



**Housing Authority  
of the City of Reno**

# **2014 Moving to Work Annual Report**

**Submitted to HUD September 30, 2014**



## Contents

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | Introduction.....   | 1  |
|      | Overview of RHA’s short-term goals.....   | 1  |
|      | Increase housing choices for low-income households.....                                   | 1  |
|      | Create incentives for families to work, seek work or prepare for work.....                | 1  |
|      | Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.....           | 2  |
|      | Progress towards RHA’s long-term goals.....   | 3  |
| II.  | General Housing Authority Operating Information.....                                      | 5  |
| III. | Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested.....                                      | 17 |
| IV.  | Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted.....                             | 18 |
|      | Implemented Activities.....   | 18 |
|      | 2014-1: Assignment of PBVs to RHA Owned/Controlled Units without competitive process..... | 18 |
|      | 2014-2: Mobility Demonstration.....   | 20 |
|      | 2014-3: Rent Reform Controlled Study.....   | 26 |
|      | 2014-4: Expand self-sufficiency activities.....   | 33 |
|      | 2014-5: Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent.....                     | 37 |
|      | 2014-7: Alternate HQS verification policy.....  | 45 |
|      | 2014-8: Partner with local nonprofit to provide special needs housing.....                | 47 |
|      | Not yet implemented activities.....   | 49 |
|      | Activities on hold.....   | 49 |
|      | Closed Activities.....  | 49 |
| V.   | Sources and Uses of Funds.....  | 50 |
| VI.  | Administrative.....   | 53 |

## **I. Introduction**

### **Annual Report July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014**

This Annual Report describes the Housing Authority of the City of Reno's (RHA) Moving To Work activities during fiscal year 2014 (July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014). The introduction discusses RHA's accomplishments in the areas of Housing Choice, Self-Sufficiency and Cost Effectiveness. The short-term goals combine to bring RHA closer to its eventual overall goal of bringing a new level of opportunity and accomplishment to tenants and staff, making RHA a model for housing choice, resident self-sufficiency, and cost effectiveness.

#### **Overview of RHA's short-term goals**

In RHA's FY 2014 plan, the key goals included a Rent Reform Controlled Study, a Mobility Demonstration for Public Housing residents, several activities which have saved RHA time and money and streamlined resident requirements, xeriscaping to save money on water and maintenance costs, and working with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) to track outcomes for residents.

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

- RHA planned to purchase single family homes, duplexes, and condos in low poverty areas and to assign project-based vouchers (PBVs) to them without a competitive process. These properties are being made available for Public Housing residents with children who otherwise lack mobility options. During the first year, RHA purchased 14 dwelling units for the Mobility Demonstration but also repurposed another 13 which were in use in other programs. A total of 22 Mobility dwelling units in low poverty areas were occupied as of June 30, 2014.
- RHA planned to assign PBVs to some of the scattered-site single-family homes and dwelling units in RHA's current unaided multi-family properties without a competitive process to assist local nonprofits with housing for their homeless clients and other clients with particularly urgent housing needs. A contract with the Committee to Aid Abused Women (CAAW) was executed and the first tenant occupied a unit in June 2014. An additional partner agency, Casa De Vida, has been identified. RHA will work with both partner agencies and continue its efforts to identify other possible nonprofit agencies that could benefit from similar agreements.
- RHA planned to assign PBVs to a number of RHA owned/controlled non-Public Housing units to provide more housing choices for low-income families. Eleven units have been identified for this purpose and eight of these units were occupied as of the end of FY 2014.

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

- The Mobility Demonstration enables Public Housing (PH) residents to move to deconcentrated settings with more opportunities. This program allows low-income households to live in low-poverty census tracts, increasing the availability of higher-income positions in the neighborhood and surrounding areas. UNR has assisted RHA in preparing an annual questionnaire to track outcomes for this population.

- The Rent Reform Controlled Study includes one treatment group with a set rent and a control group to determine the incentive for self-sufficiency created by rents not tied to income levels. UNR assisted RHA in preparing an annual questionnaire to track outcomes for this population.
- RHA's Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Coordinators are working with various groups to increase participation and improve service delivery through use of the FSS Lite program. FSS Lite is very similar to the traditional FSS program but it does not include an escrow component. RHA combined the PH and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) FSS programs and began requiring participation for Public Housing residents who are more than 32 hours delinquent on Community Service hours. Mobility tenants who are unemployed are also included in FSS Lite and participants of the Rent Reform activity are encouraged to take advantage of the program.
- Exclusion of all educational grant and loan income from rent calculations has made a significant difference in the ability of RHA's HCV clients to continue to pursue educational goals which will eventually allow them to move towards self-sufficiency.
- Increasing the minimum rent from \$50 to \$75 has encouraged RHA participants to seek work and be more fiscally responsible.

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

- RHA's Rent Reform Controlled Study is being used to explore a more cost-effective way to calculate rent. Rent calculations can be quite complex; this activity not only allows RHA to cut back on the time spent calculating rent, it also gives HCV clients information on what their rents will be in coming years and allows them to plan for the changes.
- RHA has removed significant areas of turf at one Public Housing complex and replaced it with water-saving xeriscape landscaping. Work is still underway at two additional sites. When completed, this will save a considerable amount of money in water bills and management/maintenance costs.
- Excluding all educational grant and loan income from income calculations for rent saves staff time, but was principally designed to encourage residents to pursue educational opportunities.
- RHA is allowing self-certification of assets under \$10,000. The certification process is time-consuming and, for smaller amounts, did not make sense when compared with the amount of rent received by RHA from the income on these assets.
- Recertification every two years for families on fixed incomes (Social Security, disability, etc.) both in the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs has streamlined the process for these participants. Rent increases are based on COLA for their fixed income program. For participants on fixed incomes, the rent change year to year is very small. The time spent by RHA staff to review documents and by participants to collect and prepare documents was unnecessarily onerous for the amount of additional rent collected.

