

2019 ANNUAL MTW REPORT



FYE 2019

(July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019)

HUD Submission: September 24, 2019

HUD Approval: October 16, 2019

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

A. TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	
a.	Table of Content.....	2
b.	Overview.....	3
	Short-Term Goals and Objectives.....	3
	Long-Term Goals and Objectives.....	5
II.	General Housing Authority Operating Information	
a.	Housing Stock Information.....	7
b.	Leasing Information.....	9
c.	Wait List Information.....	11
III.	Proposed MTW Activities	
	All proposed activities that were granted approval by HUD are reported in Section IV.....	13
IV.	Approved MTW Activities	
a.	Implemented Activities.....	13
	i. Activity approvals, descriptions, changes, and challenges	
b.	Not Yet Implemented Activities.....	42
	i. Activity descriptions and actions taken toward implementation	
c.	Activities on Hold.....	45
	i. Activity descriptions and actions taken toward reactivating activities	
d.	Closed Out Activities.....	45
	i. Activity approval years, close-out explanations, and close-out years	
V.	Sources and Uses of MTW Funds	
a.	Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	48
b.	Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP).....	48
VI.	Administrative	
a.	Reviews, Audits, and Inspections.....	49
b.	Evaluations.....	49
c.	MTW Statutory Requirement Certification.....	49
d.	MTW Energy Performance Contract (EPC) Flexibility Data.....	50
VII.	Appendix Section	
a.	Attachment A – Reports Signed Certification of Statutory Requirements	52
b.	Attachment B – Columbus State University Final Evaluation	53

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) 2019.

MTW SHORT-TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following narrative addresses short-term goals and objectives during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 thru June 30, 2019. Some goals and objectives overlap with non-MTW goals and objectives. Such goals and objectives are listed under its primary intent. This past year, we:

- ▶ Maximized use of single-fund budget with full flexibility by combining operating subsidies and capital and management funding awards to form the MTW Block Grant. This “grant” is HACG’s funding source to deliver housing programs and services within HACG’s service jurisdiction.
- ▶ Implemented a cost effectiveness initiative activity on January 1, 2019 – MTW Activity 2019.01 – Minimum Rent Increase/Utility Reimbursement Payment Decrease (URP) which increases the minimum rent and reduces or eliminates URP check issuance over the next two years.
- ▶ Expanded MTW Activity 2016.03 - Project-Basing Flexibilities to include all HACG-owned properties (direct and indirect ownership) and HACG-owned units when determining rent reasonableness.
- ▶ Expanded and renamed MTW Activity 2018.02 – Site-Based Housing Flexibility (formerly Over House 1 BR Eligible Families in 2 BR Units) to apply for all non-Public Housing site-based housing communities.
- ▶ HACG did not pursue a new evaluation agreement with Columbus State University (CSU).
- ▶ Continue to collect, analyze, and synthesize data for external and internal purposes
 - ◆ Monitor and track MTW data to complete plans, reports, surveys, and similar platforms
 - ◆ Continue to build capacity for staff designated as Yardi¹ trainers to increase capacity for Yardi end-users
 - ◆ Cross reference HUD-approved MTW Activities with published guidance documents to ensure approved MTW Authorizations are relevant and necessary:

¹ HACG switched tracking software to Yardi in FYE2015

- ◆ Cross reference HACG-closed MTW Activities with published guidance documents to acknowledge obsolescence of HUD-approved MTW Authorizations
- ◆ HACG's current list of active activities include:

Activity Number	Approval Year	Activity Description	Activity Status - June 30
2014.02	2014	Innovations to Reduce Homelessness	Active, data being collected and reported
2014.03	2014	Administrative Reforms (HCV elements Only)	Active, data being collected and reported
2014.04	2014	Administrative Efficiency	Active, data being collected and reported
2015.02	2015	Portability Restrictions	Active, data being collected and reported
2015.03	2015	Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation	Active, data being collected and reported
2015.04	2015	Cap Childcare 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
2018.01	2018	Eliminate/Reduce Interim Certification Examinations	Active, data being collected and reported
2018.02	2018	Site-Based Housing Flexibility (formerly - Over-House 1 BR Eligible Families in 2 BR Units)	Active, data being collected and reported
2019.01	2019	Minimum Rent Increase/Utility Reimbursement Payment (URP) Decrease	Active, data being collected and reported

NON-MTW SHORT-TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- HACG met the requirements of HUD
 - ◆ Maintenance of financial records, housing units, etc.
 - ◆ Implemented Flat Rent Mandate (80% of Fair Market Rent (FMR)) – PH units only
 - ◆ Implemented Smoke-Free Rule – effective July 1, 2018
- HACG met the requirements of RAD
 - ◆ Completed close-out procedures for RAD I Rehabilitation Projects
 - E.F. Farley (102 units); E.J. Knight (52); E.J. Knight Senior (40); Brown Nicholson (100); and Luther Wilson (289)
 - ◆ In Process of converting remaining stock of PH units to PBV units
 - Update, as applicable, modernization plans for next conversion phases
 - Elizabeth Canty (249 units); Louis Chase (108 units); George Rivers (24); and Warren Williams (160)
 - Conversion and/or modernization plans may require building(s) demolition

