



# **ANNUAL MTW REPORT**

(FYE 2018: July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018)

HUD Submission: **September 28, 2018**

HUD Acceptance: **TBA**

# ANNUAL MOVING-TO-WORK (MTW) REPORT

## SECTION I – Introduction

- A. Contents ii
- a. Overview of Short and Long-Term MTW Goals and Objectives 2

## SECTION II – General Operating Information

- A. Housing Stock Information 9
- B. Leasing Information 13
- C. Waiting List Information 15
- D. Information on Statutory Objectives and Requirements 17

## SECTION III – Proposed Activities

- All proposed activities granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV 20

## SECTION IV – Approved MTW Activities

- A. Implemented Activities
  - a. Activity approvals, descriptions, changes, and challenges 21
- B. Not Yet Implemented Activities
  - b. Activity descriptions and actions taken toward implementation 65
- C. Activities on Hold
  - c. Activity descriptions and actions taken toward reactivating activities 66
- D. Closed Out Activities
  - d. Activity approval years, close-out explanations, and close-out years 66

## SECTION V – Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

- A. Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds 69
- B. Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP) 69

## SECTION VI – Administrative

- A. Reviews, Audits, and Inspections 70
- B. Evaluation Results 70
- C. MTW Statutory Requirement Certification 70
- D. MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data 70

### Attachments

- a. Attachment A – Signed Certification of Statutory Requirements 72

## SECTION I – Introduction

### B. OVERVIEW

The Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia (**HACG**) is a self-regulating agency created in 1938 and is directed by a 7-member Board of Commissioners (**Board or BoC**). HACG is one of 39 Moving-to-Work Demonstration (**MTW**) Program Public Housing Agencies/Authorities (**PHAs**) nationwide. HACG entered into an MTW Agreement with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (**HUD**), effective July 3, 2013.

In accordance with its MTW agreement, HACG submits this Annual MTW Report to HUD's MTW Office to provide updates on MTW and Non-MTW goals and objectives for fiscal year ending (**FYE**) 2018. HACG planned to accomplish the following during FYE 2018:

- Implement new MTW Activities
- Issue 75% of its turnover Tenant-Based Vouchers (**TBVs**) to families on the Rental Assistance Demonstration (**RAD**) Project-Based Voucher (**PBV**) Program Wait List
- Close-out obsolete, outdated MTW Activities
- Continue to administer and monitor HUD-approved MTW Activities
- Strengthen/re-define MTW evaluator relationship and deliverables
- Implement measures to ensure supportive services programming compliance
- Continue “unqualified opinion”-level accounting from internal and external audits
- Continue annual background checks, implementation of Flat Rent Mandate, and aggressive pursuit of grant-awards at Federal and Foundation levels
- Continue converting the remaining balance of Public Housing (**PH**) units to long-term Section 8 assisted PBV units under the RAD Program
- Close-out RAD I Projects, initiate RAD II Projects, finalize demolition/disposition plans for Louis Chase (**Chase**) Homes
- Implement Smoke-Free Multi-Family Housing Rule

Additionally, HACG will provide the status of its progress regarding long-term goals and objectives (over 12-months) including those that need to be extended. Examples of long-term goals and objectives include:

- Propose/re-propose new/existing MTW Activities in connection with the changes in the affordable housing industry and HACG's service delivery commitments
- Continue to position the agency to be competitive as a Regional MTW Agency should such a designation come to pass
- Evaluate supportive services programming at existing sites required to offer supportive services programming
- Plan to offer supportive services programming, in accordance with GA Department of Community Affairs (**DCA**) Qualified Allocation Plan (**QAP**), as sites come online

- Assess and analyze the benefits of changing the agency’s fiscal year (**FY**) format to a calendar FY
- Increase HACG’s portfolio diversity

In a short burst, HACG continued to move forward in the process of converting its PH units to PBV units under RAD. The agency also continued to explore and pursue Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (**LIHTC**) funding vehicles to meet requirements in current plans and conversion challenges of future conversion plans. Further, HACG continues to evaluate solutions to meet development and/or re-development challenges presented by current Site Selection Standards, the city’s Master Plan, local interest groups, and other principles delaying development and/or re-development projects.

Meanwhile, HACG averaged a 95% occupancy rate, portfolio-wide, which bodes well for HACG when construction, relocation, and other activities impacting occupancy are factored into consideration. These experiences increased HACG’s conversion and development capacity and the respectable occupancy rate continues to support HACG as a first-choice housing solution in Columbus’ affordable housing market.

Further support is exemplified through the assistance HACG provides to other housing authorities. Assistance may include management help, operational help, MTW designation help, and other assistance, which positions HACG for the next opportunity. The amended Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act includes a probable introduction of Regional MTW Agencies. And to that end, should HUD establish such a designation, **HACG** provides unwavering support of the MTW Program and **remains very interested in becoming a Regional MTW Agency** should such an opportunity come to pass.

#### MTW SHORT-TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following narrative addresses short-term goals and objectives during the reporting period (July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018). Some goals and objectives overlap with non-MTW goals and objectives. Such goals and objectives are listed under its primary intent.

- ✓ HACG introduced an activity to eliminate/reduce the number of interim examinations during a leasing period (usually 12-months). HACG **initiated implementation** of this activity by updating its Admission and Continued Occupancy Plan (**ACOP**) and Administrative Plan (**Admin Plan**) to reflect this policy change. Further, HACG used the reporting period to collect data to set the applicable HUD Standard Metrics baseline.
- ✓ HACG introduced an activity to over-house 1-bedroom eligible families into 2-bedroom units. HACG **implemented** this activity. HACG updated its Admin Plan to include this policy change and HACG housed 19 1-Bedroom families in 2-Bedroom units at Patriot Pointe, HACG’s “near”-elderly community.

- ✓ HACG **took measures to adopt** the Alternative Mobility policy by including this option in its ACOP and Admin Plan as applicable, by **creating a separate Waiting List** for RAD PBV families that express an interest in being issued a TBV at the end of their lease. Since none of the RAD PBV families established 12-months or more of RAD PBV tenancy, HACG **did not issue its TBV turnover to RAD PBV families**.
  - ❖ Alternative Mobility Policy **reminder**:
    - 75% of TBV turnover is allocated to the RAD PBV Waiting List
    - 25% of TBV turnover is allocated to the MTW TBV Waiting List
- ✓ HACG **continued to analyze the feasibility of changing the Waiting List process**; however, HACG did not make a formal decision and continues with a date-time-stamp Waiting List process. Nonetheless, HACG is strongly considering the utilization of a lottery to place families on the Waiting List. FYE 2019's Waiting List developments and issuance practices will factor into HACG's final decision on Waiting List changes.
- ✓ HACG **continued to recruit property owners** in low-poverty areas and high-opportunity to develop partnerships to project-base MTW Section 8 assistance.
- ✓ HACG continued the close-out process of ineffective, obsolete, and/or outdated MTW Activities. HACG's current list of close-out activities include:
  - ❖ 2014.03 – Administrative Reforms (*PH component only*)
  - ❖ 2014.04 – Administrative Efficiency (*PH component only*)
  - ❖ 2014.05 – Streamline Housing Quality Standards (HQS) Inspections
    - HACG adopted Attachment K and L of Notice PIH 2016-05 (HA)
  - ❖ 2015.01 – Eliminate Child Support Income from the Rent Calculation
    - HACG modernized converted units with LIHTC funds. This funding source requires all income sources in the household income and rental calculations
- ✓ HACG **did not adopt/finalize a decision on** the use of **Attachments D and/or F** of Notice PIH 2016-05 (HA)
  - ❖ A final decision on Attachment D of PIH Notice 2016-05, which streamlines the annual re-examination of fixed income sources, was not made because HACG needs to analyze the conflict impact of this attachment with DCA requirements and/or LIHTC calculations
  - ❖ HACG did not adopt Attachment F of PIH Notice 2016-05, which streamlines family declaration of assets under \$5,000, because HACG will continue with its current MTW Activity that sets the threshold at \$50,000 before income derived off assets will be included
- ✓ HACG **decided to close-out** two other MTW Activities during the reporting period:
  - ❖ 2014.01 – Community Choice
    - The activity close-out is initiated in HACG's 2019 Annual MTW Plan and will appear in HACG's 2019 Annual MTW Report with final activity data
  - ❖ 2014.06 – Rent Reform (Farley)
    - The activity close-out is initiated in HACG's 2019 Annual MTW Plan and will appear in HACG's 2019 Annual MTW Report with final activity data
- ✓ HACG continued the administration, monitoring, and data collection of active MTW Activities. HACG's current list of active activities include:

<b>Activity Number</b>	<b>Approval Year</b>	<b>Activity Description</b>	<b>Activity Status – June 30</b>
2014.01	2015	Community Choice	Close-out proposed; final data to be collected during FYE 2019
2014.02	2014	Innovations to Reduce Homelessness	Active, data being collected and reported
2014.03	2014	Administrative Reform	Active, data being collected and reported
2014.04	2014	Administrative Efficiency	Active, data being collected and reported
2014.06	2014	Rent Reform (Farley)	Close-out proposed; final data to be collected during FYE 2019
2015.02	2015	Portability Restrictions	Active, data being collected and reported
2015.03	2015	Simplified Utility Allowance Calculations	Active, data being collected and reported
2015.04	2015	Cap Childcare Dependent Deductions	Active, data being collected and reported
2016.01	2016	Next Step Vouchers	Active, data being collected and reported
2016.02	2016	Non-Competitive Project-Basing Process	Active, data being collected and reported
2016.03	2016	Project-Basing Flexibilities	Active, data being collected and reported. By way of information, HACG re-proposed this activity in its 2019 Plan
2018.01	2018	Eliminate/Reduce Interim Certification Examinations	Active, data being collected and reported
2018.02	2018	Over-House 1-Bedroom Families in 2-Bedroom Units	Active, data being collected and reported. By way of information, HACG re-proposed and re-named this activity in its 2019 Plan

- ✓ HACG **continued to assess the 5-year agreement** of its evaluation partner Columbus State University (CSU), which terminates in August 2018. HACG's options include: renew the agreement with CSU, enter a new agreement with another evaluation group, or create an evaluation team of mixed membership to continue the evaluation of:
  - ❖ 2014.02 – Innovations to Reduce Homelessness: Activity evaluates the influences and/or impacts of MTW Rapid Rehousing Vouchers (**RRVs**) issued to chronically homeless families/individuals
  - ❖ 2016.01 – Next Step Vouchers (NSVs): Activity seeks to learn the impact of a term/time limited TBV on Foster Youth aging out of Foster Care. TBV limitations include a 36-month term or age 23, whichever comes first and case management

#### NON-MTW SHORT-TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- ✓ HACG **continued to increase supportive services offerings** at its LIHTC funded conversion properties to meet GA DCA QAP requirements. DCA QAP requirements are separated into two categories: Family Sites and Senior Sites. Effected HACG sites are as follows:
  - ❖ Family sites: Arbor Pointe I & II, Ashley Station I, E.E. Farley, EJ Knight, and Luther Wilson, must provide supportive services. Categories include:
    - Social and Recreational events
    - On-site Enrichment Classes
    - On-site Health Classes
    - Other services as approved by GA DCA
  - ❖ Senior sites: Cottages, Ashley Station II, EJ Knight Senior, and Brown Nicholson Terrace, must provide 4 services from 2 categories. Categories include:
    - Social and Recreational events
    - On-site Enrichment Classes
    - On-site Health Classes
    - Other services as approved by GA DCA
- ✓ HACG **continued to plan supportive services** for the next phase(s) of portfolio sites that may utilize LIHTC funds to convert from PH units to PBV units under RAD.
  - ❖ Sites include: Elizabeth Canty, Louis Chase, George Rivers, and Warren Williams.
  - ❖ Future sites include: Columbus Commons and Patriot Pointe.
- ✓ HACG **did not increase staffing levels**, regular or temporary, to deliver supportive services programming at LIHTC funded sites – current and future.
- ✓ HACG **continued to assess a fiscal year change** from its current July to June format to a calendar year, January to December, format – no decision was been made.
- ✓ HACG **continued annual background checks** of adult household members as part of the recertification process. HACG continued implementation requirements **to meet the Flat Rate mandate** (80% of the Fair Market Rent (**FMR**)).
- ✓ HACG **created and recruited for a second Compliance Control Specialist position** to ensure RAD PBV units using LIHTC funding meet RAD and LIHTC requirements.