- RHA's plan to allow a unit which passes the annual Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection on the first visit with no follow-up required to skip an inspection the next year has been well-received. Tenants and landlords prefer the self-certification form to having to take the time to make sure an inspection is done.

### **Progress towards RHA's long-term goals**

RHA is working closely with UNR to begin documenting the initial values and, over the years, the outcomes of the Mobility and Rent Reform activities. A questionnaire has been developed and will be administered to all participants in the programs. Participants who have already joined are being given the questionnaire to fill out to provide RHA and UNR with baseline data.

RHA's purchase of vacant single-family homes, duplexes, and condominiums and assignment of PBVs for the Mobility Demonstration is proceeding. Since the beginning of this initiative, RHA staff decided that, in addition to new purchases, some currently owned properties in low-poverty census tracts could also be used for this activity as they become vacant. RHA planned to have 21 purchased within the first MTW year. In utilizing both new purchases and reassignment of properties, 27 have been either purchased or made available for this activity and 22 are currently occupied. At this point, RHA plans to cap this program at 32 units instead of 50, but this could be increased in the future.

RHA's planned partnerships with nonprofit providers providing services to people with particularly urgent housing needs is in process. In the first year, RHA worked with CAAW, signed a contract, and provided housing for one of their participants. RHA is currently exploring other possible partners to assist these populations, and has since executed an agreement with Casa De Vida, another special needs nonprofit provider.

The Rent Reform Controlled Study began in January 2014. RHA initially planned to issue 57 vouchers for each portion of the study in FY 2014, a total of 114 vouchers. In fact, at the end of June 2014, 170 vouchers had been issued and 109 had been leased under this activity. RHA has not yet made a decision on whether to consider expanding this to current tenants.

RHA is addressing the issue of negative rents by removing them entirely; no participants in RHA's programs will receive negative rents once the FY 2015 plan has been fully implemented. Expansion of the FSS program will be considered in future years. The FSS component for FY 2015 includes a fund to assist with specific self-sufficiency activities using the block grant component of MTW.

Modifications to HCV utility allowances to simplify them are being implemented in the FY 2015 plan. Additional xeriscaping is in process. Additional changes for FY 2015 include allowing RHA to inspect its own units, and a required savings plan for PH participants in the Earned Income Disallowance (EID) program.

For RHA's third year of MTW, the expansion of the FSS program is again under consideration. RHA is also examining the possibility of creating time-limited vouchers fashioned after the

Rent Reform Controlled Study to include all new clients who are not elderly or disabled rather than only those included in Rent Reform.

Other long-term goals will be created as the outcomes for the Mobility and Rent Reform studies become available, as these will heavily influence the decisions regarding future activities. In future years, RHA is considering further modifications to or possibly eliminating EID altogether and increasing the minimum rent to \$100.

## II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

### 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  |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Properties for Mobility Program | 21   | 22  | RHA is assigning PBVs to scattered site single-family homes, duplexes, apartments and condominiums in low poverty areas to assist Public Housing tenants with improving mobility options. |
| RHA-owned/controlled properties | 10   | 10  | RHA is assigning PBVs to properties owned or purchased by RHA to provide a wider variety of low-income housing.   |
| RHA partnerships                | 5  | 1   | RHA is providing housing options for partners who provide supportive services to clients with urgent housing needs.   |

| Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based * | Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based | 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 * |
|--|---|--|--|
| 36   | 33  | 36   | 26   |
| 36   | 33  | 33   | 32   |

\* From the Plan

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

RHA purchased 19 units under various programs to be used to provide alternative non-Public Housing low-income housing options for current tenants and individuals and families on waiting lists. Three more properties were donated by the City of Reno. RHA plans to continue acquiring properties that could be used for this purpose. No other changes to the housing stock occurred during FY 2014.

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

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

The CFP expenditures in FY 2014 were as follows:

- 1) Mineral Manor: Range replacements, furnace replacements, and security improvements. Total expenditures were \$281,504.
- 2) Tom Sawyer Village: Range replacements, lighting improvements, and furnace replacements. Total expenditures were \$203,033.
- 3) Silverada Manor: Screen door replacements, security improvements, carpet replacements, lighting improvements, landscape improvements, and appliance replacements. Total expenditures were \$139,417.
- 4) Stead Manor: Sewer line replacement, kitchen remodels, and sewer line repair landscape modifications. Total expenditures were \$388,912.
- 5) Hawk View Apartments: Security improvements. Total expenditures were \$11,992.
- 6) Essex Manor: Bathtubs and surrounds replacements. Total expenditures were \$223,311.
- 7) McGraw Court: Landscape improvements. Total expenditures were \$19,791.

Total expenditures for all CFP work carried out in FY 2014: \$1,267,510.