- Determine appropriate funding vehicle to convert above listed units
 - Rehabilitation work is estimated at \$40,000/unit
 - Use of MTW Block Grant funds is considered (funds will be available from HUD held Section 8 reserves)
 - ◆ In Process of finalizing RAD conversion plan for remaining PH units
 - Columbus Commons (24); and Patriot Pointe (31)
- HACG met the requirements of Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA)
 - ◆ Complete close-out procedures of Booker T. Washington (BTW)-Chapman Phase II Redevelopment Project (known as Columbus Commons²)
 - ◆ Design and implemented supportive services programming in compliance with appropriate DCA Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP)
 - Family Sites: E.F. Farley (102 units); E.J. Knight Gardens (52); and Luther Wilson (289)
 - Senior Sites: E.J. Knight Senior (40 units) and Brown Nicholson (100)
 - Assess position control elements to determine supportive services staffing levels
 - ◆ Plan supportive services programming for rehabilitation projects that may use LIHTC funding
 - RAD Rehabilitation Projects: George Rivers (24 units) and Warren Williams (160)
 - RAD Rehabilitation Projects: Elizabeth Canty (249 units)
 - DCA's QAP year dictates the level and type of supportive services programming required at sites that use LIHTC funds
 - HACG plans to offer supportive services programming levels that commensurate with the level of project completion

MTW LONG-TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following narrative addresses long-term goals and objectives during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 thru June 30, 2019. 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 pursued the Emergency Housing Voucher MTW activity in the 2020 MTW Plan and was approved July 2019. The new MTW Activity 2020.01 is the Sponsor Based Emergency Voucher Program which assist families affected by local natural disasters, fire, flooding or notice to condemn property prompted by local government action in Muscogee County.
- HACG still plans to present consistent with demand/need for target groups such as:
 - ◆ HACG may construct or acquire a development for the purpose of Workforce Housing
 - ◆ Implement a 7-day eviction process verses the 30 days related to criminal activity.

² State of Georgia refers residents in accordance with the Olmstead Agreement dated October 29, 2010.

- ◆ Revise the nonpayment of rent cure from 14 days to 7 days.
 - ◆ Provide an early childhood education program
 - ◆ Use MTW funds or charge the properties for lease enforcement personnel
 - ◆ Develop incentive initiatives related to education or employment
 - ◆ Present re-entry program in partnership with non-profit organization for ex-offenders.
- Continue to position HACG to become designated as a Regional MTW Agency.

NON-MTW LONG TERM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- Meet requirements of HUD
 - ◆ Monitor guidance documents, such as Federal Register, Notices PIH, and similar
 - ◆ Review Wait List process for efficiency and fairness
 - Consider other Wait List types, including hybrid or preference Wait Lists
- Meet requirements of RAD
 - ◆ Convert remaining stock of PH units to PBV units
 - RAD IV Redevelopment Project: Chase (108 units)
 - Columbus Commons (31) and Patriot Pointe (24)
- Meet requirements of DCA
 - ◆ Design and implement supportive services programming in compliance with appropriate DCA QAP (Qualified Allocation Plan)
 - Family sites: Chase (108 units) and Columbus Commons (31)
 - Senior sites: Patriot Pointe (24 units)
 - Review historical position control to determine/project staffing needs
 - DCA's QAP year dictates level and type of supportive services programming
- Ensure peaceful enjoyment of units (as controllable by HACG)
 - ◆ Improve enforcement of all lease agreement elements
 - ◆ Continue annual background checks of all adults listed on lease agreement
 - ◆ Recruit landlord partners in areas of opportunity to project-base assistance
 - ◆ Improve collection rate of payment agreements with current and former program participants
- Change Agency's fiscal year
 - ◆ Determine if fiscal year change is beneficial to HACG
 - Review fiscal years of partner agencies e.g., Federal, State, contracted PHAs, etc.
 - ◆ HACG is considering to move to a calendar fiscal year end to December for fiscal year 2022.
 - Must receive approval from appropriate governing body to change fiscal year

(II) GENERAL OPERATING INFORMATION

ANNUAL MTW REPORT

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	184	0	N/A	Yes	RAD Conversion
GA004000407 – Louis Chase	108	0	N/A	Yes	RAD Conversion
GA004000408 – Elizabeth Canty	249	0	N/A	Yes	RAD Conversion
GA004000423 – Patriot Pointe	24	0	N/A	Yes	RAD Conversion
	565	0	Planned/Actual Total Vouchers Newly Project-Based		

* 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 Existing number of vouchers project-based is HACG was unable to convert 565 planned PH units to long-term Section 8 assisted PBV units during the planned year.

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	288	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
GA004000414 – E. J. 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	Lease/Issued	Yes	Former PH Units converted to PBV units under RAD Program
GA004000420 – Arbor Pointe I	75	75	Leased/Issued	No	Existing PBV units in Mixed Income Community
GA004000421 – Arbor Pointe II	75	75	Leased/Issued	No	Existing PBV units in Mixed Income Community
GA004000422 - 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

1062	1062
-------------	-------------

Planned/Actual Total Existing Project-Based Vouchers

* 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:

There are no differences between the Planned and the Actual Existing Number of Vouchers Project-Based.
--

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
There were no other changes to HACG's housing stock for FYE 2019.

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 to expend approximately \$15M on capital expenditures during Fiscal Year 2019, with majority being allocated to the completion of HACG's Public Housing (PH) portfolio conversion under RAD. Actual expenditures totaled \$553k, which consist of expenses toward RAD II predevelopment cost, purchase and installation of 357 slider replacement windows, 5 heating and air units and gas package unit, purchase of 8 new fleet vehicles, new color copier, lighting in warehouse, repairs to front porch, and replace/paint siding and gable. HACG's planned expenditure of the remaining \$14.5M during FY2019 for RAD conversion activity was delayed because two of the three remaining 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. HACG is currently working with HUD to resolve the floodway issues.