- ✓ HACG **continued the process** of completing the administrative close-out of RAD I converted properties. RAD I properties and units include:
  - ❖ E.E. Farley (**Farley**), 102 units
  - ❖ EJ Knight (**EJK** or **Knight**), 52 units
  - ❖ EJK Senior, 40 units
  - ❖ Brown Nicholson (**BNT** or **Nicholson**), 100 units
  - ❖ Luther Wilson (**Wilson**), 289 units
- ✓ HACG **continued to work with HUD to convert** the remaining balance of its PH portfolio award. HACG submitted an RCC request to HUD in late 2016/early 2017. In the first week of October in 2017, HUD issued new guidance to HACG regarding PH units affected by a regulatory floodway. Since then, HACG presented a plan to demolish and/or dispose of floodway effected units. The remaining sites to be converted include:
  - ❖ Elizabeth Canty (**Canty**), 249 units, *16 floodway units*
  - ❖ Louis Chase (**Chase**), 108 units
  - ❖ Warren Williams (**WW**, **WWms**, or **Williams**), 184 units, *80 floodway units*
- ✓ HACG **postponed redevelopment and/or rehabilitation plans** at its remaining sites because of floodway concerns and/or current Site Selection Standards. Meanwhile, HACG formulated an alternate plan for Chase. An overview of the plans continues:
  - ❖ HACG plans to request Community Development Block Grant (**CDBG**) funds (under city’s control) to demolish Chase and redevelop up to 60 units on the site
    - An alternative to the above continues to include requesting the city to provide land for new units if replacement units are not constructed on the same site
  - ❖ Finalize replacement plan for remaining 48 units (or whatever the difference totals)
    - Current plans include the transfer of assistance to private property owners located in low-poverty and/or areas of opportunity
- ✓ HACG **postponed family relocation** for the remaining conversion units to address units located in and/or affected by a floodway.
- ✓ HACG **made units available** in compliance with the Olmstead Settlement Agreement
- ✓ HACG **planned to implement** the Smoke-Free Multifamily Housing Rule by July 31

#### MTW LONG-TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following narrative addresses long-term goals and objectives during the reporting period (July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018). Some goals and objectives overlap with non-MTW goals and objectives. Such goals and objectives are listed under its primary intent.

- ✓ HACG **continued to assess and evaluate ideas** that maximize cost effectiveness, promote resident self-sufficiency, and expand housing choices, while meeting HACG’s service delivery commitments.
  - ❖ HACG may present a workforce housing concept
  - ❖ HACG is considering term and/or time limits for rental assistance
  - ❖ HACG plans to present ideas consistent with demand/need for target vouchers
    - Emergency Housing Vouchers: address minor disasters

- Different calculations for elderly and/or disabled families and/or employed families
- Introduce incentives that “reward” achievements, such as education, employment, and similar
- Provide rental assistance specifically to non-traditional custodial parents/guardians (e.g., aunts, fathers, grands, uncles, et al)
- Promote resident “graduation” to market rate property and/or homeownership
- Present re-entry program in partnership with non-profit organization
- ✓ HACG **continued to monitor announcements** of newest MTW Agencies and/or establishment of Regional MTW Agencies (should such a designation become available).

#### NON-MTW LONG-TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- ✓ HACG **postponed developing a timetable** to change its fiscal year period.
- ✓ HACG **delayed plans to increase supportive services programming** at remaining PH sites since regulatory floodway concerns terminated unit conversion and postponed LIHTC application submission and/or use of LIHTC funding during FYE 2018.
- ✓ HACG **continued to review options to expand its real estate portfolio**. Portfolio expansion plans include:
  - ❖ Modernization of existing units, which increases unit marketability
  - ❖ Acquisition of site(s) and applicable redevelopment and/or rehabilitation thereof
  - ❖ Construction of new site on currently-owned or acquired parcel(s)
  - ❖ Increase portfolio of mixed-use rentals through acquisition, partnership, etc.
  - ❖ Increase portfolio of single-family units through construction and/or acquisition
- ✓ HACG **continued plans to convert PH units** at Patriot Pointe and Columbus Commons, included in its amended Portfolio Award, once PH units in the original Portfolio Award are converted to RAD PBV units.

## SECTION II – General Operating Information

### A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION

#### i. Actual New Project Based Vouchers

Tenant-based vouchers that the MTW PHA project-based for the first time during the Plan Year. These include only those in which at least an Agreement to enter into a Housing Assistance Payment (AHAP) was in place by the end of the Plan Year. Indicate whether the unit is included in the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD).

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF VOUCHERS NEWLY PROJECT-BASED		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
GA004000405 – Warren Williams	181	0	N/A	N/A	PH units were planned for conversion to long-term Section 8 PBV units under the RAD Program.
GA004000408 – Elizabeth Canty	248	0	N/A	N/A	PH units were planned for conversion to long-term Section 8 PBV units under the RAD Program.
	429	0	<b>Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based</b>		

\* Figures in the "Planned" column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

\*\* Select "Status at the End of Plan Year" from: Committed, Leased/Issued

#### Please describe differences between the Planned and Actual Number of Vouchers Newly Project-Based:

The difference between the Planned and Actual number of vouchers newly project-based is HACG was unable to convert the planned Public Housing (PH) units to long-term Section 8 assisted Project-Based Voucher (PBV) units because some of the planned PH units were in and/or affected by a regulatory floodway.

Therefore, HACG was unable to convert any PH units to PBV units under the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program and did not at least have an Agreement to enter into a Housing Assistance Payment (AHAP) by the end of fiscal year 2018.

**ii. Actual Existing Project Based Vouchers**

Tenant-based vouchers that the MTW PHA is currently project-basing in the Plan Year. These include only those in which at least an AHAP was in place by the beginning of the Plan Year. Indicate whether the unit is included in RAD.

PROPERTY NAME	NUMBER OF PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS		STATUS AT END OF PLAN YEAR**	RAD?	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
	Planned*	Actual			
GA004000406 – Luther C. Wilson	289	288	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000410 – E.E. Farley	102	102	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000412 – Brown Nicholson	100	100	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000416 – EJ Knight	92	92	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000418 – Ashley Station I	73	73	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000419 – Ashley Station II	73	73	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000420 – Arbor Pointe I	18	18	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000421 – Arbor Pointe II	18	18	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000422 – Arbor Pointe III (Cottages)	19	19	Leased/Issued	Yes	Former PH units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000405 – Warren Williams	181	0	Committed	No	PH units planned for PBV conversion under RAD Program
GA004000408 – Elizabeth Canty	248	0	Committed	No	PH units planned for PBV conversion under RAD Program
GA004-000420 – Arbor Pointe I	75	75	Leased/Issued	No	Existing PBV units in Mixed-Income Community
GA004-000421 – Arbor Pointe II	75	75	Leased/Issued	No	Existing PBV units in Mixed-Income Community
GA004-000422 – Arbor Pointe III (Cottages)	101	101	Leased/Issued	No	Existing PBV units in Mixed-Income Community
GA004000630 – Willow Glen	28	28	Leased/Issued	No	Existing PBV units in Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Community

1,492	1,062	<b>Planned/Actual Total Existing Project-Based Vouchers</b>
-------	-------	---

\* Figures and text in the “Planned” column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

\*\* Select “Status at the End of Plan Year” from: Committed, Leased/Issued

**Please describe differences between the Planned and Actual Existing Number of Vouchers Project-Based:**

The difference between the Planned and Actual number of existing vouchers project-based is HACG was unable to convert 429 planned PH units to long-term Section 8 assisted PBV units because some of the planned 429 PH **units were in and/or affected by a regulatory floodway.**

Therefore, HACG **did not at least have an Agreement to enter into a Housing Assistance Payment (AHAP)** by the end of fiscal year 2018.

Additionally, the difference between the Planned and Actual number of existing vouchers project-based at Wilson is the planned vouchers include an off-line unit in its count and the Actual vouchers include livable units. The Actual voucher count mirrors the 582 (part of the 783 units converted under RAD) vouchers listed in the RAD Resource Desk listing.

**iii. Actual Other Changes to MTW Housing Stock in the Plan Year**

Examples of the types of other changes can include (but are not limited to): units held off-line due to relocation or substantial rehabilitation, local, non-traditional units to be acquired/developed, etc.

**ACTUAL OTHER CHANGES TO MTW HOUSING STOCK IN THE PLAN YEAR**

HACG anticipated a rhythmic exchange of units between a modernization contractor and the agency; however, HACG was unable to convert any of its 429 PH units to PBV units under the RAD Program because some of the 429 units planned for conversion were in and/or affected by a floodway. As a result, HACG spent a fair portion of FYE 2018 developing plans to resolve the regulatory floodway issue(s).

Since HACG did not convert any PH units because of regulatory floodway concerns, HACG postponed plans to create an affordable housing PBV and/or workforce housing community. HACG will resume plans to create such a community once it successfully converts the remaining balance of its PH Portfolio Award.

**iv. General Description of All Actual Capital Expenditures During the Plan Year**

Narrative general description of all actual capital expenditures of MTW funds during the Plan Year.

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALL ACTUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES DURING THE PLAN YEAR**

HACG planned \$3.1M in capital expenditures during Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, with much of that total being allocated towards expenses related to the completion of HACG's Public Housing (PH) portfolio conversion under RAD. Actual expenditures totaled \$135k, which went towards predevelopment costs for the RAD conversion as well as for third-party consulting service fees related to RAD conversion as well as purchase and installation of smoke and carbon monoxide detectors identified in the RPCA critical needs category. Additionally, spending included the purchase of two new fleet vehicles (passenger van and utility truck), costs for the re-siding of 3 buildings, roof replacement for 2 buildings, 6 heating units and purchase of gas furnaces at our Columbus Villas community as well as other consulting service fees related to re-development. HACG's planned expenditure of the remaining \$3.0M during FYE 2018 for RAD conversion activity was delayed because the remaining three PH sites in HACG's RAD Portfolio award were each identified as partially lying within or having access that lay within the FEMA-established Regulatory Floodway, therefore rendering those units ineligible for conversion under HUD's RAD program. Meanwhile, HACG initiated a demolition and/or disposition plan for the floodway-affected units for HUD's SAC office consideration. Once HACG receives approval for the floodway-affected units, HACG will move forward with converting the remaining balance of PH units to HUD's RAD Program in FY 2019.

B. LEASING INFORMATION

i. **Actual Number of Households Served**

Snapshot and unit month information on the number of households the MTW PHA actually served at the end of the Plan Year.

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED THROUGH:	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED**	
	Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
MTW Public Housing Units Leased	6,914	6,384	576	532
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized	40,995	38,124	3,416	3,177
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based				
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based				
Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership				
<b>Planned/Actual Totals</b>	<b>47,909</b>	<b>44,508</b>	<b>3,992</b>	<b>3,709</b>

\* “Planned Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased” is the total number of months the MTW PHA planned to have leased/occupied in each category throughout the full Plan Year (as shown in the Annual MTW Plan).

\*\* “Planned Number of Households to be Served” is calculated by dividing the “Planned Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased” by the number of months in the Plan Year (as shown in the Annual MTW Plan).

