loss of income or an increase in expenses between biennial recertifications may request an interim reexamination at any time.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

Previously, no benchmarks had been established for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. No changes have been made to the data collection methodology.

## **ACTIVITY #6-2008: Earned Income Disregard for Elderly HCV Families**

*1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #6-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

*2. Description and Impact*

This activity provides a \$7,500 earned income disregard to elderly families in the HCV program who's only other sources of income (in addition to earnings from employment) are Social Security entitlements.

Since FY 2009, thirty-seven elderly HCV households have taken advantage of the EID, an average of five families per year. Although no households qualified for the EID in FY 2016, LMHA believes the potential benefit to elderly families merits the continuation of the activity.

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008. Baseline data for the year prior to implementation (FY 2007) is not available. Baseline data is as of the earliest year for which data is available, FY 2009.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income</i></b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                      | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average earned income of households (HHs) affected by           | Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in | Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |

|                                    |  |   |   |                            |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| this policy in dollars (increase). |  | dollars).   | dollars).   |                            |
|                                    | <b>FY 2009:</b> \$5,651  | \$5,500   | N/A (No HHs received EID)                                     | N/A                        |
|                                    | Average gross annual earned income of eligible HCV HHs before implementation | Expected average gross annual earned income of eligible HCV HHs | Actual average gross annual earned income of eligible HCV HHs | Explanation to be provided |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC      |  |   |   |                            |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>  |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline<sup>1&amp;2</sup></b>   | <b>Benchmark<sup>2</sup></b>   | <b>Outcome<sup>2</sup></b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Report the following information separately for each category:   | Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.                | Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| (1) Employed Full-Time   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)  | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | Yes   |
| (2) Employed Part-Time   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)  | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | Yes   |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)  | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | Yes   |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)  | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | Yes   |
| (5) Unemployed   | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)  | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | Yes   |
| (6) Other  | <b>As of FY 2009:</b> 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)  | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | 0% (0 HHs / 0 HHs)   | Yes   |
|  | Percentage of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (%). This # may be zero. | Expected percentage of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (%).         | Actual percentage of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (%).         | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys   |   |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<sup>2</sup> HUD's instructions indicate that baseline, benchmark, and outcome numbers should include the "percentage of total work-able households" in each category. LMHA does not consider elderly families to be "work-able" households.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</i></b> |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Number of households (HHs) receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency                  | HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#). | Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY2009:</b> 0   | 0   | 0   | Yes   |
|   | # of HHs receiving self  | Expected of # of HHs  | Actual # of HHs   | Explanation to                                      |

|             |  |   |   |             |
|-------------|--|---|---|-------------|
| (increase). | sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity | receiving self sufficiency services as of FYE | receiving self sufficiency services as of 6/30/2016 | be provided |
|-------------|--|---|---|-------------|

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."</i> <sup>1</sup>   |  |  |  |   |
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline <sup>1&amp;2</sup>  | Benchmark <sup>2</sup>   | Outcome <sup>2</sup>   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Number of households (HHs) transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | As of FY 2009: 0   | 0  | 0  | Yes   |
|   | # of HHs transitioned to self sufficiency annually prior to implementation   | Anticipated # of HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY  | Actual # of HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY 2016  | Explanation to be provided                          |

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<sup>2</sup> Employment" means the household is receiving earned income. "Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

| <b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>         |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement                       | Baseline <sup>1</sup>   | 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. |
|   | As of FY2009: \$102.16 (16 HHs * \$6.39)  | \$59.20 (10 HHs * \$5.92)   | \$0   | Yes   |
|   | # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per HH to track/calculate annually prior to implementation | Anticipated # of HHs that will receive EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average anticipated cost per HH to track/calculate annually | Actual # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the actual average cost per HH to calculate/track annually | Explanation to be provided                          |

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b> |                       |           |         |                     |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Unit of Measurement              | Baseline <sup>1</sup> | 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. |
|   | <b>As of FY2009:</b> 4 hours (16 HHs * 0.25 hrs)   | 2.5 hrs (10 HHs * 0.25 hrs)   | 0 hours (No HHs received the EID)   | No  |
|   | # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually prior to implementation | Expected # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually | Actual # of HHs receiving EID <i>multiplied by</i> the average staff time required per HH to track/calculate EID annually | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records |  |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b> |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline <sup>1</sup>  | 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 (%).  | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).                       | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>FY 2009:</b> Not tracked  | Not tracked   | N/A (EID not calculated)  | N/A   |
|  | Average error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules prior to implementation | Expected error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP according to EID rules | Actual error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating HH TTP  | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs   |  |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase).                           | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).     | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.               |  |  |   |
|   | Gross annual rent revenue from HHs receiving EID prior to implementation | Gross annual rental revenue from HHs no longer receiving EID               | Gross annual rental revenue from HHs no longer receiving EID             | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records                 |  |  |  |   |

## 2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were made during FY 2016. Activity cannot adversely affect eligible households



3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Since FY 2009, thirty-seven elderly HCV households have taken advantage of the EID, an average of five families per year. Although no households qualified for the EID in FY 2016 (resulting in no staff time savings), LMHA believes the potential benefit to elderly families merits the continuation of the activity.

4. *Revised Metrics*

N/A. No metrics were revised.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. There have been no changes to the data collection methodology.



### **A.3 HUD/MDRC HVC Rent Reform Demonstration**

LMHA was selected to participate in a HUD-commissioned study to evaluate an alternative HCV rent reform policy (the “Study”). MDRC, a nonprofit and nonpartisan education and social policy research organization, is conducting the Study on behalf of HUD. The Study sets forth alternative rent calculation and recertification strategies that have been implemented at several Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) across the country in order to fully test the policies nationally.

The goals of this alternative rent policy are to:

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

Study participants for both the Alternate Rent Group and the Control Group were randomly selected from the eligible voucher programs by a computer generated program. The Alternate Rent Group vouchers are being managed using the proposed policies. The Control Group vouchers are being managed using the LMHA’s standard policies.

Only vouchers administered under the MTW Program are eligible for the Study. Non-MTW Vouchers (e.g., Veterans Assisted Special Housing, Moderate Rehabilitation, and Shelter Plus Care), Enhanced Vouchers, and HUD Project Based Vouchers are excluded from the Study. In addition, households receiving a biennial certification were not eligible for Study selection.

The Study is focused on work-able populations, and does not include Elderly Households, Disabled Households, and households headed by people older than 56 years of age (who will become seniors during the course of the long-term study). Households utilizing the childcare expense deduction for purposes of determining adjusted annual income, as well as households participating in Family Self Sufficiency and Homeownership programs at the time of Study implementation, were not eligible for Study selection. Households may choose to participate in these programs following Study enrollment.

In addition, households that contain a mix of members: 1) with an immigration status that is eligible for housing assistance, and 2) with an immigration status that is non-eligible for housing assistance, are not included in the Study.

Finally, households receiving case management or supportive services through one of the Housing Authority’s MTW Special Referral Programs are not eligible to participate in the Study.

Households selected for the Alternate Rent Group received an opportunity to meet with an LMHA Housing Specialist to review the Study and their specific calculation of Total Tenant Payment under both the traditional and Study policies. They then had a period of 30 days to consider whether to participate in or be excluded from the Study.

### **ACTIVITY #43-2015: HUD / MDRC Rent Reform Demonstration for HCV Households**

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #43-2015 was proposed, approved, and implemented in FY 2015.

2. *Description and Impact*

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

- 1) Simplify income determination and rent calculation of the household's Total Tenant Payment (TTP) and subsidy amount by:
  - a) Eliminating deductions and allowances;
  - b) Changing the percent of income from 30% of adjusted income to a maximum of 28% of gross income;
  - c) Ignoring income from assets when the total household asset value is less than \$25,000;
  - d) Using retrospective income, i.e., 12-month "look-back" period and, in some cases, current/anticipated income in estimating a household's TTP and subsidy; and
  - e) Capping the maximum initial rent burden at 40% of current gross monthly income.
- 2) Conduct triennial income recertification rather than annual recertification with provisions for interim recertification and hardship remedies if income decreases.
- 3) Streamline interim certifications to eliminate income review for most household composition changes and moves to new units.
- 4) Require the Tenant Rent to Owner is the greater of TTP (see #1 above) or the minimum rent of \$50. A portion of the Family Share will be paid directly to the landlord.
- 5) Simplify the policy for determining utility allowances.

Additionally, the Study offers appropriate hardship protections to prevent any Alternate Rent Group member from being unduly impacted.

**Descriptions of the Five Key Rent Reform Demonstration Features**

*(Applicable Only to Alternate Rent Group Members)*

1) **Simplified Income Determination and Rent Calculation**

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

a) **Elimination of Deductions**

The calculation of deductions and allowances in the determination of annual income has been eliminated.

b) Percent Annual Gross Income.

The TTP rent calculation is determined by establishing gross annual income and then determining the greater of 28% of the gross annual income or the minimum rent of \$50.

c) Elimination of Income from Assets when household total value less than \$25,000

The verification and calculation of income earned from household assets with total value less than \$25,000 has been eliminated. Households are not required to document assets worth less than that amount. This reduces administrative costs and simplifies the program for greater transparency and program compliance.

d) Review of Retrospective Income

To establish annual gross income for the three year certification period, LMHA reviews the total household income without deductions for a 12-month period prior to recertification, i.e., the “Retrospective Income.” A household’s TTP depends on its *Retrospective Income* during a 12-month “look back” period.

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

e) Capping The Initial Maximum Rent Burden

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

2) **Triennial Certifications**

Generally, LMHA performs re-certification of HCV households on an annual basis. The annual certification reviews program eligibility, household composition, income, and other household circumstances. Additional re-examinations (“interim certifications”) may be required for changes in the household situation such as: composition, income, and change in unit.

LMHA performs re-certification of Alternate Rent Group members every third year (triennial). The triennial certification reviews program eligibility; household composition; current income and Retrospective Income; unit information; and sets the TTP and the family share of the gross rent. The TTP for Alternate Rent Group members remains in effect during the three year certification period, with some exceptions related to decreases in income and changes in household composition.

Under the alternative rent policy, a household’s TTP is generally calculated using its reported (and verified) *retrospective gross income* during a 12-month “look-back” period (In this calculation, gross income excludes any prior income from sources that have expired for the household during that period, such as TANF or Unemployment Insurance benefits, since the

household can no longer count on them. It includes imputed welfare income – i.e., any sanctioned portion of a household’s TANF grant.).

LMHA has created a local form to supplement the HUD form 9886 to provide tenant consent for LMHA to collect information relevant to the triennial recertification period.

If the household has an increase in annual income between certifications, the household’s TTP is not re-determined and increased to reflect the higher income. However, if the household has a decrease in annual income, the household may request and LMHA may provide an interim re-certification or other remedies under the hardship process. The interim re-certification is conducted when a household has a reduction of retrospective gross income of more than 10% from the retrospective gross income used to establish the current TTP.

- a) At the interim certification, LMHA re-calculates the household TTP based on a new retrospective gross income review to determine the greater of 28% of gross income or the minimum rent of \$50. This new TTP remains in effect until the sooner of the next triennial certification or a tenant requested interim certification. The tenant may only request one interim certification per year. The year lasts 12 months from the effective date of the certification.
- b) At the triennial certification at the beginning of the three-year period (and at subsequent triennials) if a household’s current/anticipated income is less than its retrospective gross income by more than 10%, the current income alone is used to create a “temporary” TTP for a six-month grace period. After that grace period, the TTP is automatically switched to the TTP amount based on the previously determined average prior income. No interim recertification interview is required to reset this TTP.
- c) Alternate Rent Group members are allowed one request per year for an interim certification to reset their TTP. The year lasts 12 months from the effective date of the certification. The TTP is only reset if a household’s new retrospective gross income (at the time of the request) is more than 10% lower than its most recent prior retrospective monthly income. If the limit on interim certification presents a hardship, the household will need to apply for a Hardship Exemption.