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	3,804	6,216	317	518
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Utilized	41,373	38,640	3,448	3220
Local, Non-Traditional: Tenant-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Property-Based	0	0	0	0
Local, Non-Traditional: Homeownership	0	0	0	0
Planned/Actual Totals	45,177	44,856	3,765	3738

* "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:

HACG difference between the planned and actual households served by program is due to the Public Housing (PH) RAD II Conversion has been delayed, therefore there were more PH units leased and less Housing Choice Vouchers to lease.

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	0	0	0	0
Property-Based	N/A	0	0	0	0
Homeownership	N/A	0	0	0	0
Planned/Actual Totals		0	0	0	0

* 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	Significantly higher turnover of units in our Public Housing units. HACG added staff to the Tenant Selection Office to accommodate the increased turnover.
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Significantly higher turnover of units in our RAD 1 converted units. HACG added staff to the Tenant Selection Office to accommodate the increased turnover
Local, Non-Traditional	N/A

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
Federal MTW Housing Choice Vouchers	Community Wide	206	Closed	No
MTW Rapid Rehousing Vouchers; MTW Next Step Vouchers	Program Specific	By referral from service provider	Partially Open	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Converted PH Units to RAD Project-Based Vouchers	Merged	2738	Open	Yes

Please describe any duplication of applicants across waiting lists:

Applicants for Public Housing may also be included on the RAD Community Wide PBV Waitlist

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	N/A
N/A	N/A

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

Total Local, Non-Traditional Households Admitted

N/A

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	1404	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%
TOTAL	1,688	2,333	0	4,021	100%

* “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%	1463	39.2%	4.2%
2 Person	19.1%	661	17.7%	-1.4%
3 Person	20.4%	692	18.5%	-1.9%
4 Person	14.1%	491	13.1%	-1.0%
5 Person	7.4%	248	6.6%	-0.8%
6+ Person	4.0%	183	4.9%	0.9%
TOTAL	100%	3,738	100%	0.1%

** 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
Innovations to Reduce Homelessness / 2014.02	60	12 Consecutive months of stability (off-the-street)
Innovations to Reduce Homelessness/2014.02	5	Completion of 24-month of active case management
Next Step Vouchers (NSV) / 2016.01	0	Completion of 36-months of active case management
	0	<i>(Households Duplicated Across MTW Activities)</i>
	65	Total Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

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

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

Activity 2014.02 – Innovations to Reduce Homelessness

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** Activity was introduced and Approved and Implemented in fiscal year 2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014).
- ii. **Description, Impact and Update:** The 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 rent³ 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:

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

As of June 30, 2019, 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 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. The active families participating in this activity, the average time off-the-street is 2 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.

HACG in conjunction with other service providers and Home for Good has reduced the number of chronically homeless from over 200 families to 31 chronically homeless families. We are expanding our focus beyond chronically to include homeless individuals beginning with fiscal year 2020. 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 on the next page:

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

SS #1: Increase in Household Income - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness				
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 prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of Chronically Homeless households affected by this policy.	Total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$86,877 Number of households = 28 Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 3,103	Expected total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$574,130 Expected number of households = 145 Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 4,017	Actual total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$234,708 Actual number of households = 88 Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 2,667	Benchmark Not Achieved

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Chronically Homeless Households Working Fulltime	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 26 Number of work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 1 Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 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 Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity: 12.3%	Actual number of work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 56 Actual number of work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 13 Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity: 23.2%	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Chronically Homeless Households Working Part Time	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 = 56	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 = 5	
	Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part time Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 26.9%	Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part time After Implementation of the Activity: 23.8%	Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part time After Implementation of the Activity: 8.9%	

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Chronically Homeless Households Unemployed	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 = 56	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 = 38	
	Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 69.2%	Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity: 51.5%	Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity: 67.9%	

<i>Innovations to Reduce Homelessness</i>				
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.
Chronically Homeless Households Receiving TANF	Number of households in activity = 28 Percent of households receiving TANF = 7.1% Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 2.0	Expected number of households in activity after implementation = 145 Expected percent of households receiving TANF = 2.2% Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity: 3.2	Actual number of households in activity after implementation = 88 Actual percent of households receiving TANF = 2.3% Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity: 2.0	Exceeds Benchmark

<i>SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness</i>				
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 Chronically Homeless households transitioned to self sufficiency	Number of housing months available = 8 Total number of housing months = 224 Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 0	Expected number of housing months available = 12 Expected total number of housing months = 1350 Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity: 98	Actual number of housing months available = 12 Actual total number of housing months = 2004 Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Maintain Residency for 12 Consecutive Months or Longer) After Implementation of the Activity: 60	Benchmark Not Achieved

- iii. **Actual Non-Significant Changes:** HACG did not plan any Non-Significant Changes to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.
- iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG made non-significant Changes to Metrics/Data Collection to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software⁴ 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. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** 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 (4.5%)⁵ continues to outpace GA cities of similar size, such as the City of Augusta-Richmond County (4.0%)⁵, a city of comparable size and government make-up, the City of Atlanta (3.6%)⁵, the State's Capitol, and the State of Georgia (3.8%)⁵.

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.