^^ Figures and text in the “Planned” column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

**Please describe any differences between the planned and actual households served:**

The differences between Planned and Actual MTW PH Households served are attributed to the delayed completion of BTW Redevelopment II (a.k.a. Columbus Commons) units. HACG redeveloped a 392-unit community and began leasing the new community in 2017 (approx. September 2017). This delayed lease period contributes to the differences between Planned and Actual MTW PH Households served.

Also, differences between Planned and Actual Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Households served are attributed to HACG’s strategic decision to leave PH units vacant to relocate families impacted by modernization work at RAD I Project sites. RAD I Project sites, Farley, Knight, Nicholson, and Wilson experienced delayed completion timetables in modernization work. These delays contributed to some families’ decisions not to return to the modernized sites, which all impacted the difference between the Planned and Actual Households served by.

LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL CATEGORY	MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF UNIT MONTHS OCCUPIED/LEASED*		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TO BE SERVED*	
		Planned^^	Actual	Planned^^	Actual
Tenant-Based	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Property-Based	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Homeownership	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Planned/Actual Totals</b>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\* The sum of the figures provided should match the totals provided for each Local, Non-Traditional category in the previous table. Figures should be given by individual activity. Multiple entries may be made for each category if applicable.

^^ Figures and text in the "Planned" column should match the corresponding Annual MTW Plan.

HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL SERVICES ONLY	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS PER MONTH	TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE PLAN YEAR
Program Name/Services Provided	N/A	N/A

**ii. Discussion of Any Actual Issues/Solutions Related to Leasing**

Discussion of any actual issues and solutions utilized in the MTW housing programs listed.

HOUSING PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL LEASING ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS
MTW Public Housing	None
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	None
Local, Non-Traditional	None

C. WAITING LIST INFORMATION

i. Actual Waiting List Information

Snapshot information on the actual status of MTW waiting lists at the end of the Plan Year. The “Description” column should detail the structure of the waiting list and the population(s) served.

WAITING LIST NAME	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ON WAITING LIST	WAITING LIST OPEN, PARTIALLY OPEN OR CLOSED	WAS THE WAITING LIST OPENED DURING THE PLAN YEAR
MTW Public Housing	Community-Wide WL for Conventional PH	2,093	Open	Yes
RAD I PBV Housing	Community-Wide WL for Converted PH	2,305	Open	Yes
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers	Community-Wide WL for traditional HCVs	542	Closed	No
Arbor Pointe I & II	Site Specific WL for Mixed-Income Property	2,248	Open	Yes
Arbor Pointe III (Cottages)	Program Specific WL for Elderly/Disabled Prop.	454	Partially Open	Yes
Columbus Commons	Site Specific WL for Mixed-Income Property	1,513	Partially Open	Yes
Patriot Pointe	Site Specific WL for “Near”-Elderly Property	538	Partially Open	Yes
MTW Next Step Voucher Program	Program Specific WL for Foster Youth Referrals	0	Partially Open	Yes
MTW Rapid Rehousing Voucher Program	Program Specific WL for Homeless Referrals	10	Partially Open	Yes
Single-Room Occupancy	Program Specific WL for Single-Room Certificates	8	Partially Open	Yes
Willow Glen	Specific WL for Perm. Supportive Housing	17	Partially Open	Yes

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:

Some Waiting List duplication may occur because HACG permits and encourages potential eligible residents to consider all affordable communities as potential options. This philosophy promotes housing choice and potentially reduces a family’s wait time to secure affordable housing.

However, some potentially eligible families are limited because of program and/or site eligibility criteria.

Program specific Waiting Lists are all partially open because additional requirements must be met, such as community referral, age requirement, and other eligibility criteria.

Site specific Waiting Lists must be requested at HACG’s Tenant Selection Office (TSO).

**ii. Actual Changes to Waiting List in the Plan Year**

Please describe any actual changes to the organizational structure or policies of the waiting list(s), including any opening or closing of a waiting list, during the Plan Year.

WAITING LIST NAME	DESCRIPTION OF ACTUAL CHANGES TO WAITING LIST
N/A	No Changes Made
N/A	No Changes Made

D. INFORMATION ON STATUTORY OBJECTIVES AND REQUIREMENTS

i. 75% of Families Assisted Are Very Low Income

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory requirement that at least 75% of the households assisted by the MTW PHA are very low income for MTW public housing units and MTW HCVs through HUD systems. The MTW PHA should provide data for the actual families housed upon admission during the PHA’s Plan Year reported in the “Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based”; “Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based”; and “Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership” categories. Do not include households reported in the “Local, Non-Traditional Services Only” category.

INCOME LEVEL	NUMBER OF LOCAL, NON-TRADITIONAL HOUSEHOLDS ADMITTED IN THE PLAN YEAR
80%-50% Area Median Income	N/A
49%-30% Area Median Income	N/A
Below 30% Area Median Income	N/A
<b>Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted</b>	<b>N/A</b>

HACG did not house nor report on any families in any Local, Non-Traditional capacities.

ii. Maintain Comparable Mix

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory requirement that MTW PHAs continue to serve a comparable mix of families by family size by first assessing a baseline mix of family sizes served by the MTW PHA prior to entry into the MTW demonstration (or the closest date with available data) and compare that to the current mix of family sizes served during the Plan Year.

BASELINE MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (upon entry to MTW)					
FAMILY SIZE	OCCUPIED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS	UTILIZED HCVs	NON-MTW ADJUSTMENTS*	BASELINE MIX NUMBER	BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE
1 Person	714	690	0	1,404	35.0%
2 Person	356	416	0	772	19.1%
3 Person	280	542	0	822	20.4%
4 Person	196	374	0	570	14.1%
5 Person	102	197	0	299	7.4%
6+ Person	40	114	0	154	4.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,688</b>	<b>2,333</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,021</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* “Non-MTW Adjustments” are defined as factors that are outside the control of the MTW PHA. An example of an acceptable “Non-MTW Adjustment” would include demographic changes in the community’s overall population. If the MTW PHA includes “Non-MTW Adjustments,” a thorough justification, including information substantiating the numbers given, should be included below.

Please describe the justification for any “Non-MTW Adjustments” given above:

HACG did not have any Non-MTW Adjustments during the reporting period

MIX OF FAMILY SIZES SERVED (in Plan Year)				
FAMILY SIZE	BASELINE MIX PERCENTAGE**	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED IN PLAN YEAR^	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS SERVED IN PLAN YEAR^^	PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM BASELINE YEAR TO CURRENT PLAN YEAR
1 Person	35.0%	1,368	36.8%	1.8%
2 Person	19.1%	657	17.7%	-1.4%
3 Person	20.4%	718	19.4%	-1.0%
4 Person	14.1%	529	14.3%	-0.1%
5 Person	7.4%	253	6.8%	-0.6%
6+ Person	4.0%	184	5.0%	1.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,709</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>

\*\* The "Baseline Mix Percentage" figures given in the "Mix of Family Sizes Served (in Plan Year)" table should match those in the column of the same name in the "Baseline Mix of Family Sizes Served (upon entry to MTW)" table.

^ The "Total" in the "Number of Households Served in Plan Year" column should match the "Actual Total" box in the "Actual Number of Households Served in the Plan Year" table in Section II.B.i of this Annual MTW Report.

^^ The percentages in this column should be calculated by dividing the number in the prior column for each family size by the "Total" number of households served in the Plan Year. These percentages will reflect adjustment to the mix of families served that are due to the decisions of the MTW PHA. Justification of percentages in the current Plan Year that vary by more than 5% from the Baseline Year must be provided below.

**Please describe the justification for any variances of more than 5% between the Plan Year and Baseline Year:**

N/A

**iii. Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency in the Plan Year**

Number of households, across MTW activities, that were transitioned to the MTW PHA's local definition of self-sufficiency during the Plan Year.

MTW ACTIVITY NAME/NUMBER	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY*	MTW PHA LOCAL DEFINITION OF SELF SUFFICIENCY
Community Choice/2014.01	14	120% Voucher households increase earned income by 3% annually
Innovations to Reduce Homelessness/2014.02	106	12 consecutive months of stability (off-the-street)
Innovations to Reduce Homelessness/2014.02	5 <sup>^</sup>	Completion of 24-months of active case management
Rent Reform (Farley)/2014.06	3	Employed for 24 consecutive months
Next Step Vouchers (NSV)/2016.01	0	Completion of 36-months of active case management
	5 <sup>^</sup>	<i>(Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities)</i>
	<b>123</b>	<b>Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>

\* Figures should match the outcome reported where metric SS#8 is used in Section IV of this Annual MTW Report.

<sup>^</sup>Households added in this count are also included in HACG's local definition: "12 Consecutive Months of Stability (time off-the-street)" count. Although these families do not cross-over MTW Activities, HACG reduces the "Total Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency" count to avoid duplication.

### SECTION III – **Proposed MTW Activities**

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

## SECTION IV – Approved MTW Activities

### A. Implemented Activities

i. Activity **2014.01 – Community Choice** was proposed in Fiscal Year End (FYE) 2014, re-proposed in FYE 2015, and **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year 2015.

ii. HACG uses MTW Authorizations D.2.a and D.2.b listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement to issue higher-valued vouchers and restrict voucher use to areas of opportunity to study how these elements impact and/or influence activity participating families. This activity created 3 evaluation groups of Tenant-Based Voucher (TBV)-holding families.

Through use of the MTW Authorizations, HACG modifies the payment standards for two evaluation groups and modifies the content of the contract rental agreement to restrict one evaluation group. Higher-valued vouchers are set at 120% of the jurisdiction’s Fair Market Rent (FMR). Restricted vouchers are limited to 16 low-poverty Census Tracts within HACG’s service area. The third evaluation group is left unaltered to serve as the comparison/control group. The activity solicited families from HACG’s MTW Housing Choice Voucher’s (HCV) Waiting List to voluntarily fill slots in one of the evaluation groups. The evaluation groups are outlined below:

Evaluation Group	Flexibility	Comments
Community-Wide	40 TBVs at 120% FMR	No restrictions
Location Restricted	40 TBVs at 120% FMR	Restricted to low-poverty areas identified by HACG
Comparison/Control	None	40 TBVs at normal issuance (90% of FMR)

As of June 30, 2018, this activity continues to promote socio-economic diversity in Columbus by encouraging and requiring low-income families to live in low-poverty areas. At the beginning of this activity, July 2014, 9 (9.3%) of the volunteering families already lived in low-poverty areas. At the end of this reporting period, only 1/3 of the families participating in the activity lived in low-poverty areas. This is a 23.7% increase over 2014.

The increase in families moving to low-poverty areas does not accurately reflect a paradigm shift among low-income families with a higher valued voucher. In fact, the Community-Wide evaluation families remained unchanged and the Comparison/Control evaluation families dropped 50% during the same timeframe. Further, only 85% of the families restricted to low-poverty areas continued to live in those areas at the end of the reporting period.

The data suggests that higher-valued vouchers did not significantly influence where families chose to live. The data, in fact, seems to continue to support the theory that people choose familiarity and convenience, including low-income families, when choosing where to live. Whether familiarity includes good areas or bad areas, the knowledge of surroundings, shopping, banking, bus routes, or other community elements, familiarity and convenience seem to play a bigger role in housing selection than cost.