### 3) **Streamline Interim Certifications**

LMHA has instituted a streamlined interim certification process for Alternate Rent Group members to report changes of circumstance that do not require adjustment in subsidy. For these events, LMHA does not request income information. These events include:

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

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

In the event that the new or removed member requires a change to the voucher bedroom size, LMHA reviews the retrospective gross income of the newly added or removed household member(s), applies a new utility allowance, and resets the household TTP. A reduction in subsidy for new voucher bedroom size is implemented when the current lease ends and new lease begins.

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

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

#### 4) **Minimum Rent to Owner**

Currently, HUD does not require minimum rents to be paid by the voucher holder to the landlord. LMHA requires that the Alternate Rent Group make a minimum payment of at least \$50 directly to the HCV landlord in addition to LMHA's portion of rent (HAP). The total amount of rent equals the contract rent established in the lease. This policy mirrors the market system of tenants paying owners directly and creates a closer relationship and sense of responsibility for both the leaseholder HCV household and the property owner.

The amount of rent to owner the Alternate Rent Group pays is equal to their TTP less the Utility Allowance plus any amount over the payment standard for which the tenant may be responsible to pay. The Alternate Rent Group rent to owner is not less than the minimum rent. In the event that the Alternate Rent Group household TTP less the Utility Allowance is less than the minimum rent, the household pays the Owner the minimum rent, and LMHA reimburses the household the balance of the Utility Allowance. However, in the event that the minimum rent to owner exceeds 40% of the household current anticipated gross income, the household may request a Hardship Waiver.

#### 5) **Simplified Utility Allowance Schedule**

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

The simplified schedule is based on the analysis of data collected from LMHA's existing HCV portfolio including the most common structure and utility types. The goal is to reduce administrative costs and reduce errors associated with the traditional method of applying the Utility Allowance Schedule. The simplified utility allowance schedule is also anticipated to benefit property owners who now have a more accurate understanding of the gross rent to be applied to their properties and to the Alternate Rent Group member who is able to use this new schedule to clarify gross rent in their selection of housing units.

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

Study enrollment was completed during FY 2016. In all, 767 families were enrolled in the Alternate Rent Group; 1,038 were enrolled in the Control Group; and 227 opted to be excluded from the study altogether.

As of FYE 2016, seven hundred twenty-two (722) of the Alternate Rent Group households and 915 Control Group families (91% of original enrollees) were still participants in the Housing Authority's HCV Program. This 9% attrition rate is less than LMHA's attrition rate for the overall HCV Program, which currently averages approximately 15% per year.

The HUD Standard Metrics for this activity follow. Please note that MDRC does not track HUD Standard Metrics. LMHA independently established the baselines and benchmarks below, and is responsible for tracking outcomes. LMHA and MDRC may make different assumptions or use different calculations when reporting similar metrics.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</b> |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                        | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>   | <b>Benchmark<sup>2</sup></b>   | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of task in dollars                     | Cost of task prior to implementation (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. |
|   | <b>Cost per Annual Certification (Cert)</b>   |  |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2015:</b><br><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$54,920 (1 annual cert * 1,000 households (HHs) * \$54.92/cert)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$54,920 (1 annual cert * 1,000 HHs * \$54.92/cert)<br><br><u>Per annual cert cost:</u> \$54.92 (\$50.14 staff cost (2 hrs * \$25.07/hr) + \$4.78 (mail & reproduction costs)) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$0 (0 certs * \$0 per cert)<br><b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$54,920 (1,000 certs * \$54.92)<br><b>Control Group (All Years):</b> \$54,920 (1,000 certs * \$54.92)<br><br><u>Cost per annual cert:</u> \$54.92 (\$50.14 staff cost (2 hrs * \$25.07/hr) + \$4.78 (mail & repro costs)) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$41,592 (710 certs * \$58.58/cert)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$46,923 (801 certs * \$58.58/cert)<br><br><u>Cost per annual cert:</u> \$58.58 (\$53.80 staff cost (2 hrs * \$26.90/hr) + \$4.78 (mail & repro costs)) | Yes   |
|   | Average # of annual certs received by study-eligible HHs multiplied by # of expected Alt Rent Group / Control Group HHs multiplied by average cost to complete a cert prior to implementation   | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group annual certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert  | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group annual certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert   | Explanation to be provided.                         |
|   | <b>Cost per Interim Certification (Cert)</b>  |  |   |   |
|   | <b>As of FY2015:</b><br><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$75,220 (2 interim certs * 1,000 HHs * \$37.61/cert)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$75,220 (2 interim certs * 1,000 HHs * \$37.61/cert)<br><br><u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.5 hrs)   | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$18,805 (500 certs * \$37.61/cert)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$75,220 (2,000 certs * \$37.61/cert)<br><br><u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.5 hrs)  | <b>Alt Rent Group:<sup>3</sup></b> \$14,486 (359 certs * \$40.35/cert)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$33,369 (827 certs * \$40.35/cert)<br><br><u>Per interim cert cost:</u> \$40.35 (staff cost of \$26.90/hr * 1.5 hrs)   | Yes   |
|   | Average # of interim certs received by study-eligible HHs <sup>1</sup> multiplied by # of expected Alt Rent / Control Group HHs multiplied by average cost to complete a cert prior to implementation   | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert   | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert  | Explanation to be provided.                         |
|   | <b>Cost per Streamlined Interim Certification (Cert)</b>  |  |   |   |

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  | <b>As of FY2015:</b><br><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$75,220 (2 traditional interim certs per HH * 1,000 HHs * \$37.61/cert)<br><br><u>Per traditional interim cert cost:</u> \$37.61 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.5 hrs)  | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$25,070 (1,000 certs * \$25.07/cert)<br><br><u>Per streamlined interim cert cost:</u> \$25.07 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.0 hrs)   | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> <sup>2</sup> Not tracked   | N/A  |
|  | Average # of traditional interim certs received by study-eligible HHs <sup>1</sup> multiplied by # of expected Alt Rent Group HHs multiplied by average cost to complete a cert prior to implementation  | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group streamlined interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert   | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group streamlined interim certs during FY multiplied by average cost per cert  | Explanation to be provided.                |
|  | <b>Cost of Rent Calculation</b>  |  |   |  |
|  | <b>As of FY2015:</b><br><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$25,070 (1,000 HHs * \$25.07 per rent calculation)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$25,070 (1,000 HHs * \$25.07 per rent calculation)<br><br><u>Per rent calculation cost:</u> \$25.07 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 1.0 hrs)  | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$25,070 (1,000 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$25.07/hr)<br><b>Control Group (All Years):</b> \$25,070 (1,000 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$25.07/ hr)  | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$19,099 (710 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$26.90/hr)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$21,547 (801 rent calculations * 1.0 staff hrs * \$26.90/hr) | Yes  |
|  | Average cost to complete rent calculation multiplied by expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs   | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs during FY multiplied by average cost to complete rent calculation   | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs during FY multiplied by average cost to complete rent calculation  | Explanation to be provided.                |
|  | <b>Cost to Determine Income from Assets</b>  |  |   |  |
|  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b><br><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$13 (2 HHs (0.22% * 1,000 HHs) * \$6.27 per asset income determination)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$13 (2 HHs (0.22% * 1,000 HHs) * \$6.27 per asset income determination)<br><br><u>Per asset income determination cost:</u> \$6.27 (staff cost of \$25.07/hr * 0.25 hrs) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$6 (1 HH * \$25.07 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs)<br><b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> \$13 (2 HHs * \$25.07 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs)<br><b>Control Group (All Years):</b> \$13 (2 HHs * \$25.07 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Year):</b> \$0 (0 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$20 (3 HHs * \$26.90 per staff hr * 0.25 hrs)  | Yes (Alt Rent Group)<br>No (Control Group) |



|  |   |  |  |                             |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
|  | % of study-eligible HHs with income from assets multiplied by expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs multiplied by average cost to determine income from assets prior to implementation | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having income from assets determined during FY multiplied by average cost to determine asset income | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having income from assets determined during FY multiplied by average cost to determine asset income | Explanation to be provided. |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|

<sup>1</sup> Includes all households receiving MTW vouchers except households that are 1) disabled; 2) elderly; 3) headed by individuals over age 56; 4) currently using the childcare expense deduction for purposes of determining adjusted income; 5) enrolled in the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program; 6) participating in the HCV Homeownership Program; 7) participating in a Special Referral Program; and/or 8) of mixed immigration status.

<sup>2</sup> Benchmarks will be indexed annually to account for variations in staff costs.

<sup>3</sup> LMHA is not currently tracking traditional and streamlined interim certifications separately. All interim certifications have been reported as traditional certifications.

| <b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>                           |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                 | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total time to complete 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. |
|  | <b>Time to Complete Annual Certification</b>   |  |  |   |
|  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs per annual cert)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs per annual cert)                             | <b>Alt Rent Group (Non-Triennial Cert Years):</b> 0 hrs (0 certs * 2 hrs/cert)<br><b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs/cert)<br><b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 2,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 2.0 hrs/cert) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Year):</b> 1,420 hrs (710 certs * 2.0 hrs/cert)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 1,602 hrs (801 certs * 2.0 hrs/cert)                                      | Yes   |
|  | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving an annual cert multiplied by average time to complete an annual cert prior to implementation  | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving an annual cert during FY multiplied by average time to complete an annual cert  | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving an annual cert during FY multiplied by average time to complete an annual cert  | Explanation to be provided                          |
|  | <b>Time to Determine Tenant Rent</b>   |  |  |   |
|  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 1.0 hrs per tenant rent determination)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 HHs * 1.0 hrs per tenant rent determination) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 determinations * 1.0 hrs/determination)<br><b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 1,000 hrs (1,000 determinations * 1.0 hrs/determination)   | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Year):</b> 710 hrs (710 rent determinations * 1.0 hrs/determination)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 801 hrs (801 determinations * 1.0 hrs/determination) | Yes   |

|  |  |   |   |                            |
|--|--|---|---|----------------------------|
|  | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine tenant rent prior to implementation         | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine tenant rent  | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their tenant rent determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine tenant rent                                      | Explanation to be provided |
|  | <b>Time to Determine Utility Allowance (UA)</b>  |   |   |                            |
|  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 250 hrs (1,000 HHs * 0.25 hrs per UA determination)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 250 hrs (1,000 HHs * 0.25 hrs per UA determination) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> 80 hrs (1,000 determinations * 0.08 hrs per determination)<br><b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 250 hrs (1,000 determinations * 0.25 determination) | <b>Alt Rent Group (Triennial Cert Years):</b> 57 hrs (710 determinations * 0.08 hrs per determination)<br><b>Control Group (All Years):</b> 200 hrs (801 determinations * 0.25 determination) | Yes                        |
|  | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine UA prior to implementation                           | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine UA  | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs having their UA determined during FY multiplied by average staff hrs required to determine UA  | Explanation to be provided |

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b> |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| 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 (%).   | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).                              | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%).                              | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>Average Error Rate in Determining TTP</b>                              |  |  |   |
|  | <b>As of FY2015:</b> Not tracked  | Not determined   | Not tracked  | Not tracked   |
|  | Average error rate, as a %, of determining HH TTP prior to implementation | For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, expected average error rate, as a %, of determining HH TTP during the FY | For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, actual average error rate, as a %, of determining HH TTP during the FY | Explanation to be provided.                         |
|  | <b>Average Error Rate in Determining Utility Allowance (UA)</b>           |  |  |   |
|  | <b>As of FY2015:</b> Not tracked  | Not determined   | Not tracked  | Not tracked   |
|  | Average error rate, as a %, of determining HH UA prior to implementation  | For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, expected average error rate, as a %, of determining HH UA during the FY  | For Alt Rent / Control Group HHs, actual average error rate, as a %, of determining HH UA during the FY  | Explanation to be provided.                         |