Activity 2014.03 – Administrative Reforms

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** This activity was Approved and Implemented in fiscal year 2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014), in the same fiscal period as approval.
- ii. **Description, Impact, and Update:** 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

⁴ HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

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

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 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:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Administrative Reforms				
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 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 Cost of Task <i>Prior to</i> Implementation of the Activity: \$ 107,874	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 Expected Cost of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity: \$ 97,254	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,850 Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.88 hours Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.56 Actual Cost of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity: \$ 95,854	Exceeds Benchmark

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 Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 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 Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 3,447.5	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,850 Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.88 hours Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 3,478.0	Benchmark Not Achieved

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 Average Error Rate of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 16.3%	Expected number of quality control checks: HCV = 124; PH = 73 Expected number of errors noted: HCV = 21; PH = 13 Expected Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity: 17.2%	Actual number of quality control checks: HCV = 127 Actual number of errors noted: HCV = 28 Actual Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity: 22.0%	Benchmark Not Achieved

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	Monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$314,834; PH = \$181,638 Average monthly housing units for HCV = 2155; PH = 1497 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 136	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$459,006; PH = \$121,299 Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 2483; PH = 1457 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 147	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$628,279 Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 3,220 Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 195	Exceeds Benchmark

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	Number of HCV units = 2155 Percent of HCV families exceeding the 40% Income Cap = 17.0% Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 366	Expected number of HCV units = 2483 Expected percent of HCV families exceeding the 40% Income Cap = 14.0% Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity: 348	Actual number of HCV units = 3,220 Actual percent of HCV families exceeding the 40% Income Cap = 6.7% Actual Households Able to Move to a Better Unit and/or Neighborhood of Opportunity After Implementation of the Activity: 216	Benchmark Not Achieved

- iii. **Actual Non-Significant Changes:** HACG did not plan any Non-Significant Changes to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.
- iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG made non-significant Changes to Metrics/Data Collection to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software⁶ 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. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** 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.

Activity 2014.04 – Administrative Efficiency

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** 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. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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 have more time to spend with challenging, multi-family, multi-income, multi-program recertification examinations. Households must meet eligibility and income parameters:

⁶ HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

A: Eligibility

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

B: Income

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

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	Eligible income AND/OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Child Support ✓ Employment (FT, PT, etc.) ✓ Military Pay (Active or Reserve) ✓ PHA Stipend ✓ Unemployment ✓ And/or similar incomes 	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.

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 Average time to complete examinations: HCV = .92 hours; PH = 1.25 hours Average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$24.76; PH Housing Managers = \$28.41 Cost of Task <i>Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</i> \$ 23,089	Expected number of annual examinations: HCV = 819; PH = 481 Expected average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.83 hours; PH = 1.83 hours Expected average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$26.27; PH Housing Managers = \$30.15 Expected Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i> \$ 30,574	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1124 Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.25 Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.56 Actual Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i> \$ 40,444	Benchmark Not Achieved

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 Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 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 Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 1,052.1	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,174 Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.25 hours Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 1,467.5	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 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 174	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$222,242; PH = \$81,057 Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 819; PH = 481 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 191	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$214,309 Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 1174 Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 183	Benchmark Not Achieved

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

iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG made non-significant Changes to Metrics/Data Collection to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking

software⁷ 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. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** 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.

Activity 2015.02 – Portability Restrictions

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** 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. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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

⁷ HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

the first six months of porting may also lose their rental assistance benefits through absorption denial, and termination of payment to an outside PHA.

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:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Portability Restrictions				
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 = 26; Out = 14	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 = 1.88 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 = \$27.56	
	Cost of Task <i>Prior to</i> Implementation of the Activity:	Expected Cost of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:	Actual Cost of Task <i>After</i> Implementation of the Activity:	
	\$ 8,579	\$ 7,073	\$ 2,073	

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 Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 346.5	Expected number of annual port examinations: In = 63; Out = 91 Expected average time to complete port examinations = 1.83 hours Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 261.4	Actual number of annual port examinations: In = 26; Out = 14 Actual average time to complete port examinations = 1.88 hours Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 75.2	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 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 146	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$22,038 Expected average monthly port units: In = 63; Out = 91 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 144	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$8,115 Actual average monthly port units: In = 26; Out = 14 Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 203	Exceeds Benchmark

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 Port households affected by this policy.	Total earned income of households affected by this policy = \$9,366,439 Number of households = 1345 Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 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 Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 6,825	Actual total earned income of port households affected by this policy = \$199,509 Actual number of port households: In = 26; Out = 14 Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 4,988	Benchmark Not Achieved

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Portability Restrictions				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Port Households Working Fulltime	Number of work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 0 Number of work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 0 Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 0.0%	Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households prior to implementation of the activity = 154 Expected number of Port work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 116 Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity: 45.5%	Actual number of Port work-able (19-61) households after implementation of the activity = 35 Actual number of Port work-able (19-61) households employed Fulltime = 9 Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity: 25.7%	Benchmark Not Achieved

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Portability Restrictions				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Port Households Working Part Time	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 = 35	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 = 11	
	Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed <i>Part Time</i> Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 0.0%	Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed <i>Part Time</i> After Implementation of the Activity: 19.5%	Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed <i>Part Time</i> After Implementation of the Activity: 31.4%	

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Portability Restrictions				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Port Households Unemployed	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 = 35	Exceeds Benchmark
	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 = 6	
	Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Unemployed</i> Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 0.0%	Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Unemployed</i> After Implementation of the Activity: 35.0%	Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households <i>Unemployed</i> After Implementation of the Activity: 17.1%	