HACG will close-out this activity at the end of its 2019 fiscal year (June 30, 2019). This activity does not meet the definition of Rent Reform. The **HUD Standard Metrics** for this activity are below:

<b>SS #1: Increase in Household Income - Community Choice</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).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy <i>prior to [after]</i> implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of <b>Community-Wide</b> households affected by this policy.	Total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$9,366,439  Number of households = 1345  <b>Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 6,964	Expected total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$235,147  Expected number of households = 36  <b>Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 6,532	Actual total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$271,245  Actual number of households = 39  <b>Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 6,955	Exceeds Benchmark

<b>SS #1: Increase in Household Income - Community Choice</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average earned income of <b>Location Restricted</b> households affected by this policy.	Total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$9,366,439  Number of households = 1345  <b>Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 6,964	Expected total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$310,407  Expected number of households = 36  <b>Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 8,622	Actual total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$332,544  Actual number of households = 39  <b>Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 8,527	Benchmark Not Achieved

**SS #1: Increase in Household Income - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of Comparison/Control households affected by this policy.	Total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$9,366,439	Expected total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$210,413	Actual total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$289,919	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of households = 1345	Expected number of households = 37	Actual number of households = 37	
	<b>Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	\$ 6,964	\$ 5,687	\$ 7,836	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

*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:	Head(s) of households (HoH) in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time				
(2) Employed Part-Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Community-Wide Households Working Fulltime</b>	Number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 34	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 36	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 8	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 9	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  23.5%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  25.0%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Community-Wide Households Working Part Time</b>	Number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 34	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 36	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 8	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 9	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  23.5%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  25.0%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Community-Wide Households Unemployed</b>	Number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 34	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 36	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 14	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 19	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Unemployed Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>  41.2%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>  52.8%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Location Restricted Households Working Fulltime</b>	Number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 30	Actual number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 31	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 0	Expected number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 9	Actual number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 12	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>  30.0%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>  38.7%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Location Restricted Households Working Part Time</b>	Number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 30	Actual number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 31	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 0	Expected number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 9	Actual number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 8	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  30.0%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  25.8%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Location Restricted Households Unemployed</b>	Number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 30	Actual number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 31	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 0	Expected number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 8	Actual number of Location Restricted, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 13	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  26.7%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  41.9%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Comparison/Control</b> Households Working <b>Fulltime</b>	Number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 31	Actual number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 31	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 0	Expected number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 6	Actual number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 9	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  19.4%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  29.0%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Comparison/Control</b> Households Working <b>Part Time</b>	Number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 31	Actual number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 31	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 0	Expected number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 7	Actual number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 9	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  22.6%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  29.0%	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Comparison/Control</b> Households Unemployed	Number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 31	Actual number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 31	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 0	Expected number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 12	Actual number of Comparison/Control, work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 14	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  38.7%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  45.2%	

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Community-Wide</b> Households Receiving TANF	Number of Community-Wide households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide households after implementation of the activity = 36	Actual number of Community-Wide households after implementation of the activity = 39	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0%	Expected percent of households receiving TANF = 1.7%	Actual percent of households receiving TANF = 2.6%	
	<b>Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0	<b>Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.6	<b>Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  1.0	

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Location Restricted</b> Households Receiving TANF	Number of Community-Wide households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide households after implementation of the activity = 36	Actual number of Community-Wide households after implementation of the activity = 39	Exceeds Benchmark
	Percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0%	Expected percent of households receiving TANF = 2.0%	Actual percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0%	
	<b>Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Comparison/Control</b> Households Receiving TANF	Number of Community-Wide households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Community-Wide households after implementation of the activity = 37	Actual number of Community-Wide households after implementation of the activity = 37	Exceeds Benchmark
	Percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0%	Expected percent of households receiving TANF = 0.7%	Actual percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0%	
	<b>Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	

<b>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households - Community Choice</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).	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.
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per <b>Community-Wide</b> household affected by this policy	Monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) prior to implementation of the activity = \$1,057,990	Expected monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) after implementation of the activity = \$25,423	Actual monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) after implementation of the activity = \$25,458	Exceeds Benchmark
	Monthly number of units leased = 2,155	Expected monthly number of units leased = 36	Actual monthly number of units leased = 39	
	<b>Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	\$ 491	\$ 706	\$ 653	

<b>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households - Community Choice</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 <b>Location Restricted</b> household affected by this policy	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.
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per <b>Location Restricted</b> household affected by this policy	Monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) prior to implementation of the activity = \$1,057,990	Expected monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) after implementation of the activity = \$26,167	Actual monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) after implementation of the activity = \$24,702	Exceeds Benchmark
	Monthly number of units leased = 2,155	Expected monthly number of units leased = 36	Actual monthly number of units leased = 39	
	<b>Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	\$ 491	\$ 727	\$ 633	

<b>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households - Community Choice</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 Comparison/Control household affected by this policy	Monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) prior to implementation of the activity = \$1,057,990	Expected monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) after implementation of the activity = \$16,625	Actual monthly Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) after implementation of the activity = \$15,081	Exceeds Benchmark
	Monthly number of units leased = 2,155	Expected monthly number of units leased = 37	Actual monthly number of units leased = 37	
	<b>Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Average Section 8 Subsidy per Household Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	\$ 491	\$ 449	\$ 408	

<b>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency - Community Choice</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.	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.
Number of Community-Wide households transitioned to self sufficiency	Voucher families housed with 120% voucher = 0	Expected voucher families housed with 120% voucher = 36	Actual voucher families housed with 120% voucher = 39	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Housing months available = 0	Expected housing months available = 48	Actual housing months available = 43	
	<b>Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	0	44	38	

**SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of <b>Location Restricted</b> households transitioned to self sufficiency	Voucher families housed with <b>120%</b> voucher = 0	Expected voucher families housed with <b>120%</b> voucher = 36	Actual voucher families housed with <b>120%</b> voucher = 39	Exceeds Benchmark
	Housing months available = 0	Expected housing months available = 48	Actual housing months available = 44	
	<b>Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>0</b>	<b>Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>30</b>	<b>Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>39</b>	

**SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of <b>Comparison/Control</b> households transitioned to self sufficiency	Voucher families housed with <b>standard</b> issued voucher = 0	Expected voucher families housed with <b>standard</b> issued voucher = 37	Actual voucher families housed with <b>standard</b> issued voucher = 37	Exceeds Benchmark
	Housing months available = 12	Expected housing months available = 48	Actual housing months available = 42	
	<b>Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>0</b>	<b>Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>29</b>	<b>Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>37</b>	

<b>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility - Community Choice</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).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of <b>Community-Wide</b> households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	Total number of households issued <b>120%</b> voucher to access areas of opportunity = 0  Percent of households living in low-poverty area = Unk%  <b>Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  4	Expected total number of households issued <b>120%</b> voucher to access areas of opportunity = 36  Expected percent of households living in low-poverty area = 10.9%  <b>Expected Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  4	Actual end-of-year (EOY) households with a <b>120%</b> voucher with access to areas of opportunity = 35  Actual percent of households living in low-poverty area = 11.4%  <b>Actual Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  4	Exceeds Benchmark

<b>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility - Community Choice</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of <b>Location Restricted</b> households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	Total number of households issued <b>120%</b> voucher to access areas of opportunity = 0  Percent of households living in low-poverty area = Unk%  <b>Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  3	Expected total number of households issued <b>120%</b> voucher to access areas of opportunity = 35  Expected percent of households living in low-poverty area = 97.9%  <b>Expected Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  34	Actual EOY households with a <b>120%</b> voucher with access to areas of opportunity = 36  Actual percent of households living in low-poverty area = 91.7%  <b>Actual Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  33	Benchmark Not Achieved

**HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility - Community Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of <b>Comparison/Control</b> households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	Total number of households issued <b>standard</b> voucher to access areas of opportunity = 0	Expected total number of households issued <b>standard</b> voucher to access areas of opportunity = 37	Actual EOY households with a <b>standard</b> voucher with access to areas of opportunity = 32	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Percent of households living in low-poverty area = Unk%	Expected percent of households living in low-poverty area = 16.1%	Actual percent of households living in low-poverty area = 3.1%	
	<b>Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	2	6	1	

**COMMUNITY CHOICE ANNUAL BENCHMARK**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Average earned income of <b>Community-Wide</b> households affected by this policy in dollars	\$ 6,964	\$ 6,532	\$ 7,094	\$ 7,020	\$ 7,084	\$ 7,120
Average earned income of <b>Location Restricted</b> households affected by this policy in dollars	\$ 6,964	\$ 8,622	\$ 8,911	\$ 8,843	\$ 8,710	\$ 8,769
Average earned income of <b>Comparison/Control</b> households affected by this policy in dollars	\$ 6,964	\$ 5,687	\$ 8,215	\$ 8,321	\$ 8,162	\$ 8,189
<b>Community-Wide</b> households employed Fulltime	0.0%	23.5%	27.3%	29.4%	29.4%	32.4%
<b>Community-Wide</b> households employed Part Time	0.0%	23.5%	24.2%	23.5%	23.5%	23.5%
<b>Community-Wide</b> households Unemployed	0.0%	41.2%	63.6%	73.5%	82.4%	85.3%
<b>Location Restricted</b> households employed Fulltime	0.0%	30.0%	35.7%	37.9%	37.9%	37.9%
<b>Location Restricted</b> households employed Part Time	0.0%	30.0%	32.1%	31.0%	31.0%	31.0%
<b>Location Restricted</b> households Unemployed	0.0%	26.7%	25.0%	20.7%	20.7%	20.7%
<b>Comparison/Control</b> households employed Fulltime	0.0%	19.4%	25.8%	29.0%	32.3%	31.3%
<b>Comparison/Control</b> households employed Part Time	0.0%	22.6%	25.8%	29.0%	29.0%	28.1%
<b>Comparison/Control</b> households Unemployed	0.0%	38.7%	32.3%	32.3%	29.0%	28.1%

**COMMUNITY CHOICE ANNUAL BENCHMARK - continued**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
<b>Community-Wide</b> households receiving TANF assistance	0	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
<b>Location Restricted</b> households receiving TANF assistance	0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
<b>Comparison/Control</b> households receiving TANF assistance	0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3
Average Section 8 subsidy per <b>Community-Wide</b> household	\$ 491	\$ 706	\$ 847	\$ 806	\$ 806	\$ 806
Average Section 8 subsidy per <b>Location Restricted</b> household	\$ 491	\$ 727	\$ 890	\$ 846	\$ 824	\$ 824
Average Section 8 subsidy per <b>Comparison/Control</b> household	\$ 491	\$ 449	\$ 449	\$ 439	\$ 428	\$ 428
Number of <b>Community-Wide</b> households transitioned to self sufficiency ( <i>12+ consecutive months of residency</i> )	0	44	38	38	37	37
Number of <b>Location Restricted</b> households transitioned to self sufficiency ( <i>12+ consecutive months of residency</i> )	0	30	40	40	39	39
Number of <b>Comparison/Control</b> households transitioned to self sufficiency ( <i>12+ consecutive months of residency</i> )	0	29	23	23	22	22
Number of <b>Community-Wide</b> households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	4	4	4	4	4	4
Number of <b>Location Restricted</b> households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	3	34	32	33	33	33
Number of <b>Comparison/Control</b> households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	2	6	1	1	1	1

iii. HACG planned a **Non-Significant Change** to this activity in its Fiscal Year End (FYE) 2019 Annual MTW Plan. **HACG elected to close-out this activity at the end of Fiscal Year 2019.** Close-out steps are initiated in HACG’s 2019 Annual MTW Plan and continue here.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>1</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

<sup>1</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved**, HACG primarily attributes these shortfalls to the local economy, voucher attrition, and choice mobility. Columbus’ economy continues to experience slow growth and of those hiring, the dominant sectors are skilled-labor positions and food service, hospitality-oriented jobs. Additionally, Columbus’ unemployment rate (5.1%)<sup>2</sup> continues to outpace GA cities of similar size, such as the City of Augusta-Richmond County (4.6%)<sup>1</sup>, a city of comparable size and government make-up, the City of Atlanta (4.4%)<sup>1</sup>, the State’s Capitol, and the State of Georgia (4.4%)<sup>1</sup>.