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</b> |          |           |         |                     |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY2016:</b> \$7,195   | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$8,285<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$6,335  | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$8,285<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$6,335  | Yes   |
|   | Average annual gross earned income of Alt Rent & Control Group HHs at FYE                          | Expected average annual gross earned income of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs during FY                    | Actual average annual gross earned income of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs during FY                    | Explanation to be provided                          |

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>  |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households(HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> |  |   |   |   |
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline   | Benchmark   | Outcome <sup>1</sup>  | Benchmark Achieved?   |
| Report the following information separately for each category:  | Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).    | Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#).      | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.   |
| (1) Employed Full-Time  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b> Not tracked  | In sufficient data available to establish benchmark                                       | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 152<br><b>Control Group:</b> 1                                     | Insufficient data available to determine whether benchmarks were achieved. LMHA staff has not consistently tracked “Employment Status” in Emphasys. Data is missing for 912 control HHs and 513 alt rent group HHs. |
| (2) Employed Part- Time   | <b>As of FY 2015:</b> Not tracked  | In sufficient data available to establish benchmark                                       | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 54<br><b>Control Group:</b> 1                                      |   |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b> Not tracked  | In sufficient data available to establish benchmark                                       | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 2<br><b>Control Group:</b> 0                                       |   |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b> Not tracked  | In sufficient data available to establish benchmark                                       | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 1<br><b>Control Group:</b> 0                                       |   |
| (5) Unemployed  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b> Not tracked  | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 154 (21% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 549 (60% of 915 HHs) | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 154 (21% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 549 (60% of 915 HHs) |   |
| (6) Other   | <b>As of FY 2015:</b> Not tracked  | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 0<br><b>Control Group:</b> 0                                       | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 13 (2%)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 1 (0.01%)                         | No  |
|   | # of total study-eligible HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (#).          | Expected # of total Alt Rent / Control Group HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).      | Actual # of total Alt Rent / Control Group HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).        | Explanation to be provided.   |

<sup>1</sup> Although full-time vs. part-time employment status was not consistently tracked for either Alternate Rent Group or Control Group households, according to LMHA’s computer systems, 568 Alternate Rent Group and 366 Control Group households reported earned income at their most recent certification. “Unemployed” equals number of households reporting \$0 in earnings at their most recent certification. This method likely significantly underrepresents the number of unemployed as even those households earning as little as \$20 per year are excluded from the unemployed count (52 of the households with earned income at FYE 2016 reported earnings of less than \$1,000 per year.). In addition, the option “Other” was selected as “Employment Status” by Housing Specialists for 14 households. No further detail is available via LMHA’s computer systems.

|  |
|--|
| <b>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households (HHs) Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b> |
|--|

| Unit of Measurement                            | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| # of HHs receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | HHs receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (#). | Expected # of HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#).            | Actual HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#).                   | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2016:</b> 69 (4% of 1,637 HHs)                      | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 36 (5% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 33 (4% of 915 HHs) | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 36 (5% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 33 (4% of 915 HHs) | Yes   |
|  | % of Alt Rent & Control Group HHs receiving TANF at FYE         | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving TANF as of FYE                   | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving TANF as of FYE                     | Explanation to be provided                          |

| <i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i> |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| # of HHs receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).                                   | HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#).   | Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 0 (0% * 1,0000 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 0 (0% * 1,000 HHs)                              | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 8 (1% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 15 (2% of 915 HHs)            | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 8 (1% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 15 (2% of 915 HHs)          | Yes   |
|  | % of study-eligible HHs receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation multiplied by expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE        | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE        | Explanation to be provided                          |

<sup>1</sup> Metric captures households enrolled in the Housing Authority's FSS Program.

| <i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)<sup>1</sup></i> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Average amount of Section 8 &/or 9 subsidies per HH affected by this policy in dollars                     | Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2015:</b> \$634/month  | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$608/month<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$628/month                            | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> \$608/month<br><b>Control Group:</b> \$628/month                          | Yes   |
|  | Average HAP to owner per study-eligible HH prior to implementation of activity               | Expected HAP to owner per Alt Rent / Control Group HH as of FYE                                    | Actual HAP to owner per Alt Rent / Control Group HH as of  | Explanation to be provided                          |

|             |  |  |     |  |
|-------------|--|--|-----|--|
| (decrease). |  |  | FYE |  |
|-------------|--|--|-----|--|

<sup>1</sup> Per unit subsidy equals average HAP to Owner.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i></b> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).                            | PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (\$).         | Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (\$).         | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.       |  |  |   |
|  | Average annual rent revenue per study-eligible HH                | Expected total annual rent revenue from Alt Rent / Control Group HHs as of FYE | Actual total annual rent revenue from Alt Rent / Control Group HHs as of FYE | Explanation to be provided                          |

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households (HHs) Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i></b>   |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain suitable employment."</i> <sup>1</sup>   |  |  |  |   |
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| # of HHs 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" # should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2016:</b><br><b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 161 (22% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 188 (21% of 915 HHs)                             | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 161 (22% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 188 (21% of 915 HHs)  | <b>Alt Rent Group:</b> 161 (22% of 722 HHs)<br><b>Control Group:</b> 188 (21% of 915 HHs)                                      | Yes   |
|  | % of Alt Rent & Control Group households meeting definition of self-sufficiency at FYE   | Expected # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY  | Actual # of Alt Rent / Control Group HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY  | Explanation to be provided                          |

<sup>1</sup> "Employment" means the household is receiving earned income. "Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

#### Data Sources for Metrics Tables Above

LMHA uses several sources to obtain the data necessary to evaluate this activity:

- 1) *Emphasys LIB*. Information related to household income, assets, household composition, and unit information; and
- 2) *Human Resources personnel data*. Determination of the average hourly cost per job title.

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

Ten hardship requests were received during FY 2016. In seven cases, the family's Total Tenant Payment was re-calculated as a result of the request. Three requests were denied.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

*Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings*

**Cost to Determine Income from Assets:** LMHA anticipated two Control Group households would have income from assets. Three Control Group households actually had income from assets. The benchmark for Study Group households was achieved.

*Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status*

Staff has not consistently used the "Employment Status" field available in Emphasys to track positive outcomes in employment, and for 14 households has selected "Other" as the "Employment Status" even though this category has not been defined by LMHA. The Housing Authority will work with staff during FY 2017 to ensure this data field is used in a more consistent manner. LMHA does not currently have sufficient data available regarding the baseline employment status of Rent Reform participants to establish benchmarks.

*4. Revised Metrics*

Benchmarks were established.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## A.4 Occupancy Criteria for New Scattered Sites

### ACTIVITY #9-2007: Employment / Education Requirements in New Scattered Site Units

#### 1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #9-2007 was proposed and implemented in FY 2007. The activity originally included a five-year occupancy term limit for affected units, which was eliminated via a significant change to the activity in FY 2016.

#### 2. *Description and Impact*

Many of LMHA's Scattered Sites are highly desirable properties, especially the scattered site, single-family homes acquired or constructed through the Housing Authority's most recent HOPE VI revitalization projects. When these units first began to come online as part of the Liberty Green HOPE VI a decade ago, the Housing Authority was concerned that the amenities and low rent structure might in some instances discourage residents from moving out of the units towards self-sufficiency. Using its MTW flexibility, LMHA began piloting term limits (Activity #9-2007), work requirements (Activity #9-2007), and mandatory case management (Activity #21-2010) for residents at these sites and evaluating the potential of the initiatives to incent residents to move up and out of the Public Housing program.

Jointly, these activities imposed a five-year occupancy term limit; required that adults who were neither elderly nor disabled either work at least 20 hours per week or be enrolled full-time at an accredited post-secondary educational institution; and provided that all families (including elderly and disabled) must participate in a case management program.

These requirements have been successful at moving families toward self-sufficiency. The employment rate for these households is two times the rate across all of the agency's public housing (74% versus 37% report earned income), and average earned income is more than 2.5 times as high (\$17,660 for affected households versus \$6,834 across all public housing).<sup>2</sup> Average monthly rent payments are also higher (\$325 versus \$165), reducing the agency's per unit subsidy costs for participating households.

However, LMHA has continuously struggled to maintain a high level of occupancy at these units, with three-bedroom units especially hard to fill, leading the Housing Authority to create an admissions preference for qualified, three-bedroom-eligible families in 2014. Unfortunately, the new preference did not lead to a substantial improvement in occupancy levels, and by 2015, staff were considering additional measures to improve occupancy.

As employment levels for these families had been consistently high (with more than 60% reporting earnings each year), LMHA staff did not believe that the employment / educational requirements were the determining factor dissuading families from occupying these units. Instead, staff reached a consensus decision that term limits and mandatory case management requirements were the primary causes, and the agency lifted these requirements during FY 2016.

---

<sup>2</sup> Employment and earned income statistics exclude both elderly and disabled families.

For additional information regarding the close-out of Activity #21-2010 (mandatory case management), see Section IV.D, “Closed Out MTW Activities.”

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for Activity #9-2007. All of the self-sufficiency metrics for this activity exclude elderly and disabled families, who are exempt from the education / work requirements. While 143 households lived in single family, scattered site units at fiscal-year-end, the self-sufficiency outcomes below only include the 106 non-elderly / non-disabled families subject to the employment / education requirement.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</i></b>        |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2006:</b> Not tracked.   | \$17,660   | \$17,660   | Yes   |
|   | Average gross annual earned income of HHs living in affected units before implementation           | Expected average gross annual earned income of HHs living in affected units as FYE                       | Actual average gross annual earned income of HHs living in affected units as of FYE                    | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC   |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #2: Increase in Household (HH) Savings</i></b>                  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average amount of savings/escrow of HHs affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Average savings/escrow amount of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). This # may be zero. | Expected average savings/escrow amount of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual average savings/escrow amount of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked.   | \$3,031  | \$3,031  | Yes   |
|  | Average escrow amount of HHs living in affected units prior to implementation  | Expected average escrow amount of HHs living in affected units as of FYE   | Actual average escrow amount of HHs living in affected units as of FYE   | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance   |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>  |                             |                              |                            |                            |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> |                             |                              |                            |                            |
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Benchmark<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>Outcome<sup>3</sup></b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |



| Report the following information separately for each category: | Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.            |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| (1) Employed Full-Time   | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> 78% (61 of 78 HHs)   | 45% (49 of 109 HHs)  | At least 14 of 106 HHs   | Insufficient data to determine whether benchmark was achieved. |
| (2) Employed Part-Time   |  | 18% (20 of 109 HHs)  | At least 6 of 106 HHs  |  |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program                         | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked  | 8% (9 of 109 HHs)  | At least 2 of 106 HHs  |  |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program                           | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked  | 2% (2 of 109 HHs)  | At least 1 of 106 HHs  |  |
| (5) Unemployed   | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> 22% (17 of approx. 78 HHs) <sup>4</sup>  | 37% (40 of 109 HHs)  | 26% (28 of 106 HHs)  | Yes  |
| (6) Other  | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  |
|  | % of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (%).               | Expected % of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (%).                  | Actual % of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (%).                  | Explanation to be provided.                                    |

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available. Although LMHA did not track part-time vs. full-time employment in FY 2010, the agency did track income from earnings. That year 61 (78%) of approximately 78 non-elderly / non-disabled heads of household had income from earnings.

<sup>2</sup> Benchmarks based on FY 2015 outcomes.

<sup>3</sup> Currently, LMHA only tracks categories 1-4 above for households enrolled in case management or in the FSS Program. While full-time vs. part-time employment is not tracked for all households, LMHA did track income from earnings. During FY 2016, seventy-eight (74%) of 106 non-elderly / non-disabled heads of household had income from earnings, while 28 (26%) reported no income from earnings.

