



Moving to Work

2015 Annual Plan



OCTOBER 17, 2014
(RESUBMITTED JANUARY 31, 2015)

Seattle Housing Authority

Board of Commissioners

Nora Gibson, Chair
Doug Morrison, Vice Chair
Aser Ashkir
John Littel
Juan Martinez
Kollin Min
Deborah Canavan Thiele

Cabinet

Andrew Lofton, Executive Director
Anne Fiske Zuniga, Deputy Executive Director
Michelle Ackermann
Dean Barnes
Rod Brandon
James Fearn
John Forsyth
Ann-Marie Lindboe
Steve McDowell
Stephanie Van Dyke
Lisa Wolters
Shelly Yapp

Prepared by

Beka Smith, Assistant Asset Management Coordinator

With contributions from: Denille Bezemer, Mallory Day, Holly Henke, Wendy Lance, Andria Lazaga, Tracey Locke, Michele Mosher, Tricia Smiley, Jodi Speer, Jamie Wood, and Scott Woo

Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. General Housing Authority Operating Information	3
III. Proposed MTW Activities	11
IV. Approved MTW Activities	19
V. Sources and Uses of Funds	51
VI. Administrative Information	55
Appendix A – Local Asset Management Plan	56
Appendix B - Market Rate Rent Policy	67
Appendix C – Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Plan	69
Appendix D – Capital Fund Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report	74

I. Introduction

This section provides an overview of the purpose and layout of this plan and describes Seattle Housing Authority's short-term and long-term goals.

What is "Moving to Work"?

Moving to Work (MTW) is a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) demonstration program for housing authorities to design and test innovative, locally designed housing and self-sufficiency initiatives. The MTW program allows participating agencies to waive certain statutes and HUD regulations in order to increase housing choice for low-income families, encourage households to increase their self sufficiency, and improve operational cost effectiveness. Seattle Housing Authority's participation in the MTW program allows the agency to test new methods to improve housing services and to better meet local needs.

Fiscal year 2015 will be Seattle Housing Authority's seventeenth year as a MTW agency. Each year the agency adopts a plan that describes activities planned for the following fiscal year. At the end of the year, we prepare a report describing our accomplishments.

Stakeholder involvement

As part of developing the MTW Plan and annual budget, Seattle Housing Authority provides opportunities for public review and comment. The public comment period began on September 3, 2014 and ended on October 2, 2014. The agency published articles in The Voice (a monthly newspaper for Seattle Housing Authority residents) to notify residents of the public hearing and the availability of draft documents, as well as a notice on rent statement, flyers in Seattle Housing Authority buildings, and a letter sent out to more than 100 resident leaders. The agency also informed the general public about the plan and budget through our website (seattlehousing.org) and an ad in the Seattle/King County newspaper of record, the Daily Journal of Commerce.

All comments were taken into consideration before the agency finalized the plan.

Public hearing: A public hearing was held on September 25, 2014 at 3:00 at the Central Office at 190 Queen Anne Ave N. The agency presented the draft plan and annual budget and received public testimony. Six residents attended and three presented testimony.

Resident leaders: The Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPAC), made up of residents who advise Seattle Housing Authority on various issues, discussed plan activities and the budget at their September meeting.

Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) Review Committee: At the September meeting of the SSHP Review Committee, Seattle Housing Authority staff provided an overview of the draft 2015 budget for the SSHP program.

Additional public comment: Seattle Housing Authority also accepted three comments by phone and three comments by mail during the comment period.

What is in this plan?

The 2015 Annual Plan complies with a format set forth by HUD in June 2013. This is the first year that the new format is required for the annual plan and as a result this plan differs in structure from previous years' plans.

Section I: Introduction provides an overview of the layout of the document and Seattle Housing Authority's short-term and long-term MTW goals.

Section II: General Housing Authority Operating Information provides an overview of the agency's housing portfolio, leasing rates, and waiting list information.

Section III: Proposed MTW Activities describes the new MTW activities that the agency plans to pursue in 2015, including evaluation criteria and waiver citations that provide the agency with the authority to undertake the new activities.

Section IV: Ongoing MTW Activities provides information on previously approved uses of MTW authority.

Section V: Sources and Uses of Funding describes the agency's projected revenues and expenditures for 2015, local asset management program, and use of MTW Block Grant fungibility.

Section VI: Administrative Information provides administrative information required by HUD.

MTW Goals and Objectives

Seattle Housing Authority's primary goals for new and existing MTW strategies in 2015 align with the primary goals of the MTW program: promoting cost effectiveness, housing choice, and self sufficiency. Seattle Housing Authority's new proposed strategies for 2015 include:

- A streamlined approach to self employment expenses
- A requirement that households reside in Seattle for one year before using their voucher to port out to a different community
- A self sufficiency assessment and planning program

All proposed new MTW activities are described in greater detail in Section III.

Long-Term MTW Goals

Seattle Housing Authority is exploring significant changes in rent policy for work-able households and is currently engaging in a series of discussions with the community, participants, Board, and staff to explore our approach. Depending on that feedback, Seattle Housing Authority will submit an amendment to the 2015 MTW Plan to propose a new MTW rent policy in future months.

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

This section provides an overview of Seattle Housing Authority's housing portfolio, leasing, and waiting list information.

Mission statement

The mission of Seattle Housing Authority is to enhance the Seattle community by creating and sustaining decent, safe and affordable living environments that foster stability and self-sufficiency for people with low incomes.

Agency overview

Seattle Housing Authority is a public corporation, providing affordable housing to more than 29,500 people. The agency provides housing in neighborhoods throughout Seattle through a variety of programs that include Seattle Housing Authority-operated housing, partner operated communities, and private rental housing.

More than 9,000 Seattle Housing Authority residents are children. More than 5,000 Seattle Housing Authority residents are elderly and an additional 5,000 are non-elderly disabled adults. The majority (85 percent) of households have annual incomes below 30 percent of the area median income.