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

| Housing Program *  | Total Units | Overview of the Program  |
|--------------------|-------------|--|
| Tax-Credit         | 30          | Yorkshire Terrace is a LIHTC property which was fully conveyed to RHA from the limited partners on August 27, 2012.  |
| Non-MTW HUD Funded | 58          | Sarrazin Arms Apartments was purchased by RHA in 1992 and the down payment was funded through HOME funds.  |
| Non-MTW HUD Funded | 4           | D&K Horizons was constructed in 1998 using HUD grant funds.  |
| Non-MTW HUD Funded | 207         | RHA purchased these scattered site properties between November 25, 2008 and June 30, 2014 using NSP1, NSP2, and EDI grant funds, in addition to HUD's Good Neighbor Program. |
| Locally Funded     | 156         | Ala Moana Apartments was purchased by RHA in 1996 and funded by bonds.   |
| Locally Funded     | 6           | Carville Court was purchased in 1997 through a foreclosure sale. It is family housing.   |
| Locally Funded     | 2           | 1305 Carville Dr. was purchased in 2002 and is family housing.   |
| Locally Funded     | 12          | Colonial Court was purchased in 2008 and is family housing.  |
| Locally Funded     | 34          | Idlewild Apartments was a foreclosed bank owned property purchased by RHA in 2012. It is family housing.   |
| Locally Funded     | 49          | RHA owns scattered site single family properties purchased with RHA funds.   |
| Other (1)          | 7           | Pilgrim Rest is owned by Pilgrim Rest Baptist Church and managed by RHA. It is affordable housing for the elderly.   |
| Other (2)          | 4           | These scattered site properties were donated to RHA.   |

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

**569**

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

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| If Other, please describe: | <b>Other (1) refers to a property owned by a non-Public Housing entity and managed by RHA. Other (2) refers to properties which were donated to RHA.</b> |
|----------------------------|--|

**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 ** | 0                            | 0         |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **   | 0                            | 0         |
| Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)  | N/A                          | 33        |
| <b>Total Projected and Actual Households Served</b>  | <b>0</b>                     | <b>33</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 Occupied/Leased**** |            |
|---|---------------------------------|------------|
|   | Planned                         | Actual     |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs *** | 0                               | 0          |
| Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***   | 0                               | 0          |
| Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)   | N/A                             | 399        |
| <b>Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased</b>   | <b>0</b>                        | <b>399</b> |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served**

| <b>Family Size:</b> | <b>Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW</b> | <b>Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW</b> | <b>Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *</b> | <b>Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained</b> | <b>Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained</b> |
|---------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 Person            | 284   | 1307  | 0   | 1591   | 50.56%   |
| 2 Person            | 207   | 433   | 0   | 640  | 20.34%   |
| 3 Person            | 115   | 290   | 0   | 405  | 12.87%   |
| 4 Person            | 76  | 192   | 0   | 268  | 8.52%  |
| 5 Person            | 40  | 107   | 0   | 147  | 4.67%  |
| 6+ Person           | 23  | 73  | 0   | 96   | 3.05%  |
| Totals              | 745   | 2402  | 0   | 3147   | 100%   |

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized

**No baseline adjustments.**

\* “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.

**Mix of Family Sizes Served**

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person | Totals |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------|
| Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **              | 50.56%   | 20.34%   | 12.87%   | 8.52%    | 4.67%    | 3.05%     | 100%   |
| Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***          | 1480     | 558      | 337      | 235      | 134      | 83        | 2827   |
| Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year **** | 52.35%   | 19.74%   | 11.92%   | 8.31%    | 4.74%    | 2.94%     | 100%   |
| Percentage Change  | 1.79%    | -0.60%   | -0.95%   | -0.21%   | 0.07%    | -0.11%    | 0%     |

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages

**No changes to baseline percentages over 5%.**

\*\* 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   |
| Housing Choice Voucher   | RHA did not issue new vouchers for several months at the end of calendar year 2013 due to the sequester. This has since been resolved and RHA has been issuing vouchers consistently since that time.   |
| Public Housing   | RHA had increased vacancies in Public Housing due to the Mobility Demonstration which moved 22 Public Housing families into lower-poverty areas. These units were filled quickly, but the vacancy rate over the year is slightly higher than usual. |

| Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Mobility Demonstration/2014-2  | 1 | The family must be employed and earning over 50% AMI based on family size. They may be receiving other benefits. |
| Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions                      | 0 | * The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.                         |
| ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY       | 1 |  |

**C. MTW Report: Wait List Information**

| Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End   |  |                                   |   |   |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Housing Program(s) *                       | Wait List Type**                             | Number of Households on Wait List | Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed*** | Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units           | Community-Wide Family Public Housing         | 634                               | Open  | Yes   |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units           | Site-Based Stead Manor Family Public Housing | 287                               | Open  | Yes   |
| Federal MTW Public Housing Units           | Community-Wide Elderly and Disabled Housing  | 358                               | Partially open                              | Yes   |
| Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program | Community-Wide                               | 871                               | Closed                                      | No  |
| Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program | Community-Wide Mod Rehab and SRO (1)         | 63                                | Closed                                      | No  |
| Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units   | Site-Based Project-based units owned by RHA  | 10                                | Open  | No  |

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

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

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

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

**Elderly and disabled Public Housing is only open to two-bedroom families.**

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

N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A

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

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

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

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

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

### **Implemented Activities**

#### *2014-1: Assignment of PBVs to RHA Owned/Controlled Units without competitive process*

MTW Statutory Objective: Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

#### **Description:**

RHA owns a number of single-family homes and condos throughout Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County and is continuing to purchase more of these units. To expand housing choice, RHA has been requesting and receiving approval from HUD to assign PBVs to many of these units without a competitive process. These units are being used for several programs which increase housing choice. Thirty-three units have gone through HUD's approval process so far.

This activity reduces cost by eliminating the need to place legal ads for the competitive process usually required to assign PBVs to units.