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households (HHs) Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b> |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline <sup>1</sup>   | Benchmark  | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| # of HHs receiving TANF assistance (decrease).   | HHs receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (#).   | Expected # of HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked                                 | 2% (2 of 106 HHs)  | 2% (2 of 106 HHs)   | Yes   |
|  | # of HHs in affected units receiving TANF prior to implementation | Expected # of HHs in affected units receiving TANF as of FYE               | Actual # of HHs in affected units receiving TANF as of FYE          | Explanation to be provided                          |

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</b> |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline <sup>1</sup>  | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                      |
| # of HHs receiving services aimed  | HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the | Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after | Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the |

|   |  |   |   |                            |
|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| to increase self sufficiency (increase) | activity (#).  | implementation of the activity (#).   | after implementation of the activity (number).                                  | benchmark.                 |
|   | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> 36 of 100 HHs (36%)  | 3 of 100 HHs (3%) <sup>2</sup>  | 20 of 106 HHs (19%)   | Yes                        |
|   | # of HHs in affected units receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of activity | Expected # of HHs in affected units receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE | Actual # of HHs in affected units receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE | Explanation to be provided |

Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance; Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<sup>2</sup> Due to the removal of the case management requirement, participation in self-sufficiency services is expected to decrease gradually before levelling off to a rate that approximates LMHA's overall public housing population.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)</i></b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline <sup>1</sup>  | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Average amount of Section 8 &/or 9 subsidies per HH affected by this policy in dollars (decrease)     | Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked  | \$1,078  | \$1,078  | Yes   |
|   | Average monthly subsidy per affected HH prior to implementation of activity                  | Expected monthly subsidy per affected HH as of FYE   | Actual monthly subsidy affected HH as of FYE   | Explanation to be provided                          |

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; PHA financial records

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i></b> |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline <sup>1</sup>   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).                            | PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (\$).      | Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (\$). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked                                     | \$413,532 (Average of \$3,901 per HH per year)                         | \$413,532 (Average of \$3,901 per HH per year)                       | Yes   |
|  | Gross annual rental revenue from affected HHs prior to implementation | Gross annual rental revenue from affected HHs as of FYE                | Gross annual rental revenue from affected HHs as of FYE              | Explanation to be provided                          |

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households (HHs) Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i></b>   |                       |           |         |                     |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| <i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."<sup>1</sup></i> |                       |           |         |                     |
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline <sup>1</sup> | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| # of HHs 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" # should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked  | 55 of 106 HHs (52%)  | 55 of 106 HHs (52%)  | Yes   |
|  | # of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation  | Expected # of affected HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY  | Actual # of affected HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY  | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys   |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> "Employment" means the household is receiving earned income. "Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

<sup>2</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

| <b><i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i></b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                  | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| 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. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> Not tracked  | 1 month  | 1 month  | Yes   |
|   | 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). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys                                    |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

#### *2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

### *3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

#### *Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status*

Although LMHA does not currently track full-time vs. part-time employment for households that are not in case management or in the FSS Program, the agency does track income from earnings. Since the benchmarks for this metric call for 63% of non-elderly/non-disabled households to be employed (either full- or part-time) and 74% of non-elderly/non-disabled households reported earnings in FY 2016, LMHA considers this activity to be successful at increasing positive outcomes in employment status.

#### *4. Revised Metrics*

The only metric that previously had a benchmark established is Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency. All other benchmarks are new.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## A.5 Public Housing Development

LMHA's goal is to transform the physical stock of the original family developments owned and managed by the agency in the coming years, replacing the current public housing developments with mixed income communities, while at the same time providing replacement units so that the overall number of families served will not decrease. LMHA has implemented the following MTW initiatives designed to expedite the redevelopment process and ensure that all new and newly acquired properties are energy-efficient and cost effective.

### ACTIVITY #18-2009: Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #18-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity simplifies the public housing development submittal process for each acquired or developed public housing property. Twice yearly, LMHA also submits a six month report summarizing the Agency's acquisition and development activities to the HUD Louisville Field Office. The activity has reduced the amount of time staff spends preparing development submittals and reduced the average length of time to close on a property.

Although LMHA did not use the regulatory flexibility provided through this MTW activity during FY 2016, between FY 2009 and FY 2013 the initiative reduced the amount of staff time required to prepare a proposal significantly from 25 hours to 7.5 hours. The length of time required to close on a property was also reduced from an average of 8-10 weeks to approximately 6 weeks.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</b> |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                        | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).         | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).  | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> \$12,249 (9 submittals * 25 hrs * \$54.44/hr)                                       | \$930 (2 submittals * 7.5 hrs * \$62.00/hr)   | \$0 (0 submittals * 0 hrs)  | No  |
|   | Total annual cost to prepare development submittals prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected total annual cost to prepare development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual total annual cost to prepare development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records |   |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available. Staff hourly rate for FY 2008 is not available. FY 2009 hourly rate of \$54.44 (including benefits) was used instead.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</b> |                             |                  |                |                            |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                       | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Benchmark</b> | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).               | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).                 | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).                 | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> 225 hrs (9 submittals * 25 hrs)  | 15 hrs (2 submittals * 7.5 hrs)  | 0 hrs (0 submittals * 0 hrs)   | No  |
|  | Total annual staff time spent preparing development submittals prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected total annual staff time spent preparing development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual total annual staff time spent preparing development submittals after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records          |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

| <b><i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i></b>   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline <sup>1</sup>   | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| # of new housing units made available for HHs at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of HH, give that type in this box. | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).         | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).         | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of 2008:</b> Not tracked  | 10  | 0   | No  |
|   | Public housing units acquired/developed prior to implementation of the activity             | Expected public housing units acquired/developed after implementation of the activity | Actual public housing units acquired/developed after implementation of the activity | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs   |   |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

#### *2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

#### *3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

Due to the small number of transactions, LMHA chose to use the traditional public housing development submittal process during FY 2016. The Housing Authority may use the flexibilities provided through this activity again in future should the volume of annual acquisitions increase.

#### *4. Revised Metrics*

No benchmarks had previously been established for this activity.

#### *5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

### **ACTIVITY #26-2011: Public Housing – Acquisition of Mixed Income Sites**

#### *1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #26-2011 was proposed and implemented in FY 2011.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity authorizes LMHA to acquire units for public housing or vacant land for developing public housing without prior HUD authorization if HUD does not respond to LMHA's request for authorization within 10 days of the submittal date. All acquired properties must meet HUD's site selection requirements, and LMHA will request approval of the HUD Field Office when a pending acquisition deviates from the selection requirements and/or at the discretion of the Executive Director. Copies of all required forms and appraisals will be maintained in the project file.

Although this activity was proposed and implemented in FY 2011, it has not yet been used to acquire property at mixed-income sites. This regulatory flexibility would be used in the event that HUD has not responded to LMHA's request for authorization within 10 days of the submittal date.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></i> |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                     | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).              | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).              | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).              | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2010:</b> N/A   | N/A   | N/A   | N/A   |
|   | Total annual cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected total annual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual total annual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records             |   |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff, as an acquisition package is still prepared and submitted to HUD.

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>           |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline <sup>1</sup>  | 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. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> N/A  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A   |
|  | Total annual staff time spent on task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).            | Expected total annual staff time spent on task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).          | Actual total annual staff time spent on task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).          | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records          |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the amount of staff time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff, as an acquisition package is still prepared and submitted to HUD.

| <i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i> |          |           |         |                     |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Number (#) of new housing units made available for HHs at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of HH, give that type in this box. | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).         | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#).         | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of 2008: 0</b>  | 0 <sup>1</sup>  | 0   | Yes   |
|  | Public housing units acquired/developed prior to implementation of the activity             | Expected public housing units acquired/developed after implementation of the activity | Actual public housing units acquired/developed after implementation of the activity | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs  |   |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> LMHA anticipates this activity will be invoked only rarely. In most years, we anticipate this flexibility will not be used at all.

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No metrics had been established for this activity previously.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

No metrics had been established for this activity previously, so all data collection methods listed are new.



## A.6 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities

### ACTIVITY #3-2006: Amount and Distribution of HCV Homeownership Assistance

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #3-2006 was proposed and implemented in FY 2006.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity allows LMHA to offer a two-bedroom payment standard for all one-bedroom-eligible HCV Homeownership households. It does not otherwise affect the calculation of the payment standard.

During FY 2016, fifteen HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home. The average home sales price was \$103,727, with an average mortgage interest rate of 2.94%. Eight of the buyers were elderly and/or disabled. Six of the buyers together received a total of \$79,300 in HOME down payment assistance through Louisville Metro Government.

This activity permitted five one-bedroom-eligible families to purchase a unit using the two-bedroom payment standard. None of the five purchased a home in an exception payment standard area.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></i> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                     | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | As of FY 2005: N/A   | N/A  | N/A  | N/A   |
|   | 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). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): N/A   |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></i> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).   | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (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. |
|  | As of FY 2005: N/A   | N/A  | N/A  | N/A   |
|  | 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                      | Explanation to be provided                          |

|                     |  |  |                      |  |
|---------------------|--|--|----------------------|--|
|                     |  |  | activity (in hours). |  |
| Data Source(s): N/A |  |  |                      |  |

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

| <b><i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i></b>   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| # of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2005: 0</b>   | 2   | 5   | Yes   |
|  | 1-BR HHs able to purchase a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.                                   | Expected 1-BR HHs able to purchase a home after implementation of the activity (#).                                   | Actual 1-BR HHs able to purchase a home after implementation of the activity (#).   | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs   |   |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> Benchmark based on FY 2015 outcome.

| <b><i>Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</i></b>            |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark<sup>1</sup></b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| # of households (HHs) that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase). | # of HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.      | Expected # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).      | Actual # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#).      | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2005: 0</b>  | 2  | 5  | Yes   |
|   | # of 1-BR HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected # of 1-BR HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual # of 1-BR HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs  |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> Benchmark based on FY 2015 outcome.

#### *2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

#### *3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

#### *4. Revised Metrics*

No benchmarks had previously been established for this activity.

#### *5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## ACTIVITY #13-2009: Exception Payment Standards for HCV Homeownership

### 1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #13-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009. The number of homeownership-specific exception payment standard areas was increased via a significant change to this activity in FY 2016.

### 2. Description and Impact

In April 2016, LMHA expanded the number of homeownership-specific payment standard areas; payment standards are now set to 120% of FMR in those census tracts where, according to the most recently available 5-year American Community Survey estimates, *Owner Occupied Median Value* for the census tract is greater than 80% of the *Owner Occupied Median Value* for the Louisville Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Before this significant change, the *Owner Occupied Median Value* for the census tract had to be greater than 100% of the same value for the MSA as a whole.

Since FY 2009, this activity has allowed a total of 13 families to buy homes in areas of opportunity. Two HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home in an exception payment standard area during FY 2016. One home was in a newly-added exception area.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                    | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                     | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> N/A  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A   |
|   | 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). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): N/A   |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></b> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).   | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> N/A  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A   |
|  | 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). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): N/A  |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

| <b>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| # of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2008: 0</b>   | 2   | 2   | Yes   |
|  | HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit &/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys   |   |   |   |   |

| <b>Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</b>                   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| # of households (HHs) that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase). | # of HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2008: 0</b>   | 2   | 2   | Yes   |
|   | # of HHs that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual # of HHs that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (#). | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs  |   |   |   |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## ACTIVITY #11-2009: Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications for HCV Homeownership

### 1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #11-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

### 2. Description and Impact

Under this activity, income verification for HCV Homeownership program applicants remains valid for eight months.