In keeping with our mission, Seattle Housing Authority supports a wide range of community services for residents, including employment services, case management, and youth activities.

Funding for Seattle Housing Authority's activities comes from a variety of sources, including HUD's MTW Block Grant, which the agency can use for a variety of activities in support of the agency's mission, special purpose HUD funds that can only be used for specific purposes, other government grants, tenant rents, and revenue from other activities.

Housing stock information: units funded with the MTW Block Grant

The majority of Seattle Housing Authority's funding from HUD comes in the form of a block grant that combines the Low Income Public Housing operating fund, Low Income Public Housing capital fund, and MTW Housing Choice Voucher funding into one funding source for Seattle Housing Authority to use to pursue its mission.

Public housing units

The Low Income Public Housing program (also referred to as public housing or LIPH) is projected to include 6,156 units at the beginning of 2015, including high-rises (large apartment buildings), scattered sites (small apartment buildings or single family housing), and communities at NewHolly, Rainier Vista, High Point, Lake City Court, and Yesler Terrace. HUD's MTW Block Grant provides funding to help contribute to costs exceeding rental income. Households typically pay 30 percent of their adjusted monthly income for rent and utilities.

Currently a total of 115 of these units are leased to service providers who use the units to provide transitional housing or services to residents. An additional forty units receiving public housing subsidy through Seattle Housing Authority are owned and operated by nonprofits as traditional public housing.

Nearly 900 of these units are in the Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP). These communities provide affordable housing to senior households and non-elderly disabled participants.

Projected changes in public housing stock

Seattle Housing Authority does not anticipate adding new public housing units in 2015.

Planned Public Housing Units to be Removed During the Fiscal Year		
PIC Dev. # / AMP and PIC Dev. Name	Number of Units to be Removed	Explanation for Removal
WA1001000050-57 Scattered Sites	50*	SHA is contemplating a second phase of asset repositioning for the scattered site portfolio. Units are currently being evaluated based on size, efficiency, and location.
WA1001000001 Yesler Terrace	112	Yesler Terrace redevelopment
WA1001000041 Holly Court	31	Potential long-term lease for emergency housing for families
Total Number of Units to be Removed	193	
<p>* As noted in previous plans, the second phase of scattered site asset repositioning may ultimately include up to 200 units. However, it is unlikely that more than 50 units will be removed during 2015 and we in fact anticipate that the actual number of units removed during the year will be less than 50.</p>		

The agency may seek HUD approval for demolition and/or disposition of the following during the year, as well as dispositions outlined in prior year plans:

- Up to 112 units and the Epstein Building at Yesler Terrace for Choice Neighborhoods redevelopment and subsequent disposition of the vacant land
- Land disposition for sale to market-rate developers, for the Seattle Housing Authority mixed finance replacement housing limited partnership, and to the City of Seattle Parks Department
- Up to 200 public housing units in our scattered site and partnership housing as part of a second phase of asset repositioning
- One building at Holly Court, currently leased to a non-profit service provider for homeless family housing

Planned Public Housing Units to be Removed During the Fiscal Year		
PIC Dev. # / AMP and PIC Dev. Name	Number of Units to be Removed	Explanation for Removal
WA1001000050-57 Scattered Sites	Up to 200	SHA is contemplating a second phase of asset repositioning for the scattered site portfolio. Units are currently being evaluated based on size, efficiency, and location.
WA1001000001 Yesler Terrace	112	Yesler Terrace redevelopment
WA1001000041 Holly Court	31	Potential long-term lease for emergency housing for families
Total Number of Units to be Removed	Up to 343	

Other Changes to the Housing Stock Anticipated During the Fiscal Year	
Seattle Housing Authority anticipates that approximately 106 units will come offline in 2015 for Yesler Terrace redevelopment. All units will be replaced with redevelopment.	

MTW Housing Choice Vouchers

The Housing Choice Voucher program (also referred to as the voucher program, HCV, and Section 8) is a public/private partnership that provides housing subsidies through vouchers to low-income families for use in the private rental housing market. **At the beginning of 2015, Seattle Housing Authority will administer a projected 9,487 authorized vouchers funded through HUD's MTW Block Grant.**

Participants typically pay 30 to 40 percent of their household's monthly income for rent and utilities, depending on the unit they choose. Voucher subsidy is provided through a variety of means including:

- Tenant-based (tenants can take their voucher into the private rental market)
- Project-based (the subsidy stays with the unit)
- Program-based (Seattle Housing Authority uses MTW flexibility to provide unit-based subsidies that float within a group of units or properties)
- Provider-based (Seattle Housing Authority uses MTW flexibility to provide subsidy to service providers to master lease units, who then sublet to participants in need of highly-supportive housing)

Project-based Vouchers

- **Seattle Housing Authority anticipates awarding approximately 143 new project-based vouchers in 2015.** These new project-based vouchers will support Yesler Terrace redevelopment at 1105 E Fir and 820 Yesler and homeless housing through the King County Combined Funders allocation.

See the following table for more information on planned project-based vouchers.

New Housing Choice Vouchers to be Project-Based During the Fiscal Year		
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Description of Project
1105 E Fir	83	Replacement housing for Yesler redevelopment
820 Yesler Way	50	Replacement housing for Yesler redevelopment
To be determined	10	Homeless housing through the King County Combined Funders allocation
Anticipated Total New Vouchers to be Project-Based	143	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year 3372 Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year 3202

Other HUD-funded housing

Seattle Housing Authority also administers units and vouchers that are funded through sources other than the MTW Block Grant.

Special Purpose Vouchers

At the beginning of 2015 Seattle Housing Authority will administer an authorized 629 non-MTW vouchers provided by HUD for special purposes, including 354 Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, 200 Family Unification Program vouchers, and 75 mainstream vouchers. These vouchers are often awarded competitively and funding is provided outside of the MTW Block Grant. This number fluctuates over time, not only due to new vouchers, but also because the agency is able to move certain types of vouchers into the MTW Block Grant after the first year.