#### **Impact:**

At the end of FY 2014, RHA had received HUD approval to assign PBVs without a competitive process to 33 units. Several more units are currently in process. RHA will continue to utilize this flexibility in future years to ensure housing choice for RHA participants.

#### **Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

#### **Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C. D. 7. a.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD’s revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baselines, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity.

| <b>2014-1 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>  |   |  |   |                            |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>                         | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Legal advertisements: \$720/property for a three-day advertisement. | \$0; no legal ads will need to be placed | RHA assigned PBVs to 33 units without placing legal ads. This represents a savings of \$23,760. | Yes                        |

  

| <b>2014-1 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). | Writing and placing a legal advertisement takes staff approximately 15 minutes per property. | 0 hours; no legal ads will need to be placed | RHA assigned PBVs to 33 units without placing legal ads. This represents a savings of 8.25 hours. | Yes                        |

2014-2: Mobility Demonstration

MTW Statutory Objective: Increase housing choice for low-income families.

**Description:**

RHA is issuing PBVs for single family homes and condominiums in low-poverty census tracts to Public Housing families with children who are currently in good standing and who meet the requirements of the program. The University of Nevada, Reno will be conducting a longitudinal study of these families to look at whether moving from a high poverty census tract to a low poverty census tract changes outcomes.

**Impact:**

At the end of FY 2014, 22 RHA Public Housing families with children had moved to properties in low-poverty census tracts.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C: D.1.b., D.4., D. 7. a., and E.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD's revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baselines, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity. As the HUD Standard Metrics are a new requirement, benchmarks for FY 2014 were not set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

| <b><i>2014-2 SS #1: Increase in Household 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 households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | \$0             | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan | Currently there is no change in average earned income for this population. | N/A                        |

| <b><i>2014-2 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings</i></b>                                     |                 |   |   |                            |
|---|-----------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b>                                  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | \$0             | Increase of \$25 per year for unemployed tenants. | Mobility tenants have not been in units for a full year; data is not available. | N/A                        |

**2014-2 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status**

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

**Please note: Much of this data will be gathered using a questionnaire developed with the assistance of the University of Nevada, Reno. This questionnaire was only recently completed. In addition, the program started later in the year than expected, so there is not a full year's worth of data on any of these clients.**

| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline                                   | Benchmark                                  | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------|
| <b>Report the following information separately for each category:</b> |  |  |   |                     |
| (1) Employed Full-Time  | (1) Employed Full-Time - 7                 | (1) Employed Full-Time - 7                 | (1) Employed Full-Time - 11                               | (1) Yes             |
| (2) Employed Part-Time  | (2) Employed Part-Time - 13                | (2) Employed Part-Time - 13                | (2) Employed Part-Time - 5                                | (2) No              |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program                                | (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program - 0 | (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program - 0 | (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program - 2                | (3) Yes             |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program                                  | (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program - 0   | (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program - 0   | (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program - data not available | (4) N/A             |
| (5) Unemployed  | (5) Unemployed - 2                         | (5) Unemployed - 2                         | (5) Unemployed - 6  | (5) No              |
| (6) Other   | (6) Other - no baseline set                | (6) Other - no benchmark set               | (6) Other - N/A   | (6) N/A             |

**2014-2 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline  | Benchmark                                    | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | No baseline set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | At the end of FY 2014, two clients in the Mobility group were receiving TANF. | N/A                 |

| <b>2014-2 SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency</b>    |                 |                  |                |                            |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b> | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase). | 0               | 2                | 2              | Yes                        |

| <b>2014-2 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 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease). | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | On average, the 22 families participating in the Mobility Demonstration pay \$437 per month for rent. Families with children, who were recently pulled from the HCV wait list and issued a voucher, pay an average of \$365/month. When comparing the two groups, the Mobility group participants pay approximately \$72 more per month towards rent and utilities, thus saving the HCV program \$1,584/month. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-2 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> |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).              | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | RHA has placed PBVs on each of the 22 occupied Mobility Demonstration properties, increasing RHA rental revenues to \$73,058 for FY 2014. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-2 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</b>  |   |  |   |                            |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family is employed and earning over 50% AMI based on family size. They may be receiving other benefits. Based on this definition, one family in the Mobility group transitioned to self-sufficiency. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-2 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>  |                 |                  |                |                            |
|---|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b> | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | 0               | 21               | 22             | Yes                        |

| <b>2014-2 HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>    |                 |                  |  |                            |
|--|-----------------|------------------|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b> | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). | 0               | 21               | 22 households were provided with housing choice when they had none before. | N/A                        |

| <b>RHA Local Metric:</b>                                      |   |   |   |                            |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                    | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Benchmark</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Improvement in poverty level of census tract for individuals. | <p>Poverty level of initial tracts for 22 households:</p> <p>Average percentage of people in the census tracts below the poverty line: 29.63%.</p> <p>This ranges from a low of 11.46% of people in the census tract below the poverty line to 42.73% of people in the census tract below the poverty line.</p> | <p>Every family moving into a Mobility property will also be moving into a census tract with a lower percentage of people below the poverty line.</p> | <p>Poverty level of ending tracts for 22 households:</p> <p>Average percentage of people in the census tracts below the poverty line: 5.23%.</p> <p>This ranges from a low of 1.43% of people in the census tract below the poverty line to 8.91% of people in the census tract below the poverty line.</p> | Yes                        |

2014-3: Rent Reform Controlled Study

MTW Statutory Objective: Give incentives for education and employment – particularly for families with children whose heads of households are either working, seeking work, or participating in job training, education or other programs that assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient.