Once approved for the HCV Homeownership Program, families have eight months to execute and close on a proposed sales agreement. Since the income verification completed during the program application process is now valid for eight months, staff no longer has to re-verify income for families who take more than 60 days to close on a sale. Thus, the cost of this task (re-verifying income after 60 days) has dropped from \$179 pre-implementation (FY 2008) to \$0.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>           |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                   | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$)               | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$)             | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$)             | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark |
|   | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> \$179 (12 verifications * 0.5 hrs * \$29.78/hour) | \$0   | \$0   | Yes  |
|   | Cost to re-verify income prior to implementation of the activity (\$)   | Expected cost to re-verify income after implementation of the activity (\$) | Actual cost to re-verify income after implementation of the activity (\$) | Explanation to be provided                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs; PHA financial records |   |   |   |  |

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>           |   |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (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 |
|  | <b>As of FY 2008:</b> 6 hrs (12 verifications * 0.5 hrs)  | 0 hrs   | 0 hrs   | Yes  |
|  | Staff time spent re-verifying income prior to implementation of the activity (\$)                   | Expected staff time spent re-verifying income after implementation of the activity (\$)                   | Actual staff time spent re-verifying income after implementation of the activity (\$)                   | Explanation to be provided                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs                       |   |   |   |  |

| <i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i> |          |           |         |                     |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved? |

| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease) | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%). | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|--|---|---|---|---|
|  | As of FY 2008: Not tracked  | N/A (Task no longer conducted)  | N/A (Task no longer conducted)  | N/A   |
|  | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (%). | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (%). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs.  |   |   |   |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All outcomes meet benchmark.

*4. Revised Metrics*

N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## A.7 Local Leased Housing Program

### **Activity #44-2015: Special Referral MTW HCV Programs**

MTW allows LMHA to maximize the potential of locally available resources to develop programs for people with specific needs. The goal is to meet needs not met by other agencies and to partner with local organizations that have social services programs that need a housing support element. Some of these needs are transitional; others are for programs that provide more long-term support.

Special referral programs are intended to address the needs of traditionally underserved populations in the community, and provide the voucher as incentive for families to move toward economic self-sufficiency. The programs provide housing subsidy to up to 514 families through partnerships with a number of supportive services agencies. Families with specific needs often face multiple barriers to achieving their self-sufficiency goals. LMHA's special referral MTW HCV programs provide a strong incentive for participation as eligible applicants receive an admissions preference for the agency's HCV program, which has a current waitlist of approximately 17,500 applicants. These programs also increase housing choices for low-income families.

Per HUD's request, LMHA has combined the reporting for these activities under a single, umbrella activity (#44-2015).

#### *1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

The following "sub-activities" are reported under umbrella activity #44-2015, "Special Referral MTW HCV Programs," which was proposed and implemented in FY 2015:

- 1) Activity #1-2005 (The Villager / Center for Women and Families) was proposed and implemented in FY 2005.
- 2) Activity #7-2008 (Day Spring) was proposed in FY 2008 and implemented in FY 2012.
- 3) Activity #15-2009 (Louisville / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.
- 4) Activity #20-2010 (Downtown / Family Scholar House with Spalding University) was proposed in FY 2010 and implemented in FY 2011.
- 5) Activity #30-2012 (100,000 Homes Initiative) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 6) Activity #31-2012 (Stoddard Johnston / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 7) Activity #34-2012 (Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 8) Activity #35-2012 (Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 9) Activity #36-2013 (Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 10) Activity #38-2013 (Parkland / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2013.
- 11) Activity #42-2015 (Centerstone (formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.)) was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.
- 12) Activity #45-2016 (Coalition for the Homeless "Move Up" Program) was proposed and implemented in FY 2016.

#### *2. Description and Impact*

Activity #1-2005: The Villager - Center for Women and Families

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 22 households for a special referral program with the Center for Women and Families for their long-term transitional housing on their downtown campus. Programs at the Center focus on the elimination of domestic violence, sexual violence and economic hardship.

Activity #7-2008: Day Spring

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to four households with members who have a severe mental illness and who live in a Day Spring constructed unit while they participate in the program. Day Spring, a faith-based charitable organization, provides residential and supportive services to adults with developmental disabilities who want the opportunity to live independently in a supportive community setting. Under the initiative, not all of the residential units may be subject to typical HUD Housing Quality Standards and rent reasonableness requirements.

Activity #15-2009: Louisville Scholar House / Family Scholar House (formerly Project Women)

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 56 families for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Louisville Scholar House facility. Participants are solo heads of households, who often face multiple barriers to furthering their education and obtaining employment that will provide their families with adequate income to become self-sufficient.

Activity #20-2010: Downtown Scholar House - Family Scholar House with Spalding University

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 43 households for a special referral program with Family Scholar House and Spalding University at the Downtown Scholar House.

Activity #30-2012: 100,000 Homes Initiative

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 50 vouchers for a Special Referral HCV program with the 100,000 Homes initiative of the Louisville Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Community Consortium. Participants in this Housing First model program, who are identified and referred by the Louisville SAMHSA, must be chronically homeless.

Activity #31-2012: Stoddard Johnston Scholar House - Family Scholar House

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 57 vouchers for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Stoddard Johnston Scholar House location.

Activity #34-2012: Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to five households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Youngland Avenue facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #35-2012: Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs

LMHA may, without prior HUD approval, allocate (provide a limited admission preference for) up to 10 MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to a Special Referral HCV program for service-enriched affordable housing programs within the agency's jurisdiction. To be eligible, programs must offer housing and supportive services targeted to families whose needs are not adequately served elsewhere in the community. Some allocations are incremental additions to existing special referral programs while others are allocations to newly established programs.



- In 2012, LMHA allocated up to 10 vouchers to Coalition for the Homeless for homeless families with children.
- In 2013, the Agency allocated up to an additional 10 vouchers to the same referral program, as well as up to 10 vouchers to Family Scholar House participants who may choose to live at York Towers. No York Towers vouchers have been issued to date, and LMHA does not anticipate that any will be issued in the future. The York Towers vouchers have been removed from the special referral summary table included at the end of the reporting for activity #44-2015.
- In FY 2014, up to 10 vouchers were allocated to a program operated by Choices, Inc., which serves solo parent families that are both homeless and disabled.
- In FY 2016, the Housing Authority allocated vouchers to three partners:
  - Up to 10 vouchers to the Kentucky Housing Corporation for families that include either: 1) a household member with a serious mental illness who is exiting a licensed personal care home or state psychiatric hospital or is at risk of institutionalization, or 2) a household member who is exiting a nursing home or intermediate care facility for individuals with intellectual or other development disabilities;
  - Up to 10 vouchers to Wellspring for families that include a household member with a severe mental illness who is exiting Wellspring's Ardery House facility for permanent housing; and
  - Up to 10 vouchers to ChooseWell Communities' Thrive Program to assist families that include a pregnant or post-partum mother who has successfully completed residential and/or intensive outpatient treatment for addiction.

Activity #36-2013: Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility

This activity established a special referral program and limited admission preference to provide housing assistance to up to five households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Youngland Avenue facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #38-2013: Parkland Scholar House - Family Scholar House

Under this activity, LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 53 vouchers, including five vouchers for participants who reside off-campus, for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Parkland Scholar House Facility. Vouchers become portable upon graduation.

Activity #42-2015: Centerstone (formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.)

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 50 vouchers for a special referral program with Centerstone for households that include a member with a severe mental illness who is currently institutionalized at a personal care home or at risk of being institutionalized because of a lack of adequate community support.

Activity #45-2016: Coalition for the Homeless' "Move Up" Program

LMHA provides a limited admission preference for up to 100 households who are referred by the Coalition for the Homeless through the “Move Up” program. This preference allows chronically homeless families who no longer need intensive case management services to transition from temporary homeless services vouchers to permanent HCV vouchers.

LMHA tracks the following, combined HUD Standard Metrics for these activities. All Self-Sufficiency metrics for this activity exclude elderly and disabled families. While 339 households participated in a Special Referral Program at fiscal-year-end, the Self-Sufficiency outcomes below only include the 279 families that were neither elderly nor disabled. Cost Effectiveness and Housing Choice metrics include all 339 participating households.

| <i><b>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings<sup>1</sup></b></i> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                            | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | Yes   |
|  | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (\$). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records                    |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> Implementation of this activity does not modify any LMHA-completed tasks. Housing Authority staff determines applicant eligibility and performs all certifications.

| <i><b>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></b></i> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).          | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours). | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | 0 hr   | 0 hr   | 0 hr   | Yes   |
|   | 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). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records                   |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> Implementation of this activity does not modify any LMHA-completed tasks. Housing Authority staff determines applicant eligibility and performs all certifications.

| <i><b>Cost Effectiveness #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged<sup>1</sup></b></i> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase)                                  | Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (\$). This # may be zero. | Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | Yes   |
|  | Amount leveraged prior   | Expected amount  | Actual amount  | Explanation to                                      |

|  |   |  |  |             |
|--|---|--|--|-------------|
|  | to implementation of the activity (\$). This # may be zero. | leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$). | leveraged after implementation of the activity (\$). | be provided |
| Data Source(s): Special referral program partner records |   |  |  |             |

<sup>1</sup> Neither the level of LMHA housing subsidy nor task cost is affected by implementation of this activity.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</i></b>                               |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).           | Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$).           | Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).           | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>FY 2016:</b> \$4,108  | \$4,108   | \$4,108   | Yes   |
|  | Average earned income of work-able HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected average earned income of work-able HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual average earned income of work-able HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys   |  |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which this data is available.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>   |
| Report the following information separately for each category:   | Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero.       | Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.                      |
| (1) Employed Full-Time <sup>2</sup>  | <b>As of FY 2016:</b> 90 (32% of 279 HHs)  | Insufficient data to establish individual benchmarks for Categories 1-4.               | 90 (32% of 279 HHs)  | Insufficient data to establish individual benchmarks for Categories 1-4. |
| (2) Employed Part-Time <sup>2</sup>  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program   |  |  | Tracking mechanism to be determined  |  |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program   | Not tracked  |  |  |  |
| (5) Unemployed   | <b>As of FY 2016:</b> 189 (68% of 279 HHs)   | 189 (68% of 279 HHs)   | 189 (68% of 279 HHs)   | Yes  |
| (6) Other  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  |
|  | # of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected # of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).                  | Actual # of total work-able HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE (#).                  | Explanation to be provided.  |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys   |  |  |  |  |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<sup>2</sup> Although LMHA did not track part-time vs. full-time employment in FY 2016, the agency did track income from earnings. At FYE, 90 (32%) of 279 non-elderly / non-disabled households had income from earnings, while 189 (68%) reported no income from earnings.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households (HHs) Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i></b> |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>                                     | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| # of HHs receiving TANF assistance (decrease).  | HHs receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (#). | Expected # of HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual HHs receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>FY 2016:</b> 54 (19% of 279 HHs)                             | 54 (19% of 279 HHs)  | 54 (19% of 279 HHs)   | Yes   |
|   | # of work-able HHs receiving TANF prior to implementation       | Expected # of work-able HHs receiving TANF as of FYE                       | Actual # of work-able HHs receiving TANF as of FYE                  | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys  |   |  |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i></b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| # of HHs receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).  | HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#)        | Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#) | Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#) | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2016:</b> 13 (5% of 279 HHs)   | 13 (5% of 279 HHs)   | 13 (5% of 279 HHs)   | Yes   |
|   | # of work-able HHs receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of activity | Expected # of work-able HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE                      | Actual # of work-able HHs receiving self-sufficiency services as of FYE                      | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Special referral program partners   |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available. LMHA tracks FSS participation for this metric. The special referral partner may offer additional self-sufficiency services.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)</i></b> |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average amount of Section 8 &/or 9 subsidies per HH affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).    | Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (\$) | Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$) | Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (\$) | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2016:</b> \$617   | \$617  | \$617  | Yes   |
|   | Average monthly Section 8 subsidy per work-able HH prior to implementation of activity      | Expected Section 8 subsidy per work-able HH as of FYE  | Actual Section 8 subsidy per work-able HH as of FYE  | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.  |   |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                    | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).                     | PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.               |  |  |   |
|   | Gross annual rent revenue from work-able HHs prior to implementation     | Expected gross annual rent revenue from work-able HHs during FY                | Actual gross annual rent revenue from work-able HHs during FY                | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.              |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>  |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as “the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment.”<sup>1</sup></i>   |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline<sup>2</sup></b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).<br>The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero. | Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number). | Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2016:</b> 32 (11% of 279 HHs)   | 32 (11% of 279 HHs)  | 32 (11% of 279 HHs)  | Yes   |
|  | # of work-able HHs transitioned to self sufficiency annually prior to implementation  | Anticipated # of work-able HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY  | Actual # of work-able HHs transitioned to self sufficiency during FY   | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Various  |   |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> “Employment” means the household is receiving earned income. “Suitable” is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage of \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