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) - Portability Restrictions				
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.
Port Households Receiving TANF	Number of households prior to implementation of the activity = 0 Percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0% Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 0.0	Expected number of Port households after implementation of the activity: In = 63; Out = 91 Expected percent of Port households receiving TANF = 0.0% Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity: 0.0	Actual number of Port households after implementation of the activity: In = 26; Out = 14 Actual percent of households receiving TANF = 0.0% Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity: 0.0	Meets Benchmark

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency - Portability Restrictions				
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 Port households transitioned to self sufficiency	Port families housed: In = 63; Out = 91 Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Portability households reporting earned income) Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 0	Expected Port families housed: In = 63; Out = 91 Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Portability households reporting earned income) After Implementation of the Activity: 0	Actual Port families housed: In = 26 ; Out = 14 Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (Portability households reporting earned income) After Implementation of the Activity: 20	Exceeds Benchmark

- iii. **Actual Non-Significant Changes:** HACG did not plan any Non-Significant Changes to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.
- iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG made non-significant Changes to Metrics/Data Collection to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software⁸ 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. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** 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.

Activity 2015.03 – Simplify Utility Allowance (UA) Calculation

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** 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. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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:

⁸ HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

Utility Allowance Calculation Chart	Program Application
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 Georgia Department of Community Affairs (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 Georgia 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 Georgia 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 = 1,850; PH = 373	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 = 1.88 hours; PH = 1.13 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 = \$27.56; PH Housing Managers = \$32.67	
	Cost of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity:	Expected Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:	Actual Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity:	
	\$ 107,874	\$ 97,254	\$ 57,871	

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 Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 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 Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 3,447.5	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 1,850; PH = 373 Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.88 hours; PH = 1.13 hours Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 1,949.7	Exceeds Benchmark

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 Average Error Rate of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 16.3%	Expected number of quality control checks: HCV = 124; PH = 73 Expected number of errors noted: HCV = 21; PH = 13 Expected Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity: 17.2%	Actual number of quality control checks: HCV = 127; PH = 375 Actual number of errors noted: HCV = 28; PH = 176 Actual Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity: 34.5%	Benchmark Not Achieved

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 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 136	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$459,006; PH = \$121,299 Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 147	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$628,279; PH = \$70,816 Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 3,220; PH = 518 Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 166	Exceeds Benchmark

- iii. **Actual Non-Significant Changes:** HACG did not plan any Non-Significant Changes to this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan.
- iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG made non-significant Changes to Metrics/Data Collection to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software⁹ 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. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** 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.

⁹ HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

Activity 2015.04 – Cap Childcare Deductions

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** 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. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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 families. Nonetheless, HACG has not received any written hardship requests regarding this activity. Meanwhile, the **HUD Standard Metrics** for this activity are listed on next page:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings - Cap Childcare Deductions				
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 = 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 Cost of Task <i>Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</i> \$ 60,177	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 Expected Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i> \$ 98,784	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 259; PH = 14 Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.88 hours; PH = 1.13 hours Actual average hourly compensation: HCV Occupancy Specialists = \$27.56; PH Housing Managers = \$32.67 Actual Cost of Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i> \$ 7,396	Exceeds Benchmark

CE #2: Staff Time Savings - Cap Childcare Deductions				
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 = 1,239; PH = 803 Average time to complete examinations: HCV = 2.25 hours; PH = 2.25 hours Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task <i>Prior to Implementation of the Activity:</i> 4,594.5	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 Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i> 3,501.8	Actual number of annual examinations: HCV = 259; PH = 14 Actual average time to complete examinations: HCV = 1.88 hours; PH = 1.13 hours Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task <i>After Implementation of the Activity:</i> 251.4	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 Average Error Rate of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 16.3%	Expected number of quality control checks: HCV = 124; PH = 73 Expected number of errors noted: HCV = 21; PH = 13 Expected Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity: 17.2%	Actual number of quality control checks: HCV = 127; PH = 375 Actual number of errors noted: HCV = 28; PH = 176 Actual Average Error Rate of Task After Implementation of the Activity: 34.5%	Benchmark Not Achieved

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 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 136	Expected monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$459,006; PH = \$121,299 Expected average monthly housing units for HCV = 2,483; PH = 1,457 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 145	Actual monthly tenant rent for HCV = \$628,279; PH = \$70,816 Actual average monthly housing units for HCV = 3,220; PH = 518 Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 166	Exceeds Benchmark

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

- iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG made non-significant Changes to Metrics/Data Collection to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software¹⁰ 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. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** Where Benchmarks were Not Achieved is not applicable to this activity during this reporting period.

Activity 2016.02 – Non-Competitive Project-Basing Process

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** was Approved and Implemented in fiscal year 2016 (based on construction completion).
- ii. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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:

¹⁰ 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 = 451	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 = 1.88 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 = \$27.56	
	Cost of Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: \$ 15,543	Expected Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 81,210	Actual Cost of Task After Implementation of the Activity: \$ 23,368	

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 = 451	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 = 1.88 hours	
	Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task Prior to Implementation of the Activity: 627.8	Expected Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 2,878.8	Actual Total Staff Hours Dedicated to the Task After Implementation of the Activity: 847.9	

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

- iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG made non-significant Changes to Metrics/Data Collection to this MTW Activity because it changed its client tracking software¹¹ 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. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** Where Benchmarks were Not Achieved is not applicable to this activity.

Activity 2018.02 – Site-Based Housing Flexibility (*formerly Over-House 1-Bedroom Eligible Families in 2-Bedroom Units*)

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** was introduced and Approved in fiscal year (FY) 2018, but not fully implemented. HACG Re-proposed this activity in its 2019 Annual MTW Plan and implemented in FY 2019.
- ii. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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 and it was approved.