**Description:**

RHA is bringing at least 150 families with children off of the Housing Choice Voucher waiting list and issuing vouchers limited to five years. For half of the families, the rent will be calculated as a standard HCV voucher. For the other half, rents are set in advance and do not change based on income; rents will only change if the required bedroom size of the unit changes and the family moves. UNR will be tracking these families as well to identify the differences between the two groups.

**Impact:**

At the end of FY 2014, 170 vouchers had been issued for this Activity and 109 of these had been leased up.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C: D.1.b., D.1.c., D. 2. a., and D.4.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD's revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baselines, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity. As the HUD Standard Metrics are a new requirement, benchmarks for FY 2014 were not set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

| <b>2014-3 SS #1: Increase in Household Income</b>                                  |   |  |   |                            |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>                                     | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | Income on file at time of admission to the program. | Increase household income by \$600 per year. | This activity started later than expected due to the sequester and HUD's delayed approval of the FY 2014 plan. As a result the late start of this activity, none of the tenants have been in place for a full year to properly gauge outcome. | No                         |

| <b>2014-3 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings</b>  |                 |                                       |   |                            |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b>                      | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | \$0             | \$50 increase per household per year. | This activity started later than expected due to the sequester and HUD's delayed approval of the FY 2014 plan. As a result the late start of this activity, none of the tenants have been in place for a full year to properly gauge outcome. | No                         |

| <b>2014-3 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>  |   |  |   |                            |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i> |   |  |   |                            |
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| <b>Report the following information separately for each category:</b>  |   |  |   |                            |
| (1) Employed Full-Time – control group<br>(1) Employed Full-Time – study group   | Control: 19<br>Study: 19                    | Control: 19<br>Study: 19                     | <i>Control:</i> 17 Heads of Household (HOH) were employed full-time when they entered the program and 18 were employed full-time at the end of FY 2014.<br><i>Study:</i> 22 HOH were employed full-time when they entered the program and 22 were employed full-time at the end of FY 2014. | Yes                        |
| (2) Employed Part-Time – control group<br>(2) Employed Part-Time – study group   | Control: 32<br>Study: 32                    | Control: 32<br>Study: 34                     | <i>Control:</i> 14 HOH were employed part-time when they entered the program and 13 were employed part-time at the end of FY 2014.<br><i>Study:</i> 8 HOH were employed part-time when they entered the program and 8 were employed part-time at the end of FY 2014.                        | No                         |
| (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program – control group<br>(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program – study group   | Control: 0<br>Study: 0                      | Control: 0<br>Study: 0                       | There were no HOHs in either the Control or Study group who were enrolled in an educational program.  | N/A                        |
| (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program – control group<br>(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program – study group   | Control: 0<br>Study: 0                      | Control: 0<br>Study: 0                       | There were no HOHs in either the Control or Study group who were enrolled in a job training program.  | N/A                        |
| (5) Unemployed – control group<br>(5) Unemployed – study group   | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | <i>Control:</i> 23 HOH were unemployed when they entered the program and 23 were unemployed at the end of FY 2014.<br><i>Study:</i> 22 HOH were unemployed when they entered the program and 22 were unemployed at the end of FY 2014.  | N/A                        |
| (6) Other – control group<br>(6) Other – study group   | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | N/A   | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-3 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b> |   |  |   |                            |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).                                  | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | <i>Control:</i> 9 families were on TANF when they entered the program and 10 were on TANF at the end of FY 2014.<br><i>Study:</i> 6 families were on TANF when they entered the program and 7 were on TANF at the end of FY 2014. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-3 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 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease). | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | The average subsidy for the Rent Reform Study Group is an increase of \$44 per month as compared to what their subsidy would be under the standard HCV calculations. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-3 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> |
| PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).              | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | This activity started later than expected due to the sequester and HUD's delayed approval of the FY 2014 plan. As a result the late start of this Activity, none of the tenants have been in place for a full year to properly gauge outcome. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-3 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</b>  |   |  |  |                            |
|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family is employed and earning over 50% AMI based on family size. They may be receiving other benefits. Based on this definition, no one from either the Control group or the Study group was transitioned to self-sufficiency. This is not surprising considering the short time between move in and the end of FY 2014. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-3 HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</b>           |  |  |  |                            |
|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                                | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease). | While no baseline was formally set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, the average wait list time for applicants from application date to lease date was 15.45 months. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | Due to the sequester, the average wait list time for the Control group and Study group applicants was 29.50 months. There are also several factors that influence the length of time an applicant will remain on the wait list that should be noted. These include local preferences, the closure of the wait list, etc. | N/A                        |

**2014-3 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings**

| Unit of Measurement                       | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | Cost of task prior to implementation:<br>Average cost of interims (\$33) * Expected number of interims required to be processed (10% of 57, or 6) + Average cost of annuals (\$53) * 57<br>Equals \$3,219 | Expected decrease: Interims will no longer be processed, so \$198, and about half of the annuals will not be necessary, so (\$53)*29=\$1,537; estimated decrease is \$1,735 | Due to the late start for this activity, no annuals were processed. Approximately seven interims were not required for the Study group, which saved RHA \$231. | No, due to late start of this activity caused by the delay in HUD's approval of the FY 2014 plan. |

**2014-3 CE #2: Staff Time Savings**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark  | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?   |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | Amount of staff time dedicated to interims and annuals prior to implementation:<br>1.7 hours for an interim * 6 + 2.8 hours for an annual * 57 = 169.8 hours | Expected decrease of staff time dedicated to interims and annuals: Interims will no longer be processed, so 1.7*6=10.2, and about half of the hours for an annual, so 1.4*57=79.8, totals 90 hours | Due to the late start for this activity, no annuals were processed. Approximately seven interims were not required for the Study group, which saved RHA approximately 12 hours. | No, due to late start of this activity caused by the delay in HUD's approval of the FY 2014 plan. |

| <b>2014-3 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>       |   |  |   |                            |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>                                    | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | This was not tracked over the course of the year. | N/A                        |

2014-4: Expand self-sufficiency activities

MTW Statutory Objective: Give incentives for education and employment – particularly for families with children whose heads of households are either working, seeking work, or participating in job training, education or other programs that assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient.