These projections of authorized vouchers do not include anticipated Yesler tenant protection vouchers that have not yet been awarded.

Moderate Rehab

The agency administers HUD Section 8 Moderate Rehab funding for 759 units operated by partner nonprofits serving extremely low-income individuals. Over 600 of these units are designated for homeless individuals.

Section 8 New Construction

Seattle Housing Authority operates 130 units of locally owned units that receive Section 8 New Construction funding and serve people with extremely low-incomes.

Local housing

Local housing programs are operated outside of HUD's MTW Block Grant. They receive no operating subsidy except for project-based vouchers in selected properties. In a small number of cases, MTW Block Grant funds are used for capital improvements in local housing properties serving low-income residents (as discussed further in Section IV, MTW Activity 20.A.01). In such cases, the residents are counted as local, non-traditional households.

Seattle Housing Authority operates more than 1,700 units of local housing in properties throughout Seattle, including low- and moderate-income rental housing in the agency's redeveloped communities (NewHolly, Rainier Vista, High Point, and Lake City Court) and three SSHP buildings.

Major capital activities

Within the context of dwindling federal funding, addressing repairs and improvements remains a challenge for public housing authorities nationwide. In 2015 Seattle Housing Authority plans to target elevators and roofs at several properties, as well as other capital projects throughout the year, such as windows, siding, floors, and appliances.

General Description of All Planned Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

In 2015, Seattle Housing Authority anticipates addressing elevators and roofs at several properties, as well as additional capital projects throughout the year. The following description focuses on projects planned for completion in 2015, rather than expenditures based on capital fund year.

Elevators: Seattle Housing Authority plans to replace one elevator at Jefferson Terrace (WA001000009). Elevator rehabilitation is planned for Wildwood Glen (WA001000093) and Willis House (WA001000095).

Roofs: Roof replacement is planned for Columbia Place (WA001000093) and two scattered site buildings (WA001000055, WA001000051).

Other capital projects: Anticipated projects include exterior rehabilitation at Michaelson Manor (WA001000094), sealing the building exterior at Westwood Heights (WA001000023), replacement of water supply shut-off valves at Jefferson Terrace (WA001000009), additional ACAM and/or security devices at approximately six Seattle Senior Housing Program sites (buildings to be determined), painting at various buildings (buildings to be determined), and master planning work for redevelopment at Yesler Terrace (WA001000001). Various small-scale capital projects are planned for scattered site buildings, including appliances, flooring, cabinets, doors, and window coverings.

Leasing information

In 2015, Seattle Housing Authority anticipates continued strong rates of leasing for public housing and some challenges for vouchers. The following tables represent projected utilization for vouchers and occupancy for Seattle Housing Authority-operated housing.

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

MTW Households to be Served Through:	Planned Number of Households to be Served*	Planned Number of Unit Months Occupied/Leased***
Federal MTW Public Housing Units to be Leased	5,750	69,000
Federal MTW Voucher (HCV) Units to be Utilized	8,977	107,725
Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Property-Based Assistance Programs **	703	8,436
Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	39	470
Total Households Projected to be Served		185,631

* Calculated by dividing the planned number of unit months occupied/leased by 12. In some instances, such as SHA's short-term rental assistance program, the service model calls for assistance of less than 12 months and this results in a discrepancy between the reported number and the actual number of households that are projected to be served.

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

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

We do not anticipate leasing difficulties for public housing units. Leasing may be a challenge for vouchers in Seattle's rental market, which is increasingly expensive and low in vacancies. To improve leasing success rates and increase opportunities for mobility, Seattle Housing Authority plans to increase one-to-one housing counseling services for participants and to identify and connect with service providers in different geographic areas. Seattle Housing Authority has also increased payment standards for two and six bedroom units (effective August 2014).

Description of any Anticipated Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers and/or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Possible Solutions

Housing Program	Description of Anticipated Leasing Issues and Possible Solutions
Housing Choice Vouchers	The Seattle rental market is extremely tight. Planned strategies to address leasing include increased housing counseling services, identifying service providers in different geographic areas and improving connections, and (effective August 2014) new voucher payment standards for two and six bedroom units.
Local Non-Traditional	The short-term rental assistance program also anticipates that the Seattle rental market will pose challenges to assisted households, including difficulty finding and leasing available units due to low vacancy rates and high rents. Participants may also have difficulty competing in the rental market due to barriers such as lack of or poor credit and rental history. The program will address these challenges with staff support to assist households with housing search and negotiation with potential landlords.

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements

If the PHA has been out of compliance with any of the required statutory MTW requirements listed in Section II(C) of the Standard MTW Agreement, the PHA will provide a narrative discussion and a plan as to how it will return to compliance. If the PHA is currently in compliance, no discussion or reporting is necessary.

SHA is in compliance with the three statutory objectives.

Waiting list information

Seattle Housing Authority's waiting list strategies vary to match the needs of different properties and housing programs. Applicants may be, and often are, on multiple waiting lists at the same time.

Housing Choice Vouchers

Seattle Housing Authority anticipates reopening the waiting list for tenant-based vouchers in the first quarter of 2015. The agency maintains a single tenant-based waiting list, which has been closed since the 2013 lottery. As of the beginning of 2015, Seattle Housing Authority anticipates that approximately 250 households will remain on the tenant-based waiting list that was established in 2013.

Project-based voucher properties operate their own site-specific waiting lists.

Seattle Housing Authority-operated housing

Site-specific waiting lists are offered for all of Seattle Housing Authority's affordable housing properties. The larger HOPE VI communities (NewHolly, High Point, Lake City Court, and Rainier Vista) operate waiting lists on-site. All other site-specific waiting lists are maintained centrally, by program, to maximize efficiencies and housing choice. Most waiting lists are updated on an ongoing basis through the use of Save My Spot, a system that allows applicants to check in monthly by phone or computer to indicate their continued interest in housing opportunities with the agency.