<sup>2</sup> FY 2016 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</b>      |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                | <b>Baseline<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| 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. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2016:</b> <1 month   | <1 month   | <1 month   | Yes   |
|   | 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). | Explanation to be provided                          |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No baselines or benchmarks had previously been established for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

A table summarizing LMHA's Special Referral Programs follows:

**LMHA Special Referral MTW Voucher Programs  
Fiscal Year 2016**

| <b>Organization</b>                                  | <b>Site</b>                  | <b>Voucher Allocation</b> | <b>FY Proposed<br/>(FY Activity<br/>Approved, if<br/>different)</b> | <b>FY First<br/>Voucher<br/>Issued</b> | <b>Portable?</b>                          | <b>MTW Inspections?</b>  |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| 100K Homes Initiative                                | N/A                          | 50                        | 2012  | 2012                                   | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
| Center for Women and Families                        | Villager                     | 22                        | 2005  | 2005                                   | Full portability upon program completion. | Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently. |
| Choices, Inc.  | Choices owned units          | 5                         | 2014  | 2014                                   | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
| ChooseWell Communities                               | N/A                          | 10                        | 2016  | 2016                                   | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
| Coalition for the Homeless                           | N/A (Rapid Re-housing)       | 20                        | 2012  | 2013                                   | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
|  | N/A (Move Up)                | 100                       | 2016  | 2016                                   |   |  |
| Day Spring   | Day Spring constructed units | 4                         | 2009  | 2009, 2012*                            | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
| Family Scholar House                                 | Louisville                   | 56                        | 2008  | 2008                                   | Full portability upon program completion. | Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently. |
|  | Downtown                     | 54                        | 2010  | 2011                                   |   |  |
|  | Stoddard Johnston            | 57                        | 2012  | 2012                                   |   |  |
|  | Parkland + 5 off-site        | 53                        | 2012 Amended  | 2012                                   |   |  |
| Kentucky Housing Corporation                         | N/A                          | 10                        | 2016  | 2016                                   | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
| Centerstone (formerly Seven Counties Services, Inc.) | N/A                          | 50                        | 2015  | 2015                                   | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
| Wellspring   | Youngland Avenue             | 5                         | 2012  | 2012                                   | Full portability.                         | No: Traditional inspection protocol.   |
|  | Bashford Manor/Newburg       | 8                         | 2012  | 2013                                   |   |  |
|  | Ardery House                 | 10                        | 2016  | 2016                                   |   |  |

\*Referral program suspended during FY2010 and FY2011.

## ACTIVITY #2-1999: MTW Unit Inspection Protocol

### 1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #2-1999 was proposed and implemented in FY 1999.

### 2. Description and Impact

Many of LMHA's partners' residential facilities are newly constructed or renovated. As such, LMHA has used MTW authority to allow the certificate of occupancy to suffice for the initial move-in inspection in lieu of a traditional HQS inspection. This substitution has saved the Housing Authority thousands of dollars since Louisville Scholar House first came online in 2008, although this particular flexibility was not utilized during FY 2016.

Unit inspections of facilities that participate in HUD's Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program and that are managed by organizations with which the Agency has had a long-term and outstanding relationship, are waived upon initial occupancy, and the agency has the authority to conduct inspections once per year concurrently. These properties include the Chestnut Street YMCA SRO; St. Vincent de Paul SRO; and Willow Place. This activity has significantly reduced costs to inspect the units "tied" to these programs. In FY 2016, LMHA used this activity to complete concurrent inspections at both the YMCA and at St. Vincent de Paul.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>                            |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).                    | Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).               | Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).               | Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).               | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | As of FY 1998: Not available   | \$976 (41 units * \$23.80) <sup>1</sup>  | \$1,626 (65 units * \$25.01)   | Yes   |
|  | Cost of inspecting Mod Rehab units prior to implementation of the activity (\$). | Expected cost of inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the activity (\$). | Actual cost of inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the activity (\$). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records. |  |  |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> Original benchmark only included 41 YMCA units.

| <i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>                           |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (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. |
|  | As of FY 1998: Not available   | 23.9 hours (41 units * 0.6 hours) <sup>1</sup>   | 39.0 hours (65 units * 0.6 hours)  | Yes   |
|  | Staff time spent inspecting Mod Rehab units prior to implementation of the                           | Expected staff time spent inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the                           | Actual staff time spent inspecting Mod Rehab units after implementation of the                           | Explanation to be provided                          |



|  |                |                |                |  |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
|  | activity (\$). | activity (\$). | activity (\$). |  |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records. |                |                |                |  |

<sup>1</sup> Original benchmark only included 41 YMCA units.

| <b>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b> |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).    | Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage). | Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | As of FY 1998: Not available   | 0%   | 0%   | Yes   |
|  | 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). | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Staff logs.  |  |  |  |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All outcomes meet benchmark.

*4. Revised Metrics*

N/A. LMHA has not revised the metrics for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## **ACTIVITY #27-2011: Amend HCV Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility**

*1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #27-2011 was proposed and implemented in FY 2011.

*2. Description and Impact*

LMHA amended its HCV program admissions policy to allow for the deduction of verified ongoing child-care expenses from a working household's gross income when determining income eligibility. In order to qualify for the adjustment, the family must include a head of household and/or spouse with a demonstrated work history for a period of 12 months or longer.

The pool of potential families eligible for the child-care deduction is very small. No families received the deduction during FY 2016. However, because of the potential benefit to working families, the agency believes the activity merits continuation.

| <b>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households (HHs)</b> |                 |                  |                |                            |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b> | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |

| Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per HH affected by this policy in dollars (decrease). | Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average subsidy per HH affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|---|--|--|--|---|
|   | As of FY 2010: N/A (No HHs affected by policy)   | \$542  | N/A (No HHs affected during FY)  | N/A   |
|   | Average subsidy per HH affected by this policy prior to implementation (\$)                          | Expected average subsidy per HH affected by this policy as of FYE after implementation (\$)                | Actual average subsidy per HH affected by this policy as of FYE after implementation (\$)                | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records   |  |  |  |   |

| <b>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement                             | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase).           | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).                     | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).                                 | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).                                 | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.                               |  |  |   |
|   | Sum of annual rent revenue from HHs who received the deduction to determine eligibility. | Expected sum of annual rent revenue from HHs who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of FYE | Actual sum of annual rent revenue from HHs who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of FYE | Explanation to be provided.                         |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records |  |  |  |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No benchmarks had previously been established for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## **ACTIVITY #39-2014: HCV Program Rent Increase Limit**

*1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

*2. Description and Impact*

This activity places a 2% cap on annual contract rent increases for units where the tenant is already receiving HCV rental assistance. At contract renewal, LMHA will limit the landlord's requested rent to whichever is least: 102% of the previous contract rent for the same tenant; to the maximum permitted by the payment standard; or to the rent as determined through a rent reasonableness analysis.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</b>                       |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| 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 after implementation of the activity (in dollars).           | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | <b>As of FY 2014:</b> \$526 <sup>1</sup>   | \$542   | \$542   | Yes   |
|  | Average subsidy per MTW HCV HH prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) prior to implementation. | Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of FYE. | Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of FYE. | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records  |  |   |   |   |

<sup>1</sup> FY 2014 is the earliest year for which data is available.

| <b>SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b> |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                      | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase).           | Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).       | Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).       | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | N/A. LMHA realizes no rental revenue from the HCV Program.           |  |  |   |
|   | Sum of annual rental revenue from HHs affected by this policy        | Expected sum of annual rental revenue from HHs affected by this policy during FY | Actual sum of annual rental revenue from HHs affected by this policy during FY | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records |  |  |  |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No baselines or benchmarks had previously been established for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

## A.8 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

### ACTIVITY #37-2014: Accessible Units Sublease Agreement with Frazier Rehab Institute

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity allows LMHA to sublease two fully accessible units at the Liberty Green Community Center as temporary housing for low-income families that include a member who is a Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) out-patient at Frazier Rehab Institute. The units are transitional housing provided for up to six months per family. The Community Center is ideally located one-half mile from the Frazier Rehab Institute. Frazier Rehab leases the apartments from LMHA and pays the cost of all utilities. Frazier Rehab's rent is set at \$210 per month (or roughly 30% of monthly SSI for one person), and Frazier Rehab has agreed to pass on no more than 100% of the rent plus utilities to the tenant (the sub lessee). Frazier Rehab uses a modified version of LMHA's public housing lease as its tenant sublease and has established a hardship policy to define circumstances under which households may be exempted or temporarily waived from the rent Frazier Rehab may charge to the sub lessee. Examples could include involuntary loss of income or unexpected medical expenses. Frazier Rehab also refers sub lessees to area service providers, including the Center for Accessible Living (Kentucky's first Independent Living Center), who can assist households as they prepare to move-out.

Often, the only housing option for SCI patients is a room at one of the extended stay hotels located at the edge of the city. A room can cost the patient and their family hundreds of dollars per week in addition to any travel costs they may have incurred coming to Louisville for treatment. For low-income families needing treatment, securing and paying for housing can be a great burden. Through this unique partnership, LMHA increases housing options for these families. In addition, the activity achieves greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures. LMHA had been experiencing difficulty leasing the two fully-accessible apartments to applicants on the public housing waitlist; consequently the units had been vacant. Under this activity, Frazier Rehab subleases the units to out-patients of the program and pays LMHA \$210 per month for each unit, increasing the number of families served and rental revenue for the agency.

In FY 2016, LMHA served three households through this activity.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings<sup>1</sup></i>               |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (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. |
|  | As of FY 2013: 0 hr (units were vacant)  | 0 hr (0.0 hr * 6 HHs)  | 0 hr (0.0 hr * 3 HHs)  | Yes   |
|  | Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to  | Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task  | Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after  | Explanation to be provided                          |

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | implementation of the activity (in hours). | after implementation of the activity (in hours). | implementation of the activity (in hours). |  |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records |  |  |  |  |

<sup>1</sup> LMHA estimates approximately 3 hours of staff time to perform new applicant “intake” tasks are saved per participant household.

| <b><i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i></b>   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI that include a member with a Spinal Cord Injury (increase). | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2013: 0</b>   | 2   | 2   | Yes   |
|   | Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (#). This #may be zero.  | Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (#). | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): PIC   |   |   |   |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

Baseline for metric CE#2 had previously been reported as “N/A.”

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.

**ACTIVITY #29-2015: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville**

*1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #29-2015 was originally proposed in FY 2011, but not approved by HUD as LMHA lacked Broader Use of Funds authorization at that time. The activity was re-proposed, approved by HUD, and implemented in FY 2015.

*2. Description and Impact*

This activity allows YouthBuild Louisville (YBL) to sublease public housing units to provide temporary housing for low-income YBL participants who are experiencing homelessness. LMHA subleases up to three 2-bedroom apartments for the use of YBL participants (and their families). Units are provided to YBL on an as needed basis.

For unemployed young people who left high school without a diploma, YBL is an opportunity to reclaim their educations, gain the skills they need for employment, and become leaders in their communities. YBL serves low or very-low income youth, ages 16-24, who have dropped out of high school or are basic skills deficient, and, are a foster care recipient or have aged out of care,

and/or a youthful or adult offender, a youth possessing a disability and/or a child of an incarcerated parent or a migrant youth. They are trained in small cohorts of 35 youth each year with one additional year of job placement, higher education assistance, community mentoring, and social service support. Youth receive individual and group education to complete their GED and/or high school diploma and pre-college curriculum, while all gain construction skills through the Homebuilders Institute Pre Apprenticeship Certificate Training (PACT) with additional elective certifications in green construction, weatherization and facilities maintenance, and pre-nursing certification through the American Red Cross and Norton Healthcare.