**Description:**

RHA made the FSS Lite program, which does not include an escrow account, mandatory for Public Housing tenants who are not completing their Community Service hours. FSS Lite is also available to Mobility and Rent Reform clients. RHA has combined Public Housing and HCV FSS to streamline service delivery.

**Impact:**

At the end of FY 2014, 21 families had been assisted through the FSS Lite program.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C, E.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD's revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baseline, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity. As the HUD Standard Metrics are a new requirement, benchmarks for FY 2014 were not set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

**2014-4 SS #1: Increase in Household Income**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark                                    | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------|
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | \$253 per month over 21 clients (four actually had income, the others did not) | Increase household income by \$200 each year | Average earned income over 21 clients increased to \$556 per month (eight had income at the end of FY 2014) | Yes                 |

**2014-4 SS #2: Increase in Household Savings**

| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline | Benchmark                            | Outcome                | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---|----------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | \$0      | \$25 increase per household per year | \$0 increase in assets | No                  |

**2014-4 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status**

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

| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline                                     | Benchmark                                     | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---|--|---|--|---------------------|
| Report the following information separately for each category:<br>(1) Employed Full-Time<br>(2) Employed Part-Time<br>(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program<br>(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program<br>(5) Unemployed<br>(6) Other | No baselines set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmarks set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | Four clients gained employment over FY 2014. Three were full-time and one was part-time. Educational and job training programs did not change. | N/A                 |

**2014-4 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline                                    | Benchmark                                    | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease). | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | At the end of FY 2014, one client participating in the FSS Lite program was receiving TANF. | N/A                 |

| <b>2014-4 SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency</b>    |                 |  |  |                            |
|--|-----------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b>                             | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase). | 0               | 51 families in the first year will take part in the FSS Lite program | 21 families were served in the first year. | No                         |

| <b>2014-4 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</b>  |   |  |  |                            |
|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | RHA's definition of self-sufficiency is that the family is employed and earning over 50% AMI based on family size. They may be receiving other benefits. Based on this definition, no one participating in the FSS Lite program transitioned to self-sufficiency during FY 2014. | N/A                        |

2014-5: Simplify rent calculations and increase the minimum rent

MTW Statutory Objective: Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness and reduce costs

**Description:**

RHA has excluded all educational financial aid from income calculations, allowed self-certification of assets under \$10,000, and the minimum rent was increased from \$50 to \$75. These changes went into effect and will continue in the future.

**Impact:**

RHA's rental income was minimally impacted. Staff time savings were notable.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C, C. 4., C. 11., D. 2. a., and D. 3. b.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD's revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baselines, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity. As the HUD Standard Metrics are a new requirement, benchmarks for FY 2014 were not set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

**2014-5 SS #1: Increase in Household Income**

| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase). | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | We are unable to track this information for FY 2014; RHA’s system will be set to track this beginning October 2014. | N/A                        |

**2014-5 SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status**

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

| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| Report the following information separately for each category:<br>(1) Employed Full-Time<br>(2) Employed Part-Time<br>(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program<br>(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program<br>(5) Unemployed<br>(6) Other | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | We are unable to track this information for FY 2014; RHA’s system will be set to track this beginning October 2014. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-5 SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b> |   |  |   |                            |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).                                  | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | We are unable to track this information for FY 2014; RHA's system will be set to track this beginning October 2014. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-5 SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency</b>  |   |  |   |                            |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>                             | <b>Benchmark</b>                             | <b>Outcome</b>  | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided. | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | We are unable to track this information for FY 2014; RHA's system will be set to track this beginning October 2014. | N/A                        |

| <b>2014-5 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>  |                 |  |                |                            |
|---|-----------------|--|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>                | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b>   | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b> |
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | \$0             | Exclusion of assets will have a negligible effect. RHA does not expect cost savings for this Activity. | No change.     | Yes                        |

**2014-5 CE #2: Staff Time Savings**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline  | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | 0.4 hours per student status verification times 336 individuals = 134.4 hours | Verifications sent for dependents only: 91 hours saved<br>Self-certification of assets under \$10,000: PH 313 hours saved, HCV 448 hours saved.<br>Total: 852 hours saved | The estimate for student status verifications is reasonable. Self-certification of assets under \$10,000: PH 314 hours saved. HCV: 499 hours saved. Total: 904 hours saved. | Yes                 |

**2014-5 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution**

| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline                                    | Benchmark                                    | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------|
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | No baseline set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | Due to the new metrics, this was not tracked over the course of the year and cannot be calculated. | N/A                 |