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.

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:

¹¹ HACG switched from Emphasys to Yardi in October 2015

HC #4: Displacement Prevention - Site-Based Housing Flexibility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	2260	1808	1372	Benchmark Not Achieved

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility - Site-Based Housing Flexibility				
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.
	192	230	131	Benchmark Not Achieved

- iii. **Actual Non-Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Non-Significant Changes to this activity.
- iv. **Actual Changes to Metrics and Data Collection:** HACG data collection was not fully implemented until October 2018, therefore the data only reflects 9 months of the reporting fiscal year.
- v. **Actual Significant Changes:** HACG did not make any Significant Changes to this MTW Activity.
- vi. **Challenges in Achieving Benchmarks and Possible Strategies:** Where Benchmarks were Not Achieved, the activity was not fully implemented until October 2018, therefore the data only reflects 9 months of the reporting fiscal year.

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

Activity 2016.01 – Next Step Vouchers

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** was Approved and Implemented in fiscal year (FY) 2016 (July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016).

- ii. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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 not collect enough data to report on the effectiveness or outcomes of the activity during this reporting period.

As of June 30, 2019, HACG have not received any new referrals and only has one foster youth on the program. DFCS personal changes is one factor in the lack of referrals. HACG discussed the requirements with DFCS and is hopeful to begin receiving new referrals for FY 2020.

HACG will continue to administer the activity. At the end of FYE 2020, HACG will review the activity's progress and decide if an activity modification or activity close-out is appropriate.

Activity 2016.03 – Project-Basing Flexibilities

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** was introduced and approved in HACG's FY2016 Annual MTW Plan, but not implemented to date.
- ii. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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.

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, 2022; 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.

Activity 2018.01 – Eliminate/Reduce Interim Certification Examinations

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** was introduced and approved in HACG's FY2018 Annual MTW Plan, but not fully implemented to date.
- ii. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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 2022.

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.

Activity 2019.01 – Minimum Rent Increase/Utility Reimbursement Payments (URPs) Decrease

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** was introduced and Approved in HACG's 2019 Annual MTW Plan, but not fully implemented.
- vii. **Description, Impact and Update:** HACG utilizes MTW Authorizations C.11 and D.2.a listed in Attachment C of the MTW Agreement to increase the minimum rent and eliminate or reduce the utility reimbursement payments (URPs).

HACG seeks to improve its cost efficiency and promote self-sufficiency through the implementation of this activity. Elimination of this task achieves Cost Effectiveness of federal dollars.

Under this activity, HACG will increase the minimum rent to \$150 to eliminate URPs (or at the least significantly reduce the number of URPs processed) over the next two years. The increase in minimum rent across all rental assistance programs significantly reduces negative rent situation that require an URP check. The first increase in minimum rent from \$50 to \$100, was effective January 1, 2019 and the second increase from \$100 to \$150 was effective July 1, 2019.

This activity is on schedule but did not begin until the tenth month (April 2019) of the fiscal year. There was not enough data to report as the changes in the rent is done at reexaminations. This activity meets the definition of rent reform. HACG has not received any written hardship request.

C. ACTIVITIES ON HOLD

HACG does not have any activities on hold.

D. CLOSED OUT ACTIVITES

Activity 2014.01 – Community Choice

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** Activity was proposed in Fiscal Year End (FYE) 2014, re-proposed in FYE 2015, and Approved and Implemented in fiscal year 2015. HACG stopped administering this activity in FY 2018 and officially closed-out this activity in FY 2019.
- ii. **Why Activity was Closed Out:** HACG closed the activity because the evaluation period is complete. HACG had contracted with Columbus State University (CSU) to evaluate this activity. CSU's final evaluation report of its findings is included in the Appendix Section, Attachment B.
- iii. **Description, Impact and Update:** HACG learned that offering a higher-valued voucher did not have a big impact of where a resident chose to live. The majority of the residents were satisfied with their overall home and neighborhood and chose to remain in the same area. In comparing the three groups, the Community-Wide evaluation families remained unchanged and the Comparison/Control evaluation families dropped 50% during the same timeframe. Approximately 85% of the families restricted to low-poverty areas continued to live in those areas at the end of the reporting period.

The data supported 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.

Activity 2014.05 – Streamline Housing Quality Standards (HQS)

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Closed:** This activity 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. **Why Activity was Closed Out:** 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. **Description, Impact and Update of Close Out:** 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 3rd, 4th, and 5th 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.

Activity 2014.06 – Rent Reform (Farley)

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Closed:** 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. **Why Activity was Closed Out:** 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. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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.

Activity 2015.01 – Eliminate Child Support from Income Calculation

- i. **Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Amended:** was Approved and Implemented in fiscal year 2015. HACG stopped administration of this activity and Closed-Out the activity in fiscal year 2017.
- ii. **Why Activity was Closed Out:** 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. **Description, Impact and Update:** 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).

(V) SOURCES AND USES OF MTW FUNDS

ANNUAL MTW REPORT

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. Describe Actual Use of MTW Single Fund Flexibility

The MTW PHA shall provide a thorough narrative of actual activities that use only the MTW single fund flexibility. Where possible, the MTW PHA may provide metrics to track the outcomes of these programs and/or activities. Activities that use other MTW authorizations in Attachment C and/or D of the Standard MTW Agreement (or analogous section in a successor MTW Agreement) do not need to be described here, as they are already found in Section (IV) of the Annual MTW Report. The MTW PHA shall also provide a thorough description of how it used MTW single fund flexibility to direct funding towards specific housing and/or service programs in a way that responds to local needs (that is, at a higher or lower level than would be possible without MTW single fund flexibility).