Anticipated waiting list changes

Seattle Housing Authority anticipates that community need for public housing and vouchers will remain high in 2015. Most public housing waiting lists will remain open, and the waiting list for tenant-based vouchers will open for the first time since 2013. The following table shows the projected number of households on waiting lists for public housing units and vouchers as of the beginning of 2015. The agency does not currently envision organizational or policy changes to waiting lists.

Wait List Information Projected for the Beginning of the Fiscal Year

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type**	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed***	Are There Plans to Open the Wait List During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW Public Housing Units (SHA Administered)	Site-Based	7,541	Partially Open	N/A
Federal MTW Public Housing Units (Service Agency Administered)	Site-Based	315	Open	N/A
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program (Tenant Based)	Community-Wide	250	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program (Project Based)	Site-Based	9,363 (not unduplicated)	Partially Open	N/A
Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program	Site-Based	236 (not unduplicated)	Open	N/A

Rows for additional waiting lists may be added, if needed.

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

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

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

All public housing waiting lists administered by SHA are expected to remain open, except for Lake City Court, Yesler Terrace, and one, two, and three bedroom units at NewHolly.

Our community partners make their own decisions regarding when to open and close their waiting lists. Seattle Housing Authority currently projects that the waiting lists for the following project-based programs will be open, but their status is subject to change at any time: Oxford Apartments, A Place of Our Own, Leighton Apartments, Traugott Terrace, Monica's Village, Dorothy Day, Compass Cascade, Dekko Place, Council House, Community Psychiatric Clinic's 3 cluster, Alderbrook, 10th Ave NW, Holden Manor, Aridell Mitchell, Hilltop House, Colonial Gardens, Emerald City Commons, Crestwood Place, Starliter, Muslim Housing Services, Park Place, Colwell, Haddon Hall, Sea-Mar Family Housing, Westwood Heights East, Kenyon House, and Avalon Place. This does not include project-based programs that do not maintain a waiting list.

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

Two types of local non-traditional programs have waiting lists: straight tax credit units (categorized under Local Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program) and Muslim Housing Services, which is one of our community partners providing traditional housing in SHA public housing units (categorized under Federal MTW Public Housing - Service Agency Administered). The other community agencies operating within public housing units do not maintain a waiting list due to the design of their programs.

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A

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

No changes are currently anticipated.

III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested

This section provides information detailing proposed new uses of MTW authority, including evaluation criteria and specific waivers to be used.

New proposed MTW activities

Self Employment Expenses

Seattle Housing Authority is proposing a streamlined approach to the verification of expenses for households that are self employed. Self employed participants may declare expenses up to 30 percent of their gross income, using a tax return or profit-loss statement, with no further validation of deductions required. Participants with higher expenses may choose to select a 30 percent expense deduction or claim a higher amount and go through the regular full verification process within the required timeframe.

MTW Activity #10.P.22	Self Employment Expenses: Households may declare employment expenses up to 30 percent of gross income without further validation of deductions.			
Targeted MTW statutory objective	Cost Effectiveness: Reducing time spent on validation of self employment expenses will save staff and participant time. We project approximately one hour of time saved per certification for households that choose to declare self employment expenses of up to 30 percent of their income without further verification.			
Schedule	Policy is ready for immediate implementation. Households will be eligible at their next recertification. We anticipate that time savings will begin to accumulate immediately.			
Outcome Measures	Metric	Baseline (2009)	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
	CE1: Total cost of recertifications	\$814,099 in wage costs attributable to preparing and conducting certifications	\$883,225 in wage costs attributable to preparing and conducting certifications (reflecting \$2,321 saved from the previous total SHA benchmark for recertification)	\$883,225 in wage costs attributable to preparing and conducting certifications, adjusted for inflation

	Metric	Baseline (2009)	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
	CE2: Total time to complete recertifications	34,552 staff hours	37,267 staff hours (reflecting 94 hours saved from the previous total benchmark for recertification)	37,267 staff hours
Data sources	<p>Seattle Housing Authority will maintain records in Yardi of participants' selection of the 30 percent deduction or full verification of actual expenses. Participants that select verification of expenses will be responsible for supplying receipts or for new businesses a self declaration of projected income and expenses, as well as year-to-date business records such as Profit and Loss Statements.</p> <p>Regarding the baseline year, SHA began implementing rent reforms in 2001, before the implementation of standardized HUD metrics. Meaningful data from that time period is no longer available. We use 2009 as the baseline year for this activity because data is available and because this year precedes the most recent round of rent policy strategies that have a measurable impact on staff hours, including implementation of triennial recertifications in the HCV program.</p>			
Authorizations Cited	MTW Agreement: Attachment C (C)(4). We are using this authorization to waive standard requirements for the verification of employment expenses during income reviews and to instead permit a streamlined process if the expenses are under a defined threshold.			
Impact Analysis	The only impact that we anticipate for this activity is time saved for participants and Seattle Housing Authority staff. We project approximately one hour of time saved per certification for households that choose to declare self employment expenses of up to 30 percent of their income without further verification. There will be no changes in the amount or type of expenses that are allowed. Households will retain the right to request full verification of their self employment expenses over 30 percent of their gross income, or if they prefer full verification for any reason.			
Hardship criteria	Participation will be voluntary, therefore no hardship policy is necessary..			

Annual Reevaluation	Seattle Housing Authority will revisit the effectiveness of this activity annually as part of the annual MTW reporting process. We can envision no negative consequences for participants; however, if they develop we will consider revising or discontinuing the policy.
Transition Period	Households will be eligible for the streamlined approach to self employment expenses at their next recertification. If households wish to continue the standard full verification process for self employment expenses, they may continue to do so.

One Year Residency Requirement before Port Out

Seattle Housing Authority is proposing a requirement that recipients of Housing Choice Vouchers must have one year of residency in Seattle before they can use their voucher to port out to a different community. The one year residency requirement will apply after the household leases a unit in Seattle with their voucher.