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

| Unit of Measurement                   | Baseline | Benchmark  | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?  |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--|---|--|
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). | \$0      | <p>Student status will cost RHA \$7,274. Raising the minimum rent from \$50 to \$75 is expected to bring in \$154,200 per year. Net effect will be an increase of \$146,926 in rental revenue.</p> <p>This initial benchmark is erroneous. The assumption was made that each of the affected HCV clients and PH tenants would have their rent increased by exactly \$25 when in fact many of them increased from \$1 - \$25.</p> | <p>RHA's system cannot calculate the exact cost amount due to the student status income change because we would have to calculate each one separately outside of the system; the estimate is reasonable. 190 HCV clients were affected by minimum rent being raised to \$75 in November 2013, increasing income by \$4,560 per month, \$36,480 for FY 2014. 106 PH tenants were affected by minimum rent being raised to \$75 in November 2013, increasing income by \$2,309 per month, \$18,472 for FY 2014.</p> | <p>No, due partially to the late start of this activity caused by HUD's delayed approval of the plan and the assumption within the initial benchmark that each of the affected HCV clients and PH tenants would have their rent increased by exactly \$25 when in fact many of them increased from \$1 - \$25.</p> |

2014-6: Biennial recertifications for elderly/disabled participants on fixed incomes

MTW Statutory Objective: Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness and reduce costs

**Description:**

Elderly and disabled participants in both PH and HCV who are on fixed incomes have recertifications on a biennial schedule rather than annually because the changes to rent are negligible. Cost of Living increases for certain programs are automatically applied. This change went into effect. It will be replaced by triennial recertifications for these populations in FY 2015.

**Impact:**

RHA realized staff time savings and cost savings due to not having to process as many recertifications.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C, C. 4. and D. 1. c.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD's revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baseline, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity. As the HUD Standard Metrics are a new requirement, benchmarks for FY 2014 were not set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

**2014-6 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings**

| Unit of Measurement                       | Baseline                       | Benchmark   | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?  |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | HCV: \$112,291<br>PH: \$28,642 | HCV new cost: \$91,989<br>PH new cost: \$21,898<br>Total savings: \$27,046 annually | HCV new cost: \$102,808<br>PH new cost: \$25,138<br>Total actual savings: \$12,987 | No. This activity began with the November 2013 annuals. This late start was caused by the delay in HUD's approval of the plan. |

**2014-6 CE #2: Staff Time Savings**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline   | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | HCV: 661.6 hours per month<br>PH: 39.5 hours per month | HCV: 493.3 hours per month<br>PH: 28.8 hours per month<br>Total savings of 179 hours per month, 2,148 hours saved annually. | HCV: 50.33 hours per month<br>PH: 12.95 hours per month<br>Total savings of 63.4 hours per month, 759.3 hours saved annually. | No. This activity began with the November 2013 annuals due to HUD's delayed approval of the plan. Furthermore, while this activity has saved the clients/tenants a significant amount of time, RHA staff continue to process each of the mail-in annuals to include any Cost of Living Adjustments, resulting in fewer hours saved than originally noted in the benchmark. |

**2014-6 CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue**

| Unit of Measurement                   | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|
| Rental revenue in dollars (increase). | \$0      | No change | No change | Yes                 |

2014-7: Alternate HQS verification policy

MTW Statutory Objective: Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness and reduce costs

**Description:**

For HCV units that passed the HQS inspection on the first visit, as long as both the landlord and the tenant sign a certification that the unit is still in good shape, the unit will not be inspected until two years following the passed inspection. This change went into effect and will continue into the future.

**Impact:**

RHA realized staff time savings and cost savings due to not having to process as many HQS inspections. This policy was implemented for HQS inspections beginning August 2013 for October due dates. Between August 2013 and June 2014, 1,290 units were able to opt out of their annual HQS inspection. Of those, 883, or 68%, actually opted out.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C, D. 5.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD's revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baselines, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity. As the HUD Standard Metrics are a new requirement, benchmarks for FY 2014 were not set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

**2014-7 CE #1: Agency Cost Savings**

| Unit of Measurement                       | Baseline                | Benchmark   | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved?  |
|---|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). | \$169,213 cost per year | \$80,019 estimated cost after implementation, a savings of \$89,194 | 883 inspections were skipped at a cost of \$64 per inspection, so the cost of the task decreased by \$56,512. | No. This was partially due to the late start of the activity due to the delay in HUD's approval of the plan and partially due to fewer people taking advantage of the program than expected. |

**2014-7 CE #2: Staff Time Savings**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline    | Benchmark  | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved?  |
|--|-------------|--|--|--|
| Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). | 2,656 hours | 1,256 hours expected after implementation, a savings of 1,400 hours. | One hour per inspection was saved, which shows a savings of 883 hours between August 2013 and June 2014. | No. This was partially due to the late start of the activity due to the delay in HUD's approval of the plan and partially due to fewer people taking advantage of the program than expected. |

**2014-7 CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution**

| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome   | Benchmark Achieved? |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|
| Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). | 0        | No change | No change | Yes                 |

2014-8: Partner with local nonprofit to provide special needs housing

MTW Statutory Objective: Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness and reduce costs

**Description:**

RHA is providing project-based voucher units to Committee to Aid Abused Women (CAAW) participants. These PBVs are for two years and CAAW provides supportive services. An agreement with the CAAW is in place and one of their clients has moved in to an RHA unit. This year, RHA will be working with Silver Sage Manor and the City of Reno to provide project-based vouchers for five units at the NSP3 property at 435 Moran Street. An agreement was also signed recently with Casa De Vida, another special needs nonprofit provider, and RHA will continue to seek other partnerships.