Meanwhile, voucher attrition encompasses administrative and tenant-based actions, such as failure to meet family obligations, voucher expiration, and similar. It also includes family successes such as over-income and voluntary terminations. Choice mobility actions include resident moves out of HACG’s service jurisdiction that prompt program termination.

i. Activity **2014.02 – Innovations to Reduce Homelessness** was introduced and **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year 2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014).

ii. MTW Authorizations D.2.a, D.2.b, and D.4 listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement were used to designate up to 150 Tenant-Based Vouchers (**TBVs**) as MTW Rapid Rehousing Vouchers (**RRVs**) for properly referred chronically homeless families. This activity models the *Housing First* approach to quickly connect chronically homeless individuals and families to shelter and case management. Additionally, the authorizations allowed HACG to waive the minimum rent<sup>3</sup> for zero-income veterans, to create a Waiting List preference for veterans, and to create a Tiered Rent Schedule for veterans returning to the workforce.

The intent of the activity seeks to learn if the “rapid” housing concept reduces the homeless population in the area and if the voucher issuance, with required case management, helps to stabilize participating families. The activity collaborates efforts with Home for Good, the area’s Continuum of Care Committee, service providers, and other organizations to house and case manage activity participants. Since the activity’s approval, HACG has earmarked vouchers each fiscal year for this endeavor; the breakdown is tabled below:

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Vouchers Designated</b>	<b>Rolling Voucher Count</b>
FYE 2014	30	30
FYE 2015	50	80
FYE 2016	40	120
FYE 2017	30	150

As of June 30, 2018, this activity continues to receive an “open-armed” reception by the homeless prevention community, city officials, and participants alike. HACG is pleased with the feedback and positive impact that this activity has made. HACG continued to

<sup>2</sup> Source: GA Department of Labor (GA DOL) Area Unemployment Rate and Labor Force Estimates

<sup>3</sup> Minimum rent waived for first 12-months of lease for newly admitted, unemployed, work-able veterans

strengthen the referral process through Home for Good (HfG) and delivery of case management services primarily provided through New Horizons Community Service Board.

This activity has experienced a level of success not originally anticipated by HACG. Of the active families participating in this activity, the average time off-the-street is 2.5 years. Even families terminated from this activity averaged 1.5 years of stability before they were terminated. This data seems to support the *Housing First* theory that once families are off the street, they can address other issues and begin the stabilization process. Meanwhile, the positive impact of the activity continues to encourage HACG to administer this activity at a high-level.

This activity is on schedule and does not meet the definition of rent reform. The **HUD Standard Metrics** for this activity are below:

<b><i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness</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).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of <b>Chronically Homeless</b> households affected by this policy.	Total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$86,877	Expected total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$574,130	Actual total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$486,677	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of households = 28	Expected number of households = 145	Actual number of households = 128	
	<b>Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	\$ 3,103	\$ 3,960	\$ 3,802	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness**

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:				
(1) Employed Full-Time				
(2) Employed Part-Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Chronically Homeless Households Working Fulltime</b>	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 26  Number of work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 1  <b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  3.8%	Expected number of work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 122  Expected number of work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 13  <b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  10.7%	Actual number of work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 104  Actual number of work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 17  <b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	Exceeds Benchmark

<b>SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
<b>Chronically Homeless Households Working Part Time</b>	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 26	Expected number of work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 122	Actual number of work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 104	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 7	Expected number of work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 31	Actual number of work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 17	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part time Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  26.9%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  25.4%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	
<b>Chronically Homeless Households Unemployed</b>	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 26	Expected number of work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 122	Actual number of work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 104	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 18	Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 59	Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 74	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  69.2%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  48.4%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  71.2%	

<b>SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness</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).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Chronically Homeless Households Receiving TANF</b>	Number of households in activity = 28	Expected number of households in activity after implementation = 145	Actual number of households in activity after implementation = 128	Exceeds Benchmark
	Percent of households receiving TANF = 7.1%	Expected percent of households receiving TANF = 2.2%	Actual percent of households receiving TANF = 2.3%	
	<b>Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  2.0	<b>Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  3.2	<b>Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  2.9	

**SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) 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.
Number of <b>Chronically Homeless</b> households transitioned to self sufficiency	<p>Number of housing months available = 8</p> <p>Total number of housing months = 224</p> <p><b>Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="center"><b>0</b></p>	<p>Expected number of housing months available = 12</p> <p>Expected total number of housing months = 1350</p> <p><b>Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="center"><b>111</b></p>	<p>Actual number of housing months available = 12</p> <p>Actual total number of housing months = 4773</p> <p><b>Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="center"><b>106</b></p>	Benchmark Not Achieved

**INNOVATIONS TO REDUCE HOMELESSNESS ANNUAL BENCHMARKS**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Average earned income of <b>Chronically Homeless</b> households affected by this policy in dollars	\$ 3,103	\$ 3,960	\$ 4,017	\$ 3,659	\$ 3,825	\$ 3,829
<b>Chronically Homeless</b> households employed Fulltime	3.8%	10.7%	12.3%	13.1%	12.5%	12.5%
<b>Chronically Homeless</b> households employed Part Time	26.9%	25.4%	23.8%	23.1%	21.5%	20.8%
<b>Chronically Homeless</b> households Unemployed	69.2%	48.4%	51.5%	54.6%	52.1%	51.4%
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	2.0	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.2
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (12+ consecutive months of residency)	0	111	98	105	105	102

iii. HACG did not plan any **Non-Significant Changes** to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>4</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved**, HACG primarily attributes these shortfalls to the local economy and transition period. Columbus' economy continues to experience slow growth and of those hiring, the dominant sectors are skilled-labor positions and food service, hospitality-oriented jobs. Additionally, Columbus' unemployment rate (5.1%)<sup>5</sup> continues to outpace GA cities of similar size, such as the City of Augusta-Richmond County (4.6%)<sup>5</sup>, a city of comparable size and government make-up, the City of Atlanta (4.4%)<sup>5</sup>, the State's Capitol, and the State of Georgia (4.4%)<sup>5</sup>.

Meanwhile, transition encompasses stabilization period – first 12-months and other periods that a chronically homeless individual/family may take more time to reach than a family that never experienced homelessness.

i. Activity **2014.03 – Administrative Reforms** was **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year 2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014). in the same fiscal period as approval.

ii. HACG uses MTW Authorizations D.2.b, D.3.a, and D.3.b to exclude asset income, to permit self-certification of assets, and to eliminate the income cap under the Housing Choice Voucher (**HCV**) Program. Under this activity, HACG seeks to learn if these streamlining measures help to promote cost efficiency and housing choice, while reducing the “evasion” perception felt by many HCV Program participants.

Asset income received from assets totaling less than \$50,000 are excluded from the income calculation. Once assets are verified, usually during the intake process, HCV participants can self-certify their assets during recertification examinations. Asset totals are subject to random verification. HCV Program participants with assets at or above the threshold will have the income received off assets included in their household income calculation and factored into their rent share.

Under the conventional HCV requirements, families cannot use more than 40% of their income toward rent. Through this activity, HACG eliminates this cap and allows families to use up to 50% of their income towards rent. As a result, HACG essentially sets the rent burden cap at 50%. Under no circumstances will residents be allowed to use more

---

<sup>4</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

<sup>5</sup> Source: GA Department of Labor (GA DOL) Area Unemployment Rate and Labor Force Estimates

than 50% of their income toward rent. This calculation is monitored at initial, annual, and interim examinations.

The feedback received to date indicates that staff and residents are supportive of this activity. However, this activity is not without its challenges. HACG continues to administer multiple rental assistance programs simultaneously and the rules, requirements, and flexibilities sometimes blend together. Because of conversion activities under the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program and HACG’s use of Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) funds, HACG closed out the Public Housing (PH) element of the activity.

This activity remains on schedule as an *HCV only activity*. It does not meet the definition of rent reform and the HUD Standard Metrics for this activity are tabled below:

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Administrative Reforms</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.
Total cost of task (Certification Examinations) in dollars	Number of annual examinations: HCV = 2155; PH = 1497	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 2483; PH = 1457	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,406; PH = 1,036	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours	Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.67 hours	Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.00 hours; PH = 1.83 hours	
	Average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$24.76; PH Housing Managers = \$28.41	Expected average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$26.27; PH Housing Managers = \$30.15	Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.92; PH Housing Managers = \$32.04	
	<b>Cost of Task <i>Prior to</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Cost of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Cost of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	<b>\$ 107,874</b>	<b>\$ 97,254</b>	<b>\$ 97,548</b>	

**CE #2: Staff Time Savings - Administrative Reforms**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task (Certification Examinations) in staff hours	Number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,155; PH = 1,497  Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours  <b>Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  4,108.5	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457  Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.67 hours  <b>Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  3,447.5	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,406; PH = 1,036  Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.00 hours; PH = 1.83 hours  <b>Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  3,353.9	Exceeds Benchmark

**CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution - Administrative Reforms**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a task	Number of quality control checks: HCV = 37; PH = 146  Number of errors noted: HCV = 7; PH = 22  <b>Average Error Rate of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	Expected number of quality control checks: HCV = 124; PH = 73  Expected number of errors noted: HCV = 21; PH = 13  <b>Expected Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  17.2%	Actual number of quality control checks: HCV = 447; PH = 191  Actual number of errors noted: HCV = 52; PH = 40  <b>Actual Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	Exceeds Benchmark

**CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share - Administrative Reforms**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue	<p>Monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$314,834; PH = \$181,638</p> <p>Average monthly housing units for HCV = 2155; PH = 1497</p> <p><b>Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="right">\$ 136</p>	<p>Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$459,006; PH = \$121,299</p> <p>Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 2483; PH = 1457</p> <p><b>Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="right">\$ 147</p>	<p>Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$446,324; PH = \$121,329</p> <p>Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 3,101; PH = 896</p> <p><b>Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="right">\$ 140</p>	Benchmark Not Achieved

**HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility - Administrative Reforms**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity	<p>Number of HCV units = 2155</p> <p>Percent of HCV families exceeding the 40% Income Cap = 17.0%</p> <p><b>Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="center">366</p>	<p>Expected number of HCV units = 2483</p> <p>Expected percent of HCV families exceeding the 40% Income Cap = 14.0%</p> <p><b>Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="center">348</p>	<p>Actual number of HCV units = 3,101</p> <p>Actual percent of HCV families exceeding the 40% Income Cap = 6.4%</p> <p><b>Actual Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity:</b></p> <p align="center">200</p>	Benchmark Not Achieved

<b>ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS ANNUAL BENCHMARK</b>						
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>
Total cost of task in dollars	\$ 107,874	\$ 97,254	\$ 97,254	\$ 107,901	\$ 111,145	\$ 97,254
Total time to complete the task in staff hours	4108.5	3447.5	3447.5	3605.1	3605.1	3447.5
Average error rate (percentage) in completing task	16.3%	17.2%	17.2%	15.2%	15.2%	17.2%
Tenant rental revenue	\$ 136	\$ 147	\$ 147	\$ 153	\$ 147	\$ 147
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity	366	348	348	328	328	348

iii. HACG did not plan any **Non-Significant Changes** to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>6</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved**, HACG attributes these shortfalls to the full portfolio conversion award from PH units to Section 8 PBV units under RAD and HACG's use of Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (**LIHTC**) funds. The continued conversion process and additional demands required to meet LIHTC compliance prevented HACG from meeting benchmarks under some metrics listed above.

i. Activity **2014.04 – Administrative Efficiency** was **Approved and Implemented** during fiscal year (**FY**) 2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014). The implementation process took effect on annual effective dates, so full implementation of this activity overlapped into FY 2015 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015).

ii. HACG uses MTW Authorization D.1.c listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement to create local forms and restructure the review process of elderly and/or disabled families. From this activity, HACG seeks to learn if these actions promote efficiency within the recertification examination process.