Participant housing is not a traditional component of the YBL program. For many students, maintaining stable housing is not a struggle; however, some participants are homeless or may become homeless. The sublease agreement between YBL and LMHA ensures that these young people have a place to call home so they are able to make the most of this unique learning opportunity.

For each month a unit is occupied by a YBL program participant, YBL pays LMHA \$60. YBL certifies that students are income eligible upon entry to the YBL program through the application process and follow-up verification through local and state subsidy programs. The participant and their household may continue to live in the unit as long as they are active in the YBL program. Upon graduation, the household may elect to receive preference for a public housing unit.

All participants residing in the subleased public housing units must meet basic Public Housing Program eligibility criteria (no outstanding rent balance with LMHA or other public housing authority, criminal background check, age 18 or older). LMHA staff verifies that the YBL program participant is eligible for this MTW initiative.

In FY 2016, LMHA served one household through this activity.

LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household (HH) Income</i></b>        |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Average earned income of HHs affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Expected average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Actual average earned income of HHs affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY2014:</b> N/A   | \$0  | \$0. Participants do not receive wages. Instead, they receive a stipend of \$100/week                          | N/A   |
|   | Average annual gross earned income prior to implementation   | Expected average annual gross earned income during FY  | Actual average annual gross earned income during FY  | Explanation to be provided                          |

<sup>1</sup> The YouthBuild Louisville participant who lived at Beecher Terrace during FY 2016 graduated from the program during the fiscal year. At the time she graduated from the program, her earned income was \$0. Participants are not required to report their income following graduation. However, the participant does now have earned income as she is employed full-time.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>  |
|--|
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households (HHs) affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> |



| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark <sup>1</sup>   | Outcome <sup>2</sup>   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Report the following information separately for each category: | Head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual head(s) of HHs in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
| (1) Employed Full-Time   | As of FY2014: 0  | 0  | 1  | Yes   |
| (2) Employed Part-Time   | As of FY2014: 0  | 0  | 0  | Yes   |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program                         | As of FY2014: 0  | 1  | 1  | Yes   |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program                           | As of FY2014: 0  | 1  | 1  | Yes   |
| (5) Unemployed   | As of FY2014: 0  | 1  | 0  | Yes   |
| (6) Other  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  | N/A   |
|  | # of HHs in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity                                    | Expected # of HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE                                       | Actual # of total HHs in <<category name>> as of FYE                                 | Explanation to be provided.                         |

<sup>1</sup> Benchmark based on FY 2015 actuals.

<sup>2</sup> The YouthBuild Louisville participant who lived at Beecher Terrace during FY 2016 graduated from the program during the fiscal year, and is now employed full-time. She is still enrolled in education/job training programs, as she is both studying environmental education and pursuing a welding certification.

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households (HHs) Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</b> |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Number (#) of HHs receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).              | HHs receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (#). | Expected # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual # of HHs receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | As of FY 2014: 0   | 1   | 1   | Yes   |
|  | # of HHs receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of activity     | Expected # of HHs receiving self-sufficiency services during FY                                 | Actual # of HHs receiving self-sufficiency services during FY                                 | Explanation to be provided                          |

| <b>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households (HHs) Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <i>Self-Sufficiency is defined as "the ability of a non-disabled / non-elderly family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."</i> <sup>1</sup>  |  |  |  |   |
| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?                                 |
| Number (#) of HHs 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, | HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual HHs transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|  | As of FY 2014: 0   | 0  | 1  | Yes   |

|  |   |  |  |                            |
|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| the "Outcome" # should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | # of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation | Expected # of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY | Actual # of HHs transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY | Explanation to be provided |
|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|

<sup>1</sup> "Employment" means the household is receiving earned income. "Suitable" is defined as annual gross earned income equal to or exceeding \$14,500 (the hourly minimum wage as \$7.25 multiplied by 2,000 hours).

| <b>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                          |
| Number (#) of households (HHs) able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (#). This # may be zero. | Expected HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Actual increase in HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (#). | Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark. |
|   | <b>As of FY 2014: 0</b>   | 1   | 1   | Yes   |
|   | # of HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation.                                    | # of HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity during FY                                     | # of HHs able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity during FY   | Explanation to be provided                          |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB  |   |   |   |   |

*2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

*3. Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All benchmarks were achieved.

*4. Revised Metrics*

No benchmarks had previously been established for this activity.

*5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

N/A. LMHA has not changed its data collection methodology.



## **B. Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities**

For each not yet implemented activity, LMHA has provided:

- 1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved; and
- 2) Discussion of any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.

### **ACTIVITY #28-2011: Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance and Modernization of Public Housing**

*1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #28-2011 was proposed and approved in FY 2011. It has not yet been implemented.

*2. Actions Toward Implementation*

The activity is to explore using MTW authority to create locally defined guidelines for the development (including rehabilitation), maintenance and modernization of public housing. During FY 2016, LMHA continued to research reasonable and modest design guidelines, unit size guidelines and unit amenity guidelines that could be used for new public housing development activities. LMHA is also investigating how to incorporate green maintenance practices in addition to environmentally friendly and energy efficient design standards.

As part of this process, LMHA is examining innovative ways to provide one-for-one replacement of the 758 Beecher Terrace public housing units, including the potential use of locally defined guidelines for the development, maintenance, and modernization of public housing. The agency plans to submit a Transformation Plan for the Russell neighborhood and Beecher Terrace to HUD in January 2017. Any locally defined guidelines resulting from the Choice planning process would be officially proposed to HUD through the Housing Authority's FY 2018 MTW Annual Plan, and implemented during FY 2018.

If LMHA decides not to pursue locally defined guidelines in conjunction with the redevelopment of Beecher Terrace, this activity may be closed out during FY 2018.

## **C. MTW Activities On-Hold**

For each activity on-hold, LMHA has provided:

- 1) Description, including the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved, implemented and placed on-hold; and
- 2) Any actions that were taken toward reactivating the activity.

### **ACTIVITY #25-2010: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities**

#### *1. Description*

Activity #25-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010. The activity was placed on-hold in 2012.

HUD OGC investigated the use of public housing as emergency housing for victims of human trafficking and found that it was not feasible under MTW to permit families who could not produce valid identification to live in public housing communities.

#### *2. Actions Taken Toward Reactivation*

This activity will remain on hold until a resolution, allowing victims of human trafficking to receive much-needed housing assistance, can be reached.

## D. Closed Out MTW Activities

For closed out activity, LMHA has provided:

1. The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented (if applicable) and a description of the activity;
2. The year the activity was closed out; and
3. For activities closed out during FY 2016,
  - i. Discussion of the final outcome and lessons learned
  - ii. Description of any statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity
  - iii. Summary table, listing outcomes from each year of the activity (since the execution of the Standard MTW Agreement); and
  - iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table.

### ACTIVITY #21-2010: Mandatory Case Management in New Scattered Site Units

#### 1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*

Many of LMHA's Scattered Sites are highly desirable properties, especially the single family houses newly acquired or constructed through the agency's recent HOPE VI revitalization efforts. The amenities and existing low rent structure may in some instances discourage residents from moving out of the unit towards self-sufficiency. In FY 2007, LMHA proposed and implemented pilot term limits and work/education requirements. Mandatory case management for residents of these units was proposed and implemented in FY 2010.

Until FY 2016, the following rules applied to these units:

- All adult residents were required to participate in an approved case management program and meet annual self-sufficiency goals as defined in their case management plan. This requirement could be fulfilled by participating in LMHA's Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program or in the Housing Authority's Individual Development Account (IDA) program; and
- The units carried a five-year residency term limit.

In contrast, the following requirement continues to apply to these units:

- All adult family members who are neither elderly nor disabled must either work a minimum of 20 hours per week or be full-time students.

Any family containing an adult who falls/fell out of compliance with either the work/education or case management requirement above for a period of more than 90 calendar days is/was transferred to another public housing unit within the LMHA's public housing stock that does not have these requirements, when a unit of the appropriate size becomes/became available.

Before the residency term limits were lifted in FY 2016, families reaching five-years of occupancy were required to either relinquish their assistance or transfer to a non-scattered-site public housing unit. Families who had made significant progress toward their self-sufficiency goals, but were not quite ready to enter the private housing market, were able to request a temporary extension to the residency time limit. LMHA worked with each family granted an extension to update all outstanding goal dates in their case management plan,

and to determine when the temporary residency extension would expire. LMHA reserved the right to revoke the family's residency extension at any point if the family failed to complete remaining self-sufficiency goals in a manner consistent with the updated case management plan.

Because employment/education requirements, mandatory case management, and five-year term limits were inextricably linked until mandatory case management and term limits were eliminated during FY 2016, over the years LMHA has reported the outcomes for all three interventions using a single set of metrics. Please note that the agency is unable to determine how much each intervention separately influenced the outcomes.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*  
FY 2016

3. *In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:*

i. *Final outcomes and lessons learned*

The three interventions imposed (work/education requirements, mandatory case management, and five-year term limits) have been successful at moving families toward self-sufficiency. At FYE 2016, the employment rate for non-elderly/non-disabled households was two times the rate across all of the agency's public housing (74% versus 37% reported earned income), and average earned income was more than 2.5 times as high (\$17,660 for affected households versus \$6,834 across all public housing). Average monthly rent payments for all families living in these units were also higher (\$325 versus \$165), reducing the agency's per unit subsidy costs for participating households.

However, LMHA continuously struggled to maintain a high level of occupancy at these units, with three-bedroom units especially hard to fill, leading the Housing Authority to create an admissions preference for qualified three-bedroom-eligible families in 2014. Unfortunately, the new preference did not lead to a substantial improvement in occupancy levels, and by 2015, staff was considering additional measures to improve occupancy.

As employment levels for these families had been consistently high (more than 60% have reported earnings each year), LMHA staff did not believe that the employment/education requirement was the determining factor dissuading families from occupying these units. Instead, staff reached a consensus decision that term limits and mandatory case management requirements were the primary causes, and the agency lifted these requirements during FY 2016.

It remains to be seen whether occupancy levels will increase now that case management requirements and the term limit interventions have been discontinued. LMHA will continue to track the effect of the remaining work/education requirement through its ongoing reporting of Activity #9-2007.

ii. *Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit*  
None.

iii. *Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity*

LMHA tracked the following HUD Standard Metrics for Activity #9-2007, the **outcomes** of which are summarized below by fiscal year. Self-sufficiency metrics exclude elderly and disabled families.

| <i><b>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income<sup>1</sup></b></i> |                |                |                |                |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>  | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b> | <b>FY 2015</b> | <b>FY 2016</b> |
| Not tracked   | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | \$16,959       | \$16,959       | \$17,660       |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC   |                |                |                |                |                |                |

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal actual average gross annual earned income of non-elderly/non-disabled families in affected units at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

| <i><b>Self-Sufficiency #2: Increase in Household Savings<sup>1</sup></b></i> |                |                |                |                |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>   | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b> | <b>FY 2015</b> | <b>FY 2016</b> |
| Not tracked  | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | \$3,310        | \$3,310        | \$3,031        |
| Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance   |                |                |                |                |                |                |

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal average value of FSS/IDA escrow accounts held by families residing in affected units at FYE.

| <i><b>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status<sup>1</sup></b></i> |                |                |                |                |                |                |                            |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Status</b>   | <b>FY 2010</b> | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b> | <b>FY 2015</b> | <b>FY 2016<sup>3</sup></b> |
| (1) Employed Full-Time <sup>2</sup>   | 61 (78%)       | 63 (80%)       | 61 (79%)       | 77 (73%)       | 49 (44%)       | 49 (44%)       | 78 (74%)                   |
| (2) Employed Part-Time <sup>2</sup>   |                |                |                |                | 20 (18%)       | 20 (18%)       |                            |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program  | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | 9 (8%)         | 9 (8%)         | At least 2                 |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program  | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | 2 (2%)         | 2 (2%)         | At least 1                 |
| (5) Unemployed  | 17 (22%)       | 15 (20%)       | 16 (21%)       | 29 (27%)       | 31 (28%)       | 31 (28%)       | 28 (26%)                   |
| (6) Other   | N/A            | N/A            | N/A            | N/A            | N/A            | N/A            | N/A                        |
| <b>Total Number of Households</b>   | <b>78</b>      | <b>78</b>      | <b>77</b>      | <b>106</b>     | <b>111</b>     | <b>111</b>     | <b>106</b>                 |
| Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance; Emphasys  |                |                |                |                |                |                |                            |

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of heads of household (non-elderly/non-disabled families only) in each employment status category at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<sup>2</sup> Although LMHA did not track part-time vs. full-time employment until FY 2014, the agency did track income from earnings in FY 2010 – FY 2013. Households reporting any income from earnings at FYE are reported as “Employed” (categories 1 & 2 combined) while households with no earned income are reported as “Unemployed” (Category 5).