**Impact:**

RHA provided one unit to CAAW in FY 2014 and is working to expedite agreements with other nonprofit agencies.

**Implementation year:**

This policy was approved and implemented in FY 2014.

**Previously approved authorizations:**

2014 MTW Agreement, Attachment C, B. 4., D.1.b., and D. 7. a.

**Changes to Benchmarks, Baselines, and Metrics**

Under HUD's revised MTW reporting requirements, RHA revised its MTW benchmarks, baseline, and metrics for consistency with the recently established HUD Standard Metrics. The table below provides the revised information for this MTW activity. As the HUD Standard Metrics are a new requirement, benchmarks for FY 2014 were not set in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

**2014-8 CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged**

| Unit of Measurement                              | Baseline | Benchmark                                    | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|----------|--|--|---------------------|
| Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase). | 0        | No benchmark set in FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. | CAAW reported approximately \$221 per month per client in additional services. | N/A                 |

**2014-8 HC #4: Displacement Prevention**

| Unit of Measurement  | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome  | Benchmark Achieved? |
|--|----------|-----------|--|---------------------|
| Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box. | 0        | 0         | One family was provided housing using RHA's program. | Yes                 |

**2014-8 HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility**

| Unit of Measurement   | Baseline | Benchmark | Outcome | Benchmark Achieved?   |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|---|
| Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). | 0        | 2         | 1       | No; it took longer than expected to finalize the agreement. |

| <b>2014-8 HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>    |                 |                  |                |   |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------|---|
| <b>Unit of Measurement</b>   | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Benchmark</b> | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>                                  |
| Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). | 0               | 2                | 1              | No; it took longer than expected to finalize the agreement. |

**Not yet implemented activities**

Not applicable. RHA has implemented all planned activities for FY 2014.

**Activities on hold**

Not applicable. RHA is in process with all activities for FY 2014.

**Closed Activities**

Not applicable. All of RHA’s activities for FY 2014 are still in process, and FY 2014 was RHA’s first MTW year.

## V. Sources and Uses of Funds

|  |
|--|
| <b>Annual MTW Report</b>   |
| <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>RHA planned to xeriscape approximately 399,795 square feet of turf over the first three years, expending \$836,205. In the first year, RHA significantly completed xeriscape work at Mineral Manor removing 192,483 square feet of turf and expending \$411,143. The xeriscape work using MTW funds at Hawk View Apartments (21,580 square feet of turf) and Essex Manor (103,263 square feet of turf) were both in work by the end of FY 2014.</p> <p>The MTW Coordinator was paid partially through RHA funds and partially through MTW flexibility (\$39,808).</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 | No |
|-----|----|

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

|     |    |    |
|-----|----|----|
| Yes | or | No |
|-----|----|----|

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

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

|     |    |    |
|-----|----|----|
| Yes | or | No |
|-----|----|----|

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

| <b>V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds</b>   |   |                  |                  |
|---|---|------------------|------------------|
| <b>C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds</b>   |   |                  |                  |
| 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  |
| Water efficiency improvements   | Essex Manor xeriscaping                 | \$269,100        | \$269,100        |
| Water efficiency improvements   | Hawk View Apartments xeriscaping        | \$24,990         | \$24,990         |
| MTW evaluations   | Payments to UNR for FY 2014 and FY 2015 | \$24,000         | \$24,000         |
| <b>Total Obligated or Committed Funds:</b>  |   | <b>\$318,090</b> | <b>\$318,090</b> |
| <p>The xeriscaping improvements are to improve efficiency of water use, as RHA is a high desert environment and turf areas utilize excessive amounts of water.</p> <p>RHA has an informal agreement with UNR which is in the process of being formalized. This agreement will be for \$12,000 per year.</p> |   |                  |                  |
| <p><b>Note:</b> 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.</p>  |   |                  |                  |

## VI. Administrative

|   |
|---|
| A. General description of any HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue;  |
| B. Results of latest PHA-directed evaluations of the demonstration, as applicable; and  |
| C. Certification that the PHA has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; 2) continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and 3) maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration. |

- A. The audit of RHA’s first MTW year is currently in process. There are no actions required from any reviews, audits, or physical inspections.
- B. RHA has been working with the University of Nevada, Reno to create a questionnaire to be administered annually for Rent Reform and Mobility participants. This questionnaire has only recently been completed and administration began in September 2014. The current data collection is baseline data only.
- C. 1) In FY 2014, 95.09% of HCV clients and 92.34% of PH clients were very low income, which means that 94.38% of families assisted by RHA were very low income, below 50% AMI. Initially, 96% of families assisted (PH and HCV combined) were very low income.  
 2) Baseline numbers show total numbers served were 3,127. June 30, 2014 numbers served were 2,827, or 90%. This number is expected to be low due to the sequester and use of HCV funding to perform needed xeriscaping.  
 3) RHA is maintaining a comparable mix of families by family size, as seen below; all changes were under 5%.

| <b>Mix of Family Sizes Served</b>                                   |          |          |          |          |          |           |        |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------|
|   | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person | Totals |
| Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained            | 50.56%   | 20.34%   | 12.87%   | 8.52%    | 4.67%    | 3.05%     | 100%   |
| Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year         | 1480     | 558      | 337      | 235      | 134      | 83        | 2827   |
| Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year | 52.35%   | 19.74%   | 11.92%   | 8.31%    | 4.74%    | 2.94%     | 100%   |
| Percentage Change   | 1.80%    | -0.60%   | -0.95%   | -0.20%   | 0.07%    | -0.11%    | 0%     |