The need for affordable housing in Seattle exceeds the supply of vouchers. By requiring one year of residency, the agency balances the need to serve Seattle residents while continuing to support housing choice for households that choose to live in a different community after one year. Reducing port outs reduces staff hours and costs spent on administrative fees.

MTW Activity #19.H.03	One Year Residency Requirement before Port Out: SHA may require that Housing Choice Voucher households live in Seattle for one year before moving with their voucher to a different community.			
Targeted MTW statutory objective	Cost Effectiveness: Requiring one year of residency in Seattle before porting out to a different community increases cost effectiveness by decreasing staff time and money spent on port out fees.			
Schedule	The policy will be implemented following HUD approval in 2015. We anticipate that cost savings will begin to accrue immediately.			
	Metric	Baseline (2014)	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
Outcome Measures	CE1: Total cost of task in dollars	\$17,332	\$15,252	\$15,252 adjusted annually for inflation
	CE2: Total time to complete port out processing in staff hours	419 hours	369 hours per year once fully implemented	369 hours per year

Data sources	<p>Seattle Housing Authority maintains records of households that have ported out of Seattle in Elite, the current system of record for the Housing Choice Voucher program.</p> <p>Time estimates represent initial port-out processing only and do not include subsequent activities such as annual port-out updates.</p> <p>Cost estimates represent staff wages and administrative fees only and do not include overhead.</p>
Authorizations Cited	MTW Agreement: Attachment C (D)(1)(g). This authorization is needed because Seattle Housing Authority is proposing a limit on port out eligibility that is different from standard regulations.
Hardship Policy	Exemptions will be considered on a case-by-case basis, including in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Violence Against Women Act.

Self-Sufficiency Assessment and Plan

Self-sufficiency services can be critical in helping households increase their income, assets, and professional skills. Seattle Housing Authority, in partnership with several local workforce, education, and training providers, including the Seattle College District, the Workforce Development Council of King County, Seattle Jobs Initiative, and the Financial Empowerment Network, are developing a new program known as the Workforce Opportunity System pilot. The goal of this program is to connect current and wait-listed households with education, employment, and financial literacy services. Using MTW authority, Seattle Housing Authority may make it mandatory for work-able adults to participate in the pilot program in order to develop a self-sufficiency assessment and plan.

In 2015 Seattle Housing Authority will pilot this approach with approximately 330 participants, currently targeted to include work-able adults entering Seattle Housing Authority's public housing and (MTW) voucher programs, and work-able adults in households requesting an interim recertification due to a decrease in income. The target population may evolve based on information received during planning or pilot implementation.

The pilot program will include a week long "Opportunity Week," for which participants will receive college credit. At Opportunity Week, participants will complete an individualized self-sufficiency assessment and a comprehensive assessment to measure reading, listening, speaking, math, and writing proficiency levels. College staff and faculty will work with participants to develop education and career plans including immediate next steps, service provider contact information, and personal barriers to pursuing their individual education and career pathways.

Opportunity Week will be offered in multiple formats, including options such as evening hours, different days of the week, and alternate campus locations. If participation in Opportunity Week, despite the variety of scheduling options, presents a hardship for a participant they may instead meet one-on-one with a job developer to create an assessment and plan within a shorter time frame (such as a few meetings, which will also be offered at alternative times and locations).

Throughout the pilot Seattle Housing Authority will seek to continuously evaluate and improve program enrollment, assessment and planning procedures, referral processes, and auxiliary service providers in order to improve the program and expand assistance for additional work-able households. As a result program design will likely change over time.

MTW Activity #21.A.01	Self-sufficiency Assessment and Plan: SHA may make self -sufficiency assessments and planning mandatory for work-able adults			
Targeted MTW statutory objective	Self Sufficiency: This new program will increase self sufficiency by connecting participants to assessments, individualized plans, and community resources designed to help them increase their education, training, and credentials and obtain higher wage jobs.			
Schedule	The policy will be implemented as a pilot in 2015 and possibly broadened to all work-able adults in future years depending on its results. We anticipate that this activity will have an immediate impact on participants' knowledge of and connection to resources and opportunities. Impacts on participants' incomes will likely require more time, about which we will learn more as we gather information through the pilot.			
Outcome Measures	Metric	Baseline (2013)	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
	CE4: Amounts of funds leveraged in dollars	\$0	\$900,000 in funding in year one; \$500,000 in year two, self supporting in future years. (These figures reflect grants only and do not include a monetary value for the commitment of hours from our community partners.)	\$1.4 million in leveraged funding for implementation. However, the ultimate goal for this program is that it will leverage existing community resources and not require the commitment of additional funding beyond the first years of implementation.

	Metric	Baseline (2013)	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
	SS1: Averaged earned income of households participating in the assessment services	Average earned income of public housing and HCV work-able households after 1 year (but less than 2 years) of subsidized housing: \$10,173 After 3 years (but less than 4 years) of subsidized housing participation: \$11,269	Average earned income for pilot participants is higher than baseline – measured after year 1 and year 3 of participation and adjusted for inflation (Numeric benchmarks: at least \$11,190 after year 1 and at least \$12,171 after year 3)	To be determined after implementation plan is developed and based on feedback from the pilot program.
	SS3: Number of head of households: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employed full-time ▪ Employed part-time ▪ Enrolled in an educational program ▪ Enrolled in job training program ▪ Unemployed 	0 (no households are currently participating in the pilot)	87 heads of household employed full time; 118 employed part-time; 125 unemployed; Education and job training benchmarks to be created as part of the implementation plan (and reported in the 2015 report)	To be determined after implementation plan is developed and based on feedback from the pilot program.

	Metric	Baseline (2013)	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
	SS3: Percentage of total work-able households: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employed full-time ▪ Employed part-time ▪ Enrolled in an educational program ▪ Enrolled in job training program ▪ Unemployed 	Among work-able public housing and HCV households: 23% employed full-time 36% employed part-time 41% unemployed (Baseline is unavailable for educational and job training enrollment)	Among pilot participants: 26% employed full-time 36% employed part-time 38% unemployed; Education and job training benchmarks to be created as part of the implementation plan (and reported in the 2015 report)	To be determined after implementation plan is developed and based on feedback from the pilot program.
	SS4: Number of households receiving TANF assistance	0 (no households are currently participating in the pilot)	36 households receiving TANF	To be determined after implementation plan is developed and based on feedback from the pilot program.
	SS5: Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency through self-sufficiency assessment program	0 (no households are currently participating in the pilot)	330 in 2015 Further benchmarks to be determined after scale up implementation plan is developed.	To be determined after implementation plan is developed and based on feedback from the pilot program.

	Metric	Baseline (2013)	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
	SS8: Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency(households with a primary source of income from wages)	0 (no households are currently participating in the pilot)	32 households transitioned to self sufficiency (with a primary source of income from wages)	To be determined after implementation plan is developed and based on feedback from the pilot program.
Data sources	<p>Seattle Housing Authority and the third-party service agencies providing assessment and planning services will maintain records of households' participation, services delivered, and income levels.</p> <p>Baseline data on work-able households among SHA's public housing and HCV MTW programs are defined as any household that has at least one work-able individual age 19-64, excluding port-outs.</p> <p>SHA does not track number of hours worked for each household. Reporting on full-time and part-time employment status is derived through reported wage income. Households with wages equal to or greater than 40 hours per week at minimum wage are counted as full-time. Households with wages greater than zero but less than annual full-time wage are counted as part-time. Households with no wage income are counted as unemployed.</p>			
Authorizations Cited	<p>MTW Agreement: Attachment C (C)(2), (C)(4), (D)(1)(c), (D)(1)(c), (D)(3)(b).</p> <p>These authorizations are needed because requiring participation in the self sufficiency assessment and planning process would alter policies regarding eligibility for admission into the public housing and voucher programs, as well as requirements for interim review processes.</p>			

IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

This section provides HUD-required information detailing previously HUD-approved uses of MTW authority.

Background

Seattle Housing Authority has made an effort to include all previously approved MTW activities. Any exclusion is unintentional and should be considered continuously approved. If additional previously approved activities are discovered, we will add them to subsequent plans or reports.

MTW activities

MTW activities are overarching areas of reform that Seattle Housing Authority is pursuing, such as rent reform and the local project-based voucher program, often with multiple different strategies to reach our goals. The agency obtained approval from HUD for most of these activities through previous Annual Plans and other means prior to execution of the Amended and Restated MTW Agreement. During that time, MTW agencies were not required to specify policy elements or waivers being used to implement the activity. For the purpose of evaluating the impact and success of these activities, the agency has made an effort to break down the specific elements of the initiative into different strategies.

Seattle Housing Authority has developed 20 MTW activities, which are:

1. Development Simplification
2. Family Self-Sufficiency Program
3. Inspection Protocol
4. Investment Policies
5. Local Leases
6. MTW Block Grant and Fungibility (*no longer reported as an MTW activity*)
7. Procurement (*no longer reported as an MTW activity*)
8. Special Purpose Housing
9. Project-based Program
10. Rent Policy Reform
11. Resource Conservation
12. Waiting Lists, Preferences, and Admission
13. Homeownership and Graduation from Subsidy
14. Related Nonprofits
15. Combined Program Management

16. Local Asset Management Program
17. Performance Standards
18. Short-term Assistance
19. Mobility and Portability
20. Local Non-Traditional Affordable Housing

In the following pages, we provide a list of ongoing MTW activities that have been previously approved, with an update on any changes anticipated for 2015.

In accordance with the guidance issued by HUD in the revised Form 50900, activities are organized in separate sections based on whether they are active, not yet implemented, on hold, or closed out.

The agency is not using outside evaluators for any of the following ongoing activities. For the purposes of reporting on standardized metrics, Seattle Housing Authority uses two definitions of self sufficiency: households whose primary source of income is wages, and households who transition to unsubsidized housing. In reality we recognize that self sufficiency is significantly more complex and varied.

Implemented MTW Activities

MTW Activity #1 – Development Simplification

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Agreement and 1999 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2004.

Description

Development simplification helps Seattle Housing Authority to move quickly to acquire, finance, develop, and remove public housing properties from its stock in an efficient, market-driven manner. MTW flexibilities allow the agency to respond to local market conditions and avoid delays related to HUD requirements and approval processes, which ultimately increases the number of affordable units that Seattle Housing Authority is able to develop and preserve in the community. While of greatest impact when the housing market is highly competitive, these strategies present opportunities at all times for Seattle Housing Authority to increase housing options as circumstances arise.

2015 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority is planning a second phase of the scattered sites repositioning strategy, which would include the disposition of up to approximately 200 scattered site units. We will also dispose of up to 112 units and land at Yesler Terrace as part of Choice Neighborhoods redevelopment. Seattle Housing Authority may also seek approval for disposition of one building at Holly Court, currently under lease to a non-profit service provider for homeless family housing.

Seattle Housing Authority may consider implementing existing MTW Activity 1.P.03 to develop local Total Development Cost (TDC) limits for 2015. TDC guidelines issued in 2014 showed decreased limits for some building types, which is not consistent with construction costs in the Seattle market. If Seattle Housing Authority decides to implement local TDC limits in 2015, the agency will submit the proposed methodology to HUD for approval.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

No changes are currently anticipated. However, Seattle Housing Authority and HUD will be discussing the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities and this may result in changes to metrics in the 2015 MTW Report.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Public Housing Strategies					
1.P.01	Design guidelines: Seattle Housing Authority may establish reasonable, modest design guidelines, unit size guidelines and unit amenity guidelines for development and redevelopment activities.	1999 MTW Agreement	Has not yet been needed	Inactive	None
1.P.02	Streamlined public housing acquisitions: Acquire properties for public housing without prior HUD approval, provided that HUD site selection criteria are met.	1999 MTW Agreement	2004	Active	None
1.P.03	Total Development Cost limits: Replace HUD's Total Development Cost limits with reasonable limits that reflect the local market place for quality construction.	1999 MTW Plan	Has not yet been needed	Inactive	None
1.P.04	Streamlined mixed-finance closings: Utilize a streamlined process for mixed-finance closings	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Inactive	None
1.P.05	Streamlined public housing demo/dispo process: Utilize a streamlined demolition/disposition protocol negotiated with the Special Applications Center for various public housing dispositions	2000 MTW Plan	2004	Inactive	None

MTW Activity #3 - Inspection Protocol

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan and implemented in 2001.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority uses a cost-benefit approach to unit and property inspections. Current strategies within this approach include using Seattle Housing Authority's own staff to complete inspections of its properties with vouchers and inspecting residences less frequently.

2015 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority is currently discussing training and staffing structures that would enable the agency to implement MTW Strategy #3.A.01, to avoid duplication in inspections by using other recent inspections completed for agencies such as the Washington State Housing Finance Commission and the Seattle Office of Housing.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority plans to modify baselines and benchmarks in the 2015 annual report to reflect the changes made in the 2014 Appropriations Act, which made biennial inspections for Housing Choice Vouchers available to all housing authorities and therefore no longer an MTW activity.

No additional changes are currently anticipated. However, Seattle Housing Authority and HUD will be discussing the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities and this may result in changes to metrics in the 2015 MTW Report.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
3.A.01	Private sector cost benefit and risk management approaches to inspections such as avoiding duplicative inspections by using other recent inspections for agencies such as the Washington State Housing Finance Commission	1999 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None
3.A.03 (formerly 3.H.03, 3.P.01)	Reduced frequency of inspections: Cost-benefit approach to housing inspections allows Seattle Housing to establish local inspection protocol, including interchangeable use of HQS/UPCS	1999 MTW Plan	2003	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Voucher Strategies					
3.H.01	Inspect Seattle Housing Authority-owned properties: Allows Seattle Housing Authority staff, rather than a third party entity, to complete inspections of Seattle Housing Authority owned properties.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
3.H.02	Fines for no-shows at inspections: Impose fines on the landlord or participant for failing to be present at scheduled inspections.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
3.H.04	Self-certification for minor fails: Self-certification by landlords of correction of minor failed inspection items.	2010 MTW Plan	2010	Inactive	None

MTW Activity #5 – Local Leases

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan and implemented in 1999.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority utilizes local lease strategies to incorporate best practices from the private market and encourage self-sufficiency.

2015 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

SHA will add the following metrics in the 2015 MTW Report:

- SS3: Number of heads of households and percent of work-able households employed full time, part time, and unemployed
- SS4: Households receiving TANF assistance
- SS5: Households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency

SHA will no longer report on HC1: New housing units made available.

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
5.A.01	Self-sufficiency requirement: All households receiving subsidy from Seattle Housing Authority (public housing or voucher) in HOPE VI communities must participate in self-sufficiency activities.	1999 MTW Plan	1999	Active	None
Public Housing Strategies					
5.P.01	Local lease: Seattle Housing Authority may implement its own lease, incorporating industry best practices.	2001 MTW Plan	2011	Inactive	None
5.P.02	Grievance procedures: Modify grievance policies to require tenants to remedy lease violations and be up to date in their rent payments before granting a grievance hearing for proposed tenancy terminations.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
5.P.03	Lease term for public housing units: SHA may offer lease renewals for six months or month-to-month time periods.	2009 MTW Plan	2009	Inactive	None
5.P.04	Property-specific pet policies: Seattle Housing Authority may establish pet policies, which may include the continuation or establishment of pet-free communities or limits on the types of pets allowed, on a building by building basis.	2011 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None

MTW Activity #8 – Special Purpose Housing Use

Status

Active - First implemented prior to MTW participation in 1999 and continued throughout MTW participation.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority utilizes public housing units to provide special purpose housing and to improve quality of services or features for targeted populations and other residents. In partnership with agencies that provide social services, Seattle Housing Authority is able to make affordable housing available to households that would

not likely be admitted in traditional public housing units. With this program Seattle Housing Authority and partner agencies use residential units for service-enriched transitional/short-term housing, for office space for community activities and service delivery, and for management uses tied to MTW goals. The ability to designate public housing units for specific purposes and populations facilitates this work, including allowing units to target populations with specific service and housing needs, and specific purposes such as pet-free housing.

The services that community partners provide are diverse, including, for example, medical respite care for homeless adults, domestic violence support and legal assistance, mental health and chemical dependency services, tutoring and literacy services for children, health care and transportation services for elderly participants, case management, and life skills classes.

2015 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority plans to transition additional units to MTW use. With the additional units Seattle Housing Authority will increase the number of units allowable for residential management (a subcategory within special purpose use) from 21 to 29.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority will add the following metrics in the 2015 MTW Report:

- CE4: Funds leveraged
- HC5: Number of households able to move to a better unit
- HC7: Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice

Seattle Housing Authority will no longer report on the following metrics:

- SS5: Households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency
- HC1: New housing units made available

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
8.A.01	Conditional housing: Housing program for those who do not currently quite meet Seattle Housing Authority's minimum LIPH qualifications	8.A.01	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
8.A.02	Program-specific waiting lists: Operate separate waiting lists (or no waiting list) for specific programs such as service enriched units.	2000 MTW Plan	Prior to MTW participation	Inactive	None
8.A.03	Service enriched housing: With the help of key partners, Seattle Housing Authority may develop supportive housing communities.	2001 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
Public Housing Strategies					
8.P.01	Agency units for housing and related supportive services: Make residential units available for service-enriched housing by partner agencies.	1999 MTW Agreement	Prior to MTW participation	Active	None
8.P.02	Agency units for services: Make residential units available as office space for community activities, management use, and partner agencies providing services in and around the community.	1999 MTW Agreement	Prior to MTW participation	Active	None
8.P.03	Designate LIPH units for specific purposes/ populations: Seattle Housing Authority may designate properties/units for specific purposes such as elderly or smoke-free.	2000 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
8.P.04	Definition of elderly: Change definition of elderly for HUD-designated elderly preference public housing from 62 to 55.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
8.P.05	Pet-free environments: Establish pet-free environments in connection with selected service enriched housing.	2009 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None

MTW Activity #9 - Project-based Program

Status

Active - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2000.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority uses MTW to develop and implement a local project-based program, providing vouchers to subsidize units in Seattle Housing Authority-owned and non-profit-owned properties throughout Seattle. Seattle Housing Authority's project-based activities include a large number of MTW strategies to reduce costs, make project-based programs financially feasible for owners, and to provide housing choice in Seattle. The project-based program promotes housing choice through strategies such as offering site-specific waiting lists maintained by providers (and, therefore, does not issue exit vouchers), expanding the definition of eligible unit types, allowing more project-based units per development and overall, admitting certain types of felons, allocating vouchers to programs and providers (not just units), allowing payment standards that promote services and the financial viability of projects, and coupling housing assistance with services by working with partners. The project-based program reduces Seattle Housing Authority's costs through strategies allowing project-based staff to self-certify selected inspections and maintain their own waiting lists, reducing the frequency of inspections by Seattle Housing Authority staff, streamlining admissions, and non-competitively allocating subsidies to Seattle Housing Authority units. Project-based program strategies also make contract terms consistent with requirements for other leveraged funding sources.

2015 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority will add the following metrics in the 2015 MTW Report:

- CE1: total cost of MTW project-based program activities
- HC4: Number of households that would otherwise lose assistance or need to move
- HC5: Number of households able to move to a better unit

Seattle Housing Authority will no longer on HC1: New housing units made available.

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modification, or Additions to Authorizations
Voucher Strategies					
9.H.01	Cost-benefit inspection approach: Cost-benefit approach to housing inspections allows Seattle Housing Authority to establish local inspection protocol.	1999 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
9.H.02	Assets in rent calculation: Only calculate income on assets declared as valuing \$5,000 or more.	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Inactive (superseded by \$50,000 threshold under 10.H.12)	None
9.H.03	Choice offered at beginning (no exit vouchers): Housing choice is offered at the beginning of the project-based admissions process (by nature of site-specific waiting lists); exit vouchers are not offered.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.04	Contract term: Project-based commitments renewable up to 40 years.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.05	Eligible unit types: Modify the types of housing accepted under a project-based contract - allows shared housing and transitional housing.	2000 MTW Plan	2002	Active	None
9.H.06	HAP contracts: Modify the HAP contract to ensure consistency with MTW changes and add tenancy addendum.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.07	Non-competitive allocation of assistance: Allocate project-based subsidy non-competitively to Seattle Housing Authority controlled units.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.08	Owners may conduct new and turnover inspections: Seattle Housing Authority may allow project-based owners to conduct their own new construction/rehab inspections and to complete unit turnover inspections	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modification, or Additions to Authorizations
9.H.09	Percent of vouchers that may be project-based: Raise the percentage of vouchers that may be project-based above HUD limits.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.10	Unit cap per development: Waives the 25% cap on the number of units that can be project-based in a multi-family building without supportive services or elderly/disabled designation.	2000 MTW Plan	2008	Active	None
9.H.11	Rent cap-30% of income: Project-based participants can not pay more than 30% of their adjusted income for rent and utilities.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Inactive	None
9.H.12	Streamlined admissions: Streamline applications process for project-based HCV units.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.13	Competitive allocation process: Commit vouchers to the City's competitive process for housing funding.	2004 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
9.H.14	Payment standards for Seattle Housing Authority units: Allows higher than Voucher Payment Standard for Seattle Housing Authority-operated project-based units if needed to support the project budget (while still taking into account rent reasonableness).	2004 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
9.H.15	Subsidy cap in replacement units: Cap subsidy at levels affordable to households at 30% AMI in project-based HOPE VI replacement units where Seattle Housing Authority also contributed capital to write-down the unit's affordability to that level.	2004 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
9.H.16	Admissions-admit felons under certain conditions: Allows for the admission into Project-based Voucher units of Class B and Class C felons subject to time-limited sex offender registration requirements who do not, in the opinion of the owner of the subsidized units, constitute a threat to others.	2005 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modification, or Additions to Authorizations
9.H.17	Program-based vouchers: Allocate floating voucher subsidy to a defined group of units or properties.	2003 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
9.H.18	Provider-based vouchers: Provide vouchers to selected agencies to couple with intensive supportive services. The agency master leases units and subleases to tenants.	2007 MTW Plan	2007	Active	None
9.H.19	Streamlined admissions and recertifications: Seattle Housing Authority may streamline admissions and recertification processes for provider-based and project-based programs.	2009 MTW Plan	Not yet implemented	Inactive	None
9.H.20	Partners maintain own waiting lists: Allow partners to maintain waiting lists for partner-owned and/or operated units/vouchers and use own eligibility and suitability criteria.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
9.H.21 (formerly 9.H.20)	COPEs housing assistance payment calculations: Count as zero income for residents who are living in project-based units at assisted living properties where Medicaid payments are made on their behalf through the COPEs system	2012 MTW Plan	Prior to MTW participation	Active	None

MTW Activity #10 – Local Rent Policy

Status

Active - First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2000.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority's rent policy program tackles a number of objectives, including increased flexibility in the rent calculation process and determining the eligibility of units and payment standards. Rent policies also promote cost effectiveness and self sufficiency through a minimum rent and asset income threshold and through streamlined rent review processes.

2015 Updates

In order to maximize efficiencies through our previously implemented triennial re-certification policy for elderly and disabled households (10.H.10, 10.P.03), Seattle Housing