<sup>3</sup> In FY 2016, LMHA only tracked categories 1-4 above for households enrolled in case management or in the FSS Program. While full-time vs. part-time employment was not tracked for all households, LMHA did track income from earnings. During FY 2016, seventy-eight (74%) of 106 non-elderly / non-disabled heads of household had income from earnings, while 28 (26%) reported no income from earnings.

| <i><b>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)<sup>1</sup></b></i> |                |                |                |                   |                   |                   |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>  | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b>    | <b>FY 2015</b>    | <b>FY 2016</b>    |
| Not tracked   | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | 7 (6% of 111 HHs) | 7 (6% of 111 HHs) | 2 (2% of 106 HHs) |
| Data Source(s): Emphasys  |                |                |                |                   |                   |                   |

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of non-elderly/non-disabled families in affected units receiving TANF income at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i></b> |                            |                            |                            |                     |                     |                     |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>  | <b>FY 2011<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>FY 2012<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>FY 2013<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>FY 2014</b>      | <b>FY 2015</b>      | <b>FY 2016</b>      |
| 36 (36% of 100 HHs)   | 79 (83% of 95 HHs)         | 84 (83% of 101 HHs)        | 97 (79% of 123 HHs)        | 98 (88% of 111 HHs) | 98 (88% of 111 HHs) | 20 (19% of 106 HHs) |

Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance; Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of non-elderly/non-disabled households in affected units participating in the FSS Program or in LMHA case management services at FYE. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

<sup>2</sup> Outcomes for FY 2011 – FY 2013 include elderly and disabled families.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households<sup>1</sup></i></b> |                |                |                |                |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>  | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b> | <b>FY 2015</b> | <b>FY 2016</b> |
| Not tracked   | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | \$6,108        | \$6,108        | \$1,078        |

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal average annual subsidy per affected unit. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data. FY 2016 outcome is calculated only for units occupied by non-elderly/non-disabled units and as follows: Average of [Prorated Project Expense Level – (Gross Rent – Utility Allowance)]. Outcome appears to have been calculated using a different formula in fiscal years 2014/2015.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue<sup>1</sup></i></b> |                |                |                |                |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>   | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b> | <b>FY 2015</b> | <b>FY 2016</b> |
| Not tracked  | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | \$368,316      | \$368,316      | \$413,532      |

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal gross annual rental revenue from affected units. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

| <b><i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency<sup>1</sup></i></b> |                |                |                |                     |                     |                     |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>   | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b>      | <b>FY 2015</b>      | <b>FY 2016</b>      |
| Not tracked  | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | 56 (50% of 111 HHs) | 56 (50% of 111 HHs) | 55 (52% of 106 HHs) |

Data Source(s): Emphasys

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal number of non-elderly/non-disabled families that met LMHA's definition of "self-sufficiency" at FYE. LMHA considers families reporting at least \$14,500 in earned income annually (\$7.25 hourly minimum wage \* 2,000 hours) to be self-sufficient. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

| <b><i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time<sup>1</sup></i></b> |                |                |                |                |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>FY 2010</b>  | <b>FY 2011</b> | <b>FY 2012</b> | <b>FY 2013</b> | <b>FY 2014</b> | <b>FY 2015</b> | <b>FY 2016</b> |
| Not tracked   | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | Not tracked    | 28 months      | 28 months      | 1 month        |

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Scattered site waitlist records

<sup>1</sup> Table summarizes annual outcomes by fiscal year. Outcomes equal average waitlist time in months for eligible families requesting to move to an affected units during FY. Both the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Annual Report were submitted in mid-2015. As LMHA does not have access to historic data for the public housing program (Historic data is overwritten with each new certification.), both reports relied on the same household data.

*iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.*

LMHA did not report HUD Standard Metrics until FY 2014, so many outcomes are not available for earlier years.

## **ACTIVITY #24-2010: Increased Flat Rents**

### *1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*

LMHA proposed this initiative in the 2010 Annual Plan, and it was approved by HUD that year. LMHA proposed flat rents for the Agency's scattered sites be raised and adjusted based on the square footage, location, age and amenities at the property as rent comparables for the site were completed. LMHA decided not to implement this activity, and flat rents have since been raised across all of the agency's public housing units to meet HUD's recent requirement that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.

### *2. Plan Year Closed Out*

FY 2011

## **ACTIVITY #5-2007: Spatial Deconstruction of HCV Assisted Units**

### *1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*

LMHA proposed this initiative in the FY 2007 Annual Plan, and it was approved by HUD that year. The activity was to limit the concentration of HCV-assisted units in complexes of one hundred or more units to 25% (excluding both elderly/disabled and special referral program sites). The goals of the activity were two-fold: to increase the number of communities in exception rent areas where voucher holders live, and to decrease the number of assisted units in large properties that already exceeded the 25% cap.

### *2. Plan Year Closed Out*

FY 2009

## **ACTIVITY #33-2012: Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income – Public Housing Program**

### *1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*

Proposed and approved in the FY 2012 Plan, LMHA proposed that families receiving rental assistance under the Public Housing program would pay either 30% of their monthly adjusted income for rent, or the minimum rent established by the LMHA, whichever was higher. Upon further consideration, because the Housing Authority's housing stock includes tax credit units, LMHA considered amending the activity to include "ceiling rents" that would vary by bedroom size and that would be set in accordance with the annual tax-credit ceiling rents, as published by the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC). KHC is the tax credit allocating agency for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. However, this significant change was never submitted to HUD. Rather, in 2014, LMHA raised flat rents to conform to new HUD regulations mandating that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.

### *2. Plan Year Closed Out*

FY 2014

## **ACTIVITY #16-2009: Explore HUD's Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies**

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*

Proposed and approved in the FY 2009 Plan, this activity was never implemented. HUD investigated the possibility of streamlined demolition/disposition activities for MTW agencies but found that it was not feasible under MTW. Out of concern for residents' rights and the public process, HUD decided that MTW agencies must follow the established procedures for demolition and disposition of property.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*

This activity was officially closed-out FY 2014



## V. Sources and Uses of Funds

|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds</b>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds</b>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year</b>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system</p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility</b>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>LMHA used MTW single fund flexibility to transfer approx. \$2,548,000 from the HCV Program to the Public Housing Program. This transfer was necessary for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Operating subsidy for the Public Housing Program was funded at 85.36% of eligibility for 2015, and at 89.76% of eligibility for 2016 (six months of each calendar year affects LMHA's fiscal year ending June 30, 2016).</li> <li>2. LMHA attempts to manage all of its public housing AMPs at a high level and maintain a balanced operating budget at each. The HUD approved project expense levels for most AMPs do not adequately provide for management services at the level deemed necessary by LMHA.</li> </ol> <p>Although LMHA utilizes the funding flexibility available through the MTW Program, the Housing Authority adheres to all statutes and regulations relative to HUD's asset management program. All budgeting and reporting within the Public Housing Program is done on an individual site basis, and LMHA utilizes a "fee for service" methodology that charges the sites only for the services they receive.</p> <p>During FY 2016, LMHA also used MTW single fund flexibility in conjunction with the agency's HOPE VI revitalization of Sheppard Square, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. \$1,520,000 bridge loan for adaptive rehab of historic Presbyterian Community Center (on-site replacement housing)</li> <li>2. \$1,088,893 Powerhouse Lane unit acquisition (off-site)</li> <li>3. \$549,000 La Fontenay unit acquisition (off-site)</li> <li>4. \$1,140,000 Newbridge Road unit acquisition (off-site)</li> </ol> <p>During FY 2016, LMHA continued to employ a Multi-Cultural Specialist (Activity #17-2009) to address the unique needs of African immigrant families, including the provision of interpretation and translation services in several dialects commonly used in Somalia.</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan

##### B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

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

Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)? ☐ or ☐ No

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

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix? ☐ or ☐ No

N/A

#### V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds

##### C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds

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

| Account                                    | Planned Expenditure                            | Obligated Funds | Committed Funds |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| N/A  | No current planned commitments or obligations. | \$0             | \$0             |
| <b>Total Obligated or Committed Funds:</b> |  | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      |

N/A

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

## **VI. Administrative**

---

## **A. HUD Reviews, Audits, and Physical Inspection Issues**

The Housing Authority of Louisville was rated a high performer under the Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) and the Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) for FY 1998, and the agency retains this high performer designation for the duration of its participation in the MTW Demonstration.

LMHA had no HUD reviews, audits, or physical inspection issues that required the agency to take action to address the issue during FY 2016.

## **B. PHA-Directed Evaluations**

Not applicable. LMHA is not currently directing any evaluations of its MTW Program.

**C. Certification of Conformance with MTW Statutory Requirements**



### Certification of Meeting Moving to Work Demonstration Statutory Requirements

Acting on behalf of the Louisville Metro Housing Authority as its authorized official, I make the following certification to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development:

I certify that the Louisville Metro Housing Authority has met the three statutory requirements of the Moving to Work Demonstration program of:

1. Assuring that at least 75% 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.

Tim Barry

Executive Director

Name of Authorized Official

Title of Authorized Official

Signature of Authorized Official

Date



420 South Eighth Street | Louisville, KY 40203 | 502.569.3400 | 502.569.3459 Fax



## Appendix I. Waiting List Households by Bedroom Size

### Households on LMHA Wait Lists by Bedroom Size (October 2016)

|   | Bedroom Size |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         | Total  |
|---|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|----|---|---|---------|--------|
|   | 0            | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4   | 5  | 6 | 7 | Unknown |        |
|   |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
| Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program  |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
| HCV Program*  | -            | 6,287 | 5,705 | 2,952 | 565 | 81 | 6 | 1 | 1,115   | 16,712 |
| * Calculated bedroom size for 1,115 households is unavailable due to migration from legacy system.            |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
|   |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
| Public Housing Program  |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
| LMHA-Managed Sites*   | -            | 2,589 | 879   | 311   | 122 | -  | - | - | -       | 3,901  |
| Liberty Green   | 75           | 899   | 354   | 301   | -   | -  | - | - | -       | 1,629  |
| Park DuValle  | -            | 342   | 412   | 356   | 88  | -  | - | - | -       | 1,198  |
| Sheppard Square   | -            | 541   | 883   | 582   | 133 | -  | - | - | -       | 2,139  |
| Wilart Arms   | -            | 87    | 36    | 2     | -   | -  | - | - | -       | 125    |
| * Avenue Plaza, Beecher Terrace, Dosker Manor, Lourdes Hall, Parkway, St. Catherine Court, Will E. Seay Plaza |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
|   |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
| Combined HCV / Public Housing Wait Lists  |              |       |       |       |     |    |   |   |         |        |
| Family Scholar House  | -            | -     | -     | -     | -   | -  | - | - | 979     | 979    |

Please note that households may be duplicated across wait lists.