With the ability to create and/or modify relevant forms for local use with minimal approval delay and move qualified families from an annual examination schedule to a triennial examination schedule, Housing Choice Voucher (**HCV**) Occupancy Specialists will

<sup>6</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

have more time to spend with challenging, multi-family, multi-income, multi-program recertification examinations. Households must meet eligibility and income parameters:

A: Eligibility

Head-of-Household Classification	Definition
Elderly	Must be <i>62 or older prior to annual</i> certification review
Disabled	Must <i>meet disability definition</i> and <i>receive compensation</i> for such
Elderly and Disabled	Must be <i>62 or older AND meet disability definition</i> AND <i>receive compensation</i> for such

B: Income

Head-of-Household Income Source(s)
<p>Must be from <i>fixed, stable</i> income sources, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Pension</li> <li>✓ Social Security (SS)</li> <li>✓ SS Disability Insurance (SSDI)</li> <li>✓ Veteran Affairs (VA) Benefits</li> </ul>

**Note:** Social Security Insurance (SSI) is available to non-workers or workers with limited work credit, e.g., minors, therefore, HACG cautions its Housing Managers and Occupancy Specialists to verify SSI recipient before adding household to the 3-year review schedule.

Households that include a fluctuating income source are returned to and remain on an annual recertification schedule regardless if the Head-of-Household (HoH) meets the activity's definition.

Scenario examples that nullify 3-year review schedule are listed below:

Head-of-Household Classification	Household Income Source(s)	Comments
Elderly, Disabled, or Elderly and Disabled	<p>Eligible income AND/OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Child Support</li> <li>✓ Employment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (FT, PT, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Military Pay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (Active or Reserve)</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ PHA Stipend</li> <li>✓ Unemployment</li> <li>✓ And/Or similar incomes</li> </ul>	Ineligible for Triennial Review Schedule

Although HACG continues to receive positive feedback about this activity, this activity does not appear to have the impact as originally anticipated. Analysis of this activity attributes some of the lackluster impact to its portfolio conversion under the Rental Assistance Demonstration (**RAD**) Program and the use of Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (**LIHTC**) funds. These programs have requirements that make this activity flexibility null. Because of this, HACG closed-out the Public Housing (**PH**) elements of this activity.

Further factors of the performance analysis include HACG’s Housing Choice Voucher (**HCV**) staff conducts “mini-interims” annually on triennial families. The HCV staff updates triennial files with annual calculations of the family’s “new” rent as if the family were still recertifying annually. HCV staff accomplishes this to minimize the “sticker shock” effect to families when they see their new three years later. This HCV courtesy may not add a substantial amount of time, but it does not allow HACG to fully maximize process efficiencies.

This activity remains on schedule and meets the definition of rent reform. HACG has not received any written hardship requests. The **HUD Standard Metrics** for this activity are listed below:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Administrative Efficiency</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.
Total cost of task (Certification Examinations) in dollars	Number of elderly/disabled annual examinations: HCV = 904; PH = 704	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 819; PH = 481	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,249; PH = 193	Exceeds Benchmark
	Average time to complete examinations: HCV = .92 hours; PH = 1.25 hours	Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.83 hours	Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.25 hours; PH = 1.17 hours	
	Average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$24.76; PH Housing Managers = \$28.41	Expected average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$26.27; PH Housing Managers = \$30.15	Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.92; PH Housing Managers = \$32.04	
	<b>Cost of Task <i>Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>	<b>Expected Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>	<b>Actual Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>	
	<b>\$ 23,089</b>	<b>\$ 33,556</b>	<b>\$ 25,413</b>	

**CE #2: Staff Time Savings - Administrative Efficiency**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete task (Certification Examinations) in staff hours	Number of elderly/disabled annual examinations: HCV = 904; PH = 704  Average time to complete examinations: HCV = .92 hours; PH = 1.25 hours  <b>Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  868.3	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 819; PH = 481  Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.83 hours  <b>Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  1,189.5	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,249; PH = 193  Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.25 hours; PH = 1.17 hours  <b>Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  1,674.2	Benchmark Not Achieved

**CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share - Administrative Efficiency**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue	Monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$132,054; PH = \$148,108  Average monthly housing units for HCV = 904; PH = 704  <b>Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 174	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$222,242; PH = \$81,057  Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 819; PH = 481  <b>Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 233	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$416,426; PH = \$66,080  Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 1,249; PH = 193  <b>Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 338	Exceeds Benchmark

**ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY ANNUAL BENCHMARK**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total cost of task in dollars	\$ 23,089	\$ 33,556	\$ 30,574	\$ 27,296	\$ 25,791	\$ 26,308
Total time to complete the task in staff hours	868.3	1,189.5	1,052.1	912.0	836.6	828.6
Tenant (elderly/disabled) rental revenue	\$ 174	\$ 233	\$ 191	\$ 288	\$ 266	\$ 275

iii. HACG did not plan any **Non-Significant Changes** to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>7</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved**, HACG attributes these shortfalls to the full portfolio conversion award from PH units to Section 8 PBV units under RAD and HACG's use of LIHTC funds. The continued conversion process and additional demands required to meet LIHTC compliance prevented HACG from meeting benchmarks under some metrics listed above.

i. Activity **2015.02 – Portability Restrictions** was **Approved** in fiscal year (FY) 2015 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015) **and Implemented** in FY 2016 (July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016). HACG used the approval year, 2015, to identify existing ports for “grandfathering” purposes and notify other Public Housing Agencies/Authorities (**PHAs**) of its new policy.

ii. The activity utilizes MTW Authorization D.1.g listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement to establish its own Housing Choice Voucher (**HCV**) portability policies with other MTW PHAs and non-MTW PHAs.

Because port-in and port-out HCVs can significantly impact the budget authority and influence the amount of families that HACG can assist, HACG uses this activity to limit the number of HCVs that enter or leave HACG's jurisdiction to verifiable employment reasons. HACG wants to ensure that its budget authority is robust enough to assist as many local families as possible, by reducing payments to higher jurisdictions and/or masquerading as a collection agency to get payments from other jurisdictions. These activities, paying higher jurisdictions or collecting payments, require a significant commitment of resources with minimal benefit to local families.

Therefore, HCV families seeking to port-into HACG's service jurisdiction need to secure a transfer letter on company letterhead or similar document. HCV families must have at least 6 months of consecutive employment with the company before HACG will approve and/or absorb the incoming port. Similarly, HACG families seeking to port-out of HACG's service jurisdiction need to secure an offer letter or intent to employ statement on company letterhead, a transfer letter/orders from the company, or substantially similar document before HACG will approve the outgoing port. Families that lose their employment within the first six months of porting may also lose their rental assistance benefits through absorption denial, and termination of payment to an outside PHA.

---

<sup>7</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

Although this activity limits the movement of vouchers to ensure that HACG’s budget authority is robust enough to assist local families, HACG also understands that some moves may be required beyond employment reasons, such as medical and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) related reasons. HACG is committed to meeting such requirements on a case-by-case basis through written hardship submitted to the Tenant Selection Office (TSO).

This activity remains on schedule and does not meet the definition of rent reform. HACG has not received any remarkable feedback, positive or negative, regarding the limitations placed on HCV portability and since implementation of this activity, the Agency has not received any hardship requests beyond Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) voucher related requests, which are not impacted by this activity.

The HUD Standard Metrics for this activity are shown below:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Portability Restrictions</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.
Total cost of task (Port Certification Examinations) in dollars	Number of annual port examinations: In = 63; Out = 91	Expected number of annual port examinations: In = 63; Out = 91	Actual number of annual port examinations: In = 58; Out = 21	Exceeds Benchmark
	Average time to complete HCV examinations = 2.25 hours	Expected average time to complete HCV examinations = 1.83 hours	Actual average time to complete HCV examinations = 2.00 hours	
	Average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$24.76	Expected average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$26.27	Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.92	
	<b>Cost of Task <i>Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>	<b>Expected Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>	<b>Actual Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i></b>	
	\$ 8,579	\$ 7,403	\$ 4,411	

**CE #2: Staff Time Savings - Portability Restrictions**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task (Certification Examinations) in staff hours	Number of annual port examinations: In = 63; Out = 91  Average time to complete port examinations = 2.25 hours  <b>Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  346.5	Expected number of annual port examinations: In = 63; Out = 91  Expected average time to complete port examinations = 1.83 hours  <b>Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  269.5	Actual number of annual port examinations: In = 58; Out = 21  Actual average time to complete port examinations = 2.00 hours  <b>Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  158.0	Exceeds Benchmark

**CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share - Portability Restrictions**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue	Monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$314,834  Average monthly housing units for HCV = 2155  <b>Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 146	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$22,038  Expected average monthly port units: In = 63; Out = 91  <b>Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 143	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$9,750  Actual average monthly port units: In = 58; Out = 21  <b>Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 123	Benchmark Not Achieved

**SS #1: Increase in Household Income - Portability Restrictions**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy <i>prior to [after]</i> implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of <b>Port</b> households affected by this policy.	Total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$9,366,439  Number of households = 1345  <b>Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 6,964	Expected total earned income of port households affected by this policy = \$1,061,676  Expected number of port households: In = 63; Out = 91  <b>Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 6,894	Actual total earned income of port households affected by this policy = \$375,276  Actual number of port households: In = 58; Out = 21  <b>Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 4,750	Benchmark Not Achieved

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Portability Restrictions**

*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:				
(1) Employed Full-Time	Head(s) of households (HoH) in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(2) Employed Part-Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Portability Restrictions**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Port Households Working Fulltime</b>	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 154	Actual number of Port work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 20	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 0	Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 116	Actual number of Port work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 8	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  75.3%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  40.0%	
<b>Port Households Working Part Time</b>	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 154	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 20	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 0	Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 38	Actual number of Community-Wide, work-able (19-61) households employed Part Time = 28	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  24.7%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  140.0%	
<b>Port Households Unemployed</b>	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0	Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 154	Actual number of Port work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 20	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 0	Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 0	Actual number of Port work-able (19-61) households Unemployed = 7	
	<b>Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  0.0%	<b>Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  35.0%	

*The Part Time category exceeds 100% because families report multiple part time employment*

<b>SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) - Portability Restrictions</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).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<b>Port Households Receiving TANF</b>	Number of households prior to implementation of the activity = 0  Percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0%  <b>Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>0.0</b>	Expected number of Port households after implementation of the activity: In = 63; Out = 91  Expected percent of Port households receiving TANF = 0.0%  <b>Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>0.0</b>	Actual number of Port households after implementation of the activity: In = 58; Out = 21  Actual percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0%  <b>Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>0.0</b>	Meets Benchmark

<b>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency - Portability Restrictions</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.	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.
Number of <b>Port</b> households transitioned to self sufficiency	Port families housed: In = 63; Out = 91  <b>Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Portability households reporting earned income) Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>0</b>	Expected Port families housed: In = 63; Out = 91  <b>Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Portability households reporting earned income) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>9</b>	Actual Port families housed: In = 58; Out = 21  <b>Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Portability households reporting earned income) After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>12</b>	Exceeds Benchmark

<b>PORTABILITY RESTRICTIONS ANNUAL BENCHMARK</b>						
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>
Total cost of task in dollars	\$ 8,579	\$ 7,403	\$ 7,073	\$ 7,054	\$ 6,220	\$ 6,391
Total time to complete the task in staff hours	346.5	269.5	261.4	253.3	217.2	217.2
Tenant rental revenue	\$ 146	\$ 143	\$ 144	\$ 144	\$ 144	\$ 147
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars	\$ 6,964	\$ 6,894	\$ 6,756	\$ 6,689	\$ 6,555	\$ 6,489
Households employed Fulltime	0%	75%	45%	46%	46%	47%
Households employed Part Time	0%	25%	19%	20%	20%	20%
Households Unemployed	0%	0%	35%	35%	34%	33%
Households receiving TANF	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of households reporting earned income after their port into or out of Columbus	0	9	9	10	10	10

iii. HACG did not plan any **Non-Significant Changes** to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>8</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved**, HACG attributes these shortfalls to the local economy and HACG's "grandfathering" activity. Columbus' unemployment rate is higher than cities of comparable size and governance and higher than the State's unemployment rate. HACG "grandfathered" existing port families, which included zero income families among other family make-ups. Therefore, existing families were not held to the restrictions currently being enforced and somewhat skews the data.

<sup>8</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

i. Activity **2015.03 – Simplify Utility Allowance (UA) Calculation** was **Approved** in fiscal year (FY) 2015 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015). HACG re-proposed this activity in its 2016 Amended Annual MTW Plan. The **re-proposed activity was Approved and Implemented** FY 2016 (July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016).

ii. HACG uses MTW Authorization D.2.a listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement to simplify Utility Allowance (UA) Calculation Charts as appropriate to its evolving, transforming, portfolio of rental units. Portfolio evolution and transformation is attributed to HACG’s full portfolio award to convert its Public Housing (PH) inventory to Section 8 assisted Project-Based Voucher (PBV) housing under the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program. Conversion includes PH units at conventional PH sites, as well as mixed-income sites throughout HACG’s rental portfolio.

Through this activity, HACG identifies and creates UA Calculation Charts for use under specific rental assistance programs. The table below identifies the simplified UA Calculation Charts and their program applicability:

<b>Utility Allowance Calculation Chart</b>	<b>Program Application</b>
Tenant/Landlord Based	Tenant-Based Vouchers (TBVs)
Public Housing (PH) Based	PH units and RAD PBV Housing
Energy Studies	Mixed-Income Housing

Guidance from the GA Department of Community Affairs (GA DCA) regarding UAs at mixed-income sites using Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) funds played a significant role in HACG amending its 2016 Annual MTW Plan. Through its 2016 Plan Amendment, HACG clarified its original intent in the creation of a Simplified UA Calculation Chart, as well as meet the compliance concerns raised by GA DCA.

Prior UA Calculation Charts confused more and involved multiple variables that frustrated involved parties. These variables delayed the rental assistance process from all aspects. However, under these specific UA Calculation Charts, HACG can simplify the process for HACG clients, landlord partners, and staff, while meeting the compliance concerns of GA DCA and improve the rental assistance process.

This activity is on schedule. This activity meets the definition of rent reform. HACG has not received any written hardship request. Although specific feedback has not been solicited on this activity, the Simplified UA Calculation Charts appear successful. The following pages reflect **HUD Standard Metrics** for this activity:

**CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation Charts**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task (Certification Examinations) in dollars	Number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,155; PH = 1,497	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,406; PH = 1,036	Benchmark Not Achieved
	Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours	Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.67 hours	Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.00 hours; PH = 1.83 hours	
	Average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$24.76; PH Housing Managers = \$28.41	Expected average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$26.27; PH Housing Managers = \$30.15	Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.92; PH Housing Managers = \$32.04	
	<b>Cost of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	\$ 107,874	\$ 97,254	\$ 97,548	

**CE #2: Staff Time Savings - Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation Charts**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task (Certification Examinations) in staff hours	Number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,155; PH = 1,497	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,406; PH = 1,036	Exceeds Benchmark
	Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours	Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.67 hours	Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.00 hours; PH = 1.83 hours	
	<b>Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	4,108.5	3,447.5	3,353.9	

**CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution - Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation Charts**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a task	Number of quality control checks: HCV = 37; PH = 146  Number of errors noted: HCV = 7; PH = 22  <b>Average Error Rate of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	Expected number of quality control checks: HCV = 124; PH = 73  Expected number of errors noted: HCV = 21; PH = 13  <b>Expected Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  17.2%	Actual number of quality control checks: HCV = 447; PH = 191  Actual number of errors noted: HCV = 52; PH = 40  <b>Actual Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	Exceeds Benchmark

**CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share - Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation Charts**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue	Monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$314,834; PH = \$181,638  Average monthly housing units for HCV = 2,155; PH = 1,497  <b>Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 136	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$459,006; PH = \$121,299  Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457  <b>Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 147	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$446,324; PH = \$121,329  Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 3,101; PH = 896  <b>Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 140	Exceeds Benchmark

**SIMPLIFY UTILITY CALCULATION CHARTS ANNUAL BENCHMARK**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total cost of task in dollars	\$ 107,874	\$ 97,254	\$ 97,254	\$ 107,901	\$ 111,145	\$ 97,254
Total time to complete the task in staff hours	4,108.5	3,447.5	3,447.5	3,605.1	3,605.1	3,447.5
Average error rate (percentage) in completing task	16.3%	17.2%	17.2%	15.2%	15.2%	17.2%
Tenant rental revenue	\$ 136	\$ 147	\$ 147	\$ 153	\$ 147	\$ 147

iii. HACG did not plan any **Non-Significant Changes** to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>9</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved**, HACG attributes these shortfalls to the local economy and HACG's focus on converting its PH units to Section 8 PBV units under RAD. Columbus' unemployment rate is higher than cities of comparable size and governance structure, as well as the State's unemployment rate. Columbus' local economy consists primarily of food service and hospitality services in addition to its continued reliance on the Department of Defense's Fort Benning. There are few solutions, but HACG is optimistic that trends will begin to even out.

i. Activity **2015.04 – Cap Childcare Deductions** was **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year (FY) 2015 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015). Based on HUD's actual approval of this activity and HACG's implementation strategy, at annual, this activity's implementation process overlapped into FY 2016 (July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016).

ii. HACG utilizes MTW Authorizations C.11 and D.2.a listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement to limit the amount of childcare costs that HACG will include in the rent calculation. This activity, through MTW Authorizations, establishes definitions of income, adjusted income, and deductions under applicable rental assistance programs.

Under current regulations, eligible deductions can reduce a family's Total Tenant Payment (**TTP**), or their rent share, by lowering their household income. Childcare cost is such a deduction. Historical data supports that enough Public Housing (**PH**) and Housing Choice Voucher (**HCV**) families have claimed high childcare costs, which almost matched their reported income, to significantly reduce their rent share.

HACG introduced this activity to set limits regarding this deductible expense being claimed by families during their recertification examination. The activity incorporates the Division of Family and Children Services' (**DFCS**) Children and Parents Services' (**CAPS**) Program reimbursement guidelines and schedule to create a ceiling based on service provider, number of children, and facility used by service provider. Families can continue to use eligible service providers as they desire, but HACG will not factor payments above the CAPS Program reimbursement rate when calculating their household income.

This activity is on schedule, but business model changes to HACG and inconsistent application of the activity across rental assistance programs makes data collection frustrating. As a result, this activity has not received ringing endorsements from staff nor impacted

---

<sup>9</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

families. Nonetheless, HACG has not received any written hardship requests regarding this activity. Meanwhile, the **HUD Standard Metrics** for this activity are listed below:

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Cap Childcare Deductions</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.
Total cost of task (Certification Examinations) in dollars	Number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,239; PH = 803  Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours  Average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$24.76; PH Housing Managers = \$28.41  <b>Cost of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>\$ 60,177</b>	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457  Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.67 hours  Expected average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$26.27; PH Housing Managers = \$30.15  <b>Expected Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>\$ 100,315</b>	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,292; PH = 21  Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.00 hours; PH = 1.83 hours  Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.92; PH Housing Managers = \$32.04  <b>Actual Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>\$ 36,688</b>	Exceeds Benchmark

<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings - Cap Childcare Deductions</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.
Total time to complete the task (Certification Examinations) in staff hours	Number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,239; PH = 803  Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours  <b>Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>4,594.5</b>	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457  Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.67 hours  <b>Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>3,556.0</b>	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,292; PH = 21  Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.00 hours; PH = 1.83 hours  <b>Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>  <b>1,311.2</b>	Exceeds Benchmark

**CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution - Cap Childcare Deductions**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a task	Number of quality control checks: HCV = 37; PH = 146  Number of errors noted: HCV = 7; PH = 22  <b>Average Error Rate of Task <i>Prior to</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	Expected number of quality control checks: HCV = 124; PH = 73  Expected number of errors noted: HCV = 21; PH = 13  <b>Expected Average Error Rate of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>  17.2%	Actual number of quality control checks: HCV = 447; PH = 191  Actual number of errors noted: HCV = 52; PH = 40  <b>Actual Average Error Rate of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>  16.3%	Exceeds Benchmark

**CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share - Cap Childcare Deductions**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue	Monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$314,834; PH = \$181,638  Average monthly housing units for HCV = 2,155; PH = 1,497  <b>Tenant Rental Revenue <i>Prior to</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 136	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$459,006; PH = \$121,299  Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457  <b>Expected Tenant Rental Revenue <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 143	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$446,324; PH = \$121,329  Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 3,101; PH = 896  <b>Actual Tenant Rental Revenue <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:</b>  \$ 140	Benchmark Not Achieved

**CAP CHILDCARE DEDUCTIONS ANNUAL BENCHMARK**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total cost of task in dollars	\$ 60,177	\$ 100,315	\$ 98,784	\$ 105,765	\$ 103,529	\$ 86,048
Total time to complete the task in staff hours	4,594.5	3,556.0	3,501.8	3,533.7	3,358.1	3,050.3
Average error rate (percentage) in completing task	16.3%	17.2%	17.2%	15.2%	15.2%	17.2%
Tenant rental revenue	\$ 136	\$ 143	\$ 145	\$ 156	\$ 158	\$ 166

iii. HACG did not plan any **Non-Significant Changes** to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>10</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved** is not applicable to this activity during this reporting period.

i. Activity **2016.02 – Non-Competitive Project-Basing Process** was **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year 2016 (based on construction completion).

ii. The activity utilizes MTW Authorizations D.7.a listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement to eliminate the competitive bid process when HACG needs to project-base assistance within its service jurisdiction.

Under this activity, HACG can project-base Section 8 assistance at properties owned directly or indirectly by HACG, which will improve cost-efficiency to the agency and increase housing choices for low-income families. HACG actively applies this activity at recently modernized, converted sites and plans to apply this activity at newly constructed and/or modernized sites in the future.

This activity is on schedule and does not meet the definition of rent reform. Additionally, HACG has not received any pushback related to this activity beyond internal discussion on the application of this activity at existing and planned projects. The **HUD Standard Metrics** for this activity are on the next page:

<sup>10</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

**CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Non-Competitive Project-Basing Process**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task (Certification Examinations) in dollars	Number of annual examinations: PBV = 279	Expected number of annual examinations: PBV = 1,645	Actual number of annual examinations: PBV = 1,063	Exceeds Benchmark
	Average time to complete examinations: PBV = 2.25 hours	Expected average time to complete examinations: PBV = 1.83 hours	Actual average time to complete examinations: PBV = 2.00 hours	
	Average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$24.76	Expected average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$26.27	Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.92	
	<b>Cost of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	\$ 15,543	\$ 81,210	\$ 59,358	

**CE #2: Staff Time Savings - Non-Competitive Project-Basing Process**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task (Certification Examinations) in staff hours	Number of annual examinations: PBV = 279	Expected number of annual examinations: PBV = 1,645	Actual number of annual examinations: PBV = 1,063	Exceeds Benchmark
	Average time to complete examinations: PBV = 2.25 hours	Expected average time to complete examinations: PBV = 1.83 hours	Actual average time to complete examinations: PBV = 2.00 hours	
	<b>Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	<b>Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity:</b>	
	627.8	2,878.8	2,126.0	

**NON-COMPETITIVE PROJECT-BASING PROCESS ANNUAL BENCHMARK**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total cost of task in dollars	\$ 15,543	\$ 81,210	\$ 81,210	\$ 93,112	\$ 95,912	\$ 83,925
Total time to complete the task in staff hours	627.8	2,878.8	2,878.8	3,111.0	3,111.0	2,975.0

iii. HACG did not plan any **Non-Significant Changes** to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.

iv. HACG made non-significant **Changes to Metrics/Data Collection** to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software<sup>11</sup> mid-way through FYE 2016. The capabilities of the new software system allowed HACG to collect and synthesize its data better. Therefore, HACG made minor adjustments to benchmark projections and similar elements to provide a clearer representation of its MTW Activity performance.

v. HACG did not make any **Significant Changes** to this MTW Activity.

vi. Where **Benchmarks were Not Achieved** is not applicable to this activity.

---

<sup>11</sup> HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

## B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

i. Activity **2016.01 – Next Step Vouchers** was **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year (FY) 2016 (July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016).

ii. The implementation of this activity relies upon properly referred aged-out foster youth from the Division of Family and Children Services (**DFCS**), who also provide the case management component in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding / Agreement (**MOU/A**) between the agencies.

Although DFCS will exhaust all existing state programs/resources before referring aged-out foster youth to HACG, the activity requires that foster youth actively participate in an education or employment activity for at least 20-hours per week and actively participate in case management activities administered by DFCS Case Workers. HACG feels that these highlighted elements of the activity in addition to exhausting state resources first, provides foster youth with the greatest chance of self-sufficiency success.

During fiscal year 2018, **DFCS referred three foster youth**. Unfortunately, the **referrals' program participation was terminated because of program infractions**, such as transfer to another jurisdiction by DFCS, incarceration, and similar actions requiring program termination. As a result, HACG did collect enough data to report on the effectiveness or outcomes of the activity during this reporting period.

HACG will continue to administer the activity. At the end of FYE 2019, HACG will review the activity's progress and decide if an activity modification or activity close-out is appropriate.

i. Activity **2016.03 – Project-Basing Flexibilities** was introduced and **approved in HACG's FY2016 Annual MTW Plan**, but not implemented to date.

ii. The implementation of this activity is relying upon the completion of HACG's portfolio conversion from PH units to Section 8 PBV units under the RAD Program. Since initially awarded a full portfolio conversion, HACG has run into delays in the completion of its portfolio conversion. Once the conversion is complete, HACG anticipates applying activity flexibilities during fiscal year 2019 at Columbus Commons and Patriot Pointe.

Under this activity, HACG will project-base more units at converted sites and future sites, consistent with HACG's business model, than the 25% building cap (50% under RAD) currently allows. Additionally, the activity waives the mandatory, supportive services participation requirement for families living in the "excepted units" (those units above the building cap).

The latest timeline projects that all PH units in HACG's portfolio will convert to Section 8 PBV units by December 31, 2019; however, various elements in the conversion process make this timeline more fluid. Therefore, the conversion may happen sooner or may even happen later than the current projection date. Nonetheless, whenever HACG fully converts its portfolio, as awarded, it will implement the flexibilities of this activity.

i. Activity **2018.01 – Eliminate/Reduce Interim Certification Examinations** was introduced and **approved in HACG’s FY2018 Annual MTW Plan**, but not fully implemented to date.

ii. The implementation of this activity is relying upon the completion of HACG’s portfolio conversion from PH units to Section 8 PBV units under the RAD Program. Since initially awarded a full portfolio conversion, HACG has run into delays in the completion of its portfolio conversion. Once the conversion is complete, HACG anticipates applying activity flexibilities during fiscal year 2019.

The implementation delay permit HACG to re-assess the interim certification workload since all housing units will fall under the Housing Choice Voucher (**HCV**) Program. During this implementation delay, HACG plans to ensure that workloads are evenly distributed, as much as possible, to avoid sharp peaks and deep valleys during the work year, as well as to avoid employee burnout.

i. Activity **2018.02 – Site-Based Housing Flexibility** (*formerly Over-House 1-Bedroom Eligible Families in 2-Bedroom Units*) was introduced and **Approved in HACG’s 2018 Annual MTW Plan**, but not fully implemented. HACG **Re-proposed** this activity in its 2019 Plan.

ii. The activity was expanded upon because of HACG’s experience with its first portfolio conversion from PH units to Section 8 PBV units under the RAD Program. Since that experience, HACG re-proposed this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan. HACG has since learned that the re-proposed activity was approved and anticipates fully applying the approved flexibilities during fiscal year 2019 (July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019).

Under this activity, HACG will over-house smaller, otherwise eligible families off appropriate waiting lists in larger units. In addition, HACG will provide gap payment assistance, between the family’s voucher and the unit rent (up to the Fair Market Rent (FMR)), to the landlord. This measure assists in meeting statutory objectives: cost-efficiency and increasing housing choices, while indirectly assists families in avoiding an episode with homelessness.

#### C. Activities on Hold

HACG does not have any activities on hold

#### D. Closed-Out Activities

i. Activity **2014.05 – Streamline Housing Quality Standards (HQS)** was **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year 2014. HACG stopped administering this activity in fiscal year 2017 and officially **Closed-Out** this activity in fiscal year **2018**.

ii. PIH Notice 2016-05 provides several streamlining elements that MTW PHAs and non-MTW PHAs can incorporate into their policies and procedures. HACG adopted Attachment K and L of PIH Notice 2016-05. These attachments allow PHAs, MTW and non-MTW, to conduct biennial HQS inspections, permit self-certification, and accept third-party inspection results. These allowances under PIH Notice 2016-05 make HACG’s use of MTW Authorizations to do the same thing obsolete.

iii. Collectively, HACG learned that biennial inspections helped HACG inspectors to focus on properties and single-family units that habitually failed HQS inspections. It also, based on survey comments, was well received by landlord partners and voucher families.

HACG advocates mobility, but advocates stabilization more. Statutory exceptions that might have provided additional benefit may have included the ability to have families honor their lease agreement. Under some circumstances, minor infractions allow a family to relocate, on a whim, which makes it difficult to continue to develop strong partnerships with smaller portfolio landlords. On the other hand, larger portfolio landlords do not feel the impact of 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> visit inspection fees. In fact, HACG believes that some landlords wait for the “free” inspection, fix what they must and gladly pay the re-inspection fee.

HACG anticipates making a final decision to reactivate or continue the close-out process of this activity during FYE 2018.

i. Activity **2014.06 – Rent Reform (Farley)** was **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year 2014. HACG stopped administering this activity in fiscal year 2017 and officially **Closed-Out** this activity in fiscal year **2018**.

ii. HACG was awarded a full portfolio conversion from PH units to Section 8 PBV units under the RAD Program. HACG converted the treatment site, E.E. Farley, from PH units to Section 8 PBV units. HACG used Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (**LIHTC**) funding to meet GA Department of Community Affairs (**DCA**) and RAD requirements. The conversion, use of LIHTC funds, and other variables skewed comparison metrics to the point that demographically similar sites were no longer the similar.

Differences included interior and exterior improvements, including floor plan additions, market rent units, increased administrative fees, and income calculations at the treatment site and the comparison/control site remained unchanged. These changes continued to make the comparison challenging and inequitable, which made evaluation findings concerning at best.

iii. HACG learned that the differences between the two properties required detailed monitoring, especially at the treatment site, where multiple variables were introduced. HACG did not do an outstanding job of marketing the Tiered Rent Schedule to families and once the treatment site converted subsidy programs under RAD and used LIHTC funding, the Tiered Rent Schedule became obsolete. Additionally, HACG never celebrated any success because of an intense, focused Family Self-Sufficiency (**FSS**) campaign at the treatment site. As of June 30, 2018, HACG had 22 families enrolled in the FSS 9% at the treatment site and 32% at the comparison/control site. Participation data suggests that the activity had an opposite effect of intended results.

Statutory benefits that might have provided an additional benefit include an ability to mandate participation in the FSS Program to learn if that would have provided an influence or spark for the treatment site families. Also, an escrow match or some other consideration for successful families in either group. Initial ideas include down-payment assistance, college application assistance for middle-school to high-school aged HACG minors, scholarship assistance, and other “big ticket” incentives that may help families to break its poverty cycle.

i. Activity **2015.01 – Eliminate Child Support from Income Calculation** was **Approved and Implemented** in fiscal year 2015. HACG stopped administration of this activity and **Closed-Out** the activity in fiscal year 2017.

ii. HACG was awarded a full portfolio conversion from PH units to Section 8 PBV units under the RAD Program. HACG used LIHTC funding to meet DCA and RAD requirements. The conversion and use of LIHTC funds change household income calculations, which makes the exclusion of income a non-compliant action. Therefore, this activity is obsolete and no longer supported by MTW Authorizations.

iii. This activity's sample size is too small to derive final outcomes. However, a lesson learned in activity planning includes the factoring in the whole picture (when able) to avoid early close-outs, amendments, and similar actions that prevent the growth possibilities of the activity, affected families, and/or impacted staff.

Statutory exceptions that might have provided additional benefit includes the ability to eliminate or modify income calculations regardless of the funding source(s). Some income sources, especially fluctuating income, can create more challenges in calculations than being able to eliminate or adjust the fluctuating income source(s).

## SECTION V – Sources and Uses of Funds

### A. Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

**i. Actual Sources of MTW Funds in the Plan Year** – HACG shall submit unaudited and audited information in the prescribed Financial Data Schedule (**FDS**) format through the Financial Assessment System – PHA (**FASPHA**), or its successor system

**ii. Actual Uses of MTW Funds in the Plan Year** – HACG shall submit unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the FASPHA, or its successor system

**iii. Actual Use of MTW Single-Fund Flexibility** – None of HACG’s HUD-approved, implemented activities used only MTW Single-Fund flexibility in fiscal year 2018

### B. Local Asset Management Plan

**i.** Did the MTW PHA allocate costs within statute in the Plan Year? **Yes**

**ii.** Did the MTW PHA implement a Local Asset Management Plan (**LAMP**) in the Plan Year? **No**

**iii.** Did the MTW PHA provide a LAMP in the appendix? **No**

**iv.** If the MTW PHA has provided a LAMP in the appendix, please provide a brief update on the implementation of the LAMP. Please provide any actual changes (which must be detailed in an approved Annual MTW Plan/Plan Amendment) or state that the MTW PHA did not make any changes in the Plan Year. **N/A**

## SECTION VI – **Administrative**

### A. HUD Reviews, Audits, or Physical Inspection Issues

HACG did have any HUD reviews, audits, nor physical inspection issues that required action by HACG to address the issue.

### B. PHA-Directed Evaluations

HACG contracted with Columbus State University (**CSU**) to evaluate activities and provide a bi-annual report (included in HACG’s 2017 Report). The 5-year contract with CSU is complete. HACG may consider seeking another evaluation team or re-enter a contract with CSU. Meanwhile, HACG continues to administer the following MTW Activities:

- 2014.01 – Community Choice (final year, closes out at the end of fiscal year 2019)
- 2014.02 – Innovations to Reduce Homelessness
- 2016.01 – Next Step Vouchers (no active vouchers; no referrals from DFCS)

### C. Meeting Statutory Requirement Certification

HACG’s certifies that it has met the three statutory requirements 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 sized) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration

The certification is attached for review, please **see Attachment A**.

### D. MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data

This section is **Not Applicable** to HACG

# ATTACHMENTS



**ATTACHMENT A**

**CERTIFICATION OF STATUTORY COMPLIANCE**

On behalf of the Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia (HACG), I certify that the agency has met the three statutory requirements of the Amended and Restated Moving-to-Work Agreement between the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and HACG (effective July 3, 2013).

During FYE 2018, HACG has adhered to the following requirements:

- At least 75% of the families assisted by HACG are very low-income families;
- HACG has continued to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined;
- HACG has maintained a comparable mix of families (by family size) served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration

J. LEN WILLIAMS,  
Chief Executive Officer

9-17-18

DATE



1000 Wynnton Road • P.O. Box 630 • Columbus, Georgia 31902-0630 • (706) 571-2800  
Serving Columbus, Buena Vista, Ellaville, Hamilton, Pine Mountain, Waverly Hall, West Point, Georgia