ACTUAL USE OF MTW SINGLE FUND FLEXIBILITY

None of HACG’s HUD-approved, implemented activities used only MTW Single-Fund flexibility in fiscal year 2019.

B. LOCAL ASSET MANGEMENT 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 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 not have any HUD reviews nor physical inspection issues that required action by HACG to address. HACG did receive one audit finding for Housing Choice Voucher Program, 2018 Grant Year. The following audit finding was resolved, and corrective action plan submitted to HUD in a timely manner.

Finding No. 2018-001 – Moving to Work Demonstration Program Tenant Files – Eligibility – Rent Calculations – Other Matter & Significant Deficiency

Housing Choice Voucher Program - CFDA # 14.881, Grant Year 2018

Corrective Action Plan:

1. HACG have contracted a 3rd Party Source to perform Quality Control reviews on a quarterly basis, which began the week of March 15th. This will be an ongoing
2. Additional training was conducted by Quadel that was an instructor led class for two days with all staff that works on calculations. The class conducted calculation of rents, Fair housing, Annual Income, PBV/HCV Eligibility and Recertifications and Tax Credit – income Eligibility and reporting.
3. The following procedure is in place to ensure annual reexamination are conducted timely, internal quality control reviews are performed to ensure rent and utility allowances are calculated accurately and resident files contain all required documentation.

- B. PHA- Directed Evaluations

HACG contracted with Columbus State University (CSU) to evaluate activities and provide a bi-annual report (See Attachment B). The 5-year contract with CSU is complete. Meanwhile, HACG continues to administer the following MTW Activities:

- 2014.02 – Innovation to Reduce Homelessness
- 2016.01 – Next Step Vouchers (only one 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 2019, 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

7-19-19

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, Georgia



Moving to Work

Community Choice Summary

2014.01

Final Report

MTW Activity Description:

The *Moving To Work* Demonstration conducted by the Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia had three distinct evaluation components. The study examines whether or not voucher families take advantage of moving into areas of lower poverty. A total of three voucher groups are assessed. Participants are randomly assigned to groups. Groups consist of a 120% Fair Market Voucher Community Choice group, a 120% Fair Market Value low poverty group and a standard holding voucher control group. The purpose of, *Moving To Work: Community Choice* is to determine whether or not voucher holders will select housing in areas of lower poverty.

Evaluation Methodology:

The evaluation methodology being used in the *Moving To Work: Community Choice* consists of an annual survey instruments in a longitudinal study to determine outcome objectives.

All procedures and surveys in *Moving To Work: Community Choice* have been approved by the Columbus State University Institutional Review Board. An initial survey will be administered on computers at the beginning of the research process, in year one, to determine baseline measures for each participant's economic, educational, health and social status. If a participant is not computer literate a paper copy of the survey will be available. The survey is administered each year during the annual recertification process, with the final being in year five. The survey may be modified each year by the Housing Authority or the Federal Government if needed.

Geographic Data:

HACG collected data for this study from voucher recipients and then sent the data to Columbus State University for analysis. The conceptual focus of this analysis is on space. It uses a geographic information system (GIS) to explore the relationships between the location of voucher recipients, before and after their relocations. It combines visualization and descriptive spatial statistics to explore those relationships.

Last year's data led to the observation that movement decisions made by recipients may be driven far more by the availability of Section 8 housing than by amenities. This year additional attention was paid to the location of Section 8 housing.

Participant Demographics:



Respondent demographics are presented in a series of graphs. Data regarding race and ethnicity indicate that the majority of respondents, 96%, are African American. The majority of respondents in the study are female, with 73% of respondents indicating this sex. This trend may limit the ability to discuss the effects of the voucher programming on male voucher recipients in the future.

The age range of respondents included in the analysis was between 18 and 64 years old. All minor respondents were removed from the demographic analysis because they were never supposed to fill out the entire survey. The average age of respondents is $M=23.28$ and $SD=14.23$.


The number of dependent children in the household is also a key variable for the analysis. Community Choice respondents indicated relatively small housing size with $M=2.23$ and $SD=1.43$. This study will track outcomes of the entire family unit and of individual children as well.

Levels of education in the Community Choice program vary substantially. Respondents with less than a high school education constitute 21% of respondents. High school graduates or equivalencies account for 35% of respondents. Residents possessing more than a high school degree accounted for 44%.


Patterns of work is another important factor. Community Choice respondents indicated that 24.7% of respondents held some form of employment. These data is useful in terms of the relationship to housing choice.





Age



Education





Conclusion:

Slightly more than half of the Community Choice residents (53.5%) chose to move to a new area of town due to its better location. A third (33%) of residents said more resources were why they wanted to move, while a fifth (20%) responded better schools and safety were each reason why they wanted to move. Of the Community Choice residents, 80% were happy with their employment, and 47.5% had good or better health. A majority of the residents were also satisfied or very satisfied with their overall home (90%) and neighborhood (84.4%). In fact, residents were satisfied enough with their home and neighborhood that 62.5% and 78.1% responded that they would not like to move, respectively. Public transportation and the threat of crime were not undesirable enough that residents wanted to move, with 84.4% and 87.1% responding, “No,” respectively. A majority of residents (81.3%) did not have a time when they did not meet all of their essential expenses in the past 12 months. Most of the residents (93.4%) are somewhat or very satisfied with the local public schools in the neighborhood.

In general, Community Choice residents were happy with their employment and living conditions in their home and their neighborhood. In particular, these residents indicated that they wanted to move to this new area of town due to it being in a better location. Based on the survey results, being in a better location included being in a location where residents were satisfied with their overall home and neighborhood, as well as the public schools in the area.

Moving to Work

Rent-Reform Summary

2014.06

Final Report

MTW Activity Description:

Moving To Work is a Public Housing Authorities demonstration that allows them to try different methods to be more efficient and improve public housing. The Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia is dropping rental percentages to a tiered system over a five-year span for those residents that find employment. Participants residing in Chase Apartments make up the control group, while Farley Home participants are the treatment group. The purpose of the project, *Moving To Work: Rent Reform* is to encourage resident self-sufficiency by allowing newly employed residents to benefit financially.

Evaluation Methodology:


The evaluation methodology used in the *Moving To Work: Rent Reform* consists of annual baseline measures in a longitudinal study to determine outcome objectives.

All procedures and surveys in *Moving To Work: Rent Reform* have been approved by the Columbus State University Institutional Review Board. *Moving To Work: Rent Reform* is using Chase Apartments as the control group and Farley Homes as the treatment group. Initial surveys are administered on computers at the beginning of the research process, in year one, to determine baseline measures for each participant's economic, educational, health and social status. If a participant is not computer literate a paper copy of the survey will be available. The survey will be administered each year during the annual recertification process, with the final being in year five. The survey may be modified each year by the Housing Authority or the Federal Government if needed.


Participant Demographics:



There was a total of 149 respondents (Farley=103, Chase=37, Residence Unknown=9) that completed the survey via face to face and electronic means. Residents were contacted multiple times during the data collection period to provide multiple opportunities for participation. The Housing Authority of Columbus Georgia also informed residents of the survey period prior to the process.

The age of respondents ranged from 21 to 82 with a Mean of $M=40.96$, $SD=13.37$. The breakdown of ages is shown in the following graph.




The demographic profile of the respondents is presented in graphs below.






Type of Employment



Education



ANNUAL BENCHMARKS					
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Average earned income of Farley households	\$ 12,530	\$ 13,680	\$ 14,091	\$ 14,514	\$ 14,949
Average earned income of Chase households	\$ 13,697	\$ 14,108	\$ 14,531	\$ 14,967	\$ 15,416
Percentage of Farley work-able households Employed Fulltime	24.3%	25.0%	25.8%	26.5%	27.3%
Percentage of Chase work-able households Employed Fulltime	18.3%	18.8%	19.4%	20.0%	20.6%
Percentage of Farley work-able households Employed Part Time	32.9%	33.8%	34.9%	35.9%	37.0%
Percentage of Chase work-able households Employed Part Time	25.6%	26.4%	27.2%	28.0%	28.8%
Percentage of Farley work-able households Unemployed	62.9%	61.0%	59.1%	57.4%	55.6%
Percentage of Chase work-able households Unemployed	54.9%	53.2%	51.6%	50.1%	48.6%

Conclusion:

After reviewing the Annual Benchmarks for both Farley and Chase, the results are similar at both developments. It is difficult to prove that the tiered rent calculations administered at Farley had the impact anticipated with this MTW activity.

Moving to Work

Initiative to End Homelessness Summary

2014.02

Final Report

MTW Activity Description:

This activity sets aside 150 vouchers Tenant Based Vouchers (TBVs) that links permanent supportive housing to supportive services for chronically homeless families as a top preference. Secondary preference is homeless individuals or individuals who are living in a place not meant for human habitation or in an emergency shelter, in transitional housing, or are exiting an institution where they temporarily resided up to 90 days. The activity includes a tiered rent schedule, minimum rent waiver and selection preference to the targeted group.

Evaluation Methodology:

The evaluation methodology being used in the *Moving To Work: Initiative to End Homelessness* consists of annual survey instruments in a longitudinal study to determine outcome objectives.

All procedures and surveys in *Moving To Work: Initiative to End Homelessness* have been approved by the Columbus State University Institutional Review Board. An initial survey will be administered on computers at the beginning of the research process, in year one, to determine baseline measures for each participant's economic, educational, health and social status. If a participant is not computer literate a paper copy of the survey will be available. The survey is administered each year during the annual recertification process, with the final being in year five. The survey may be modified each year by the Housing Authority or the Federal Government if needed.



Geographic Data:



One interesting pattern that emerged is that most of the larger groups of homeless were located west of I-185 and south of Wynnton / Macon Road. Two areas stood out for their high concentrations of homeless. The first is the north-east-south outskirts of the downtown area of Columbus. The second area is in the southwest area of the county around N. Lumpkin Road and Victory Drive. This is an area just outside the north border of Fort Benning in the southwest area of the county. Areas north of Manchester Expressway / Warm Springs Road as well as the


eastern panhandle of the county operational area stood out for their absence of homeless individuals.

Participant Demographics:

Demographic data was analyzed on the total 156 respondents in the Initiative to End Homelessness program. The following graphs outline the demographic breakdown among the respondents.







Conclusion:

With the creation of Home for Good, HACG’s MTW Rapid Re-housing vouchers, VASH vouchers and this MTW activity to reduce homelessness, Columbus is at “functional zero” for homelessness. This was confirmed at the January 2019 “Point in Time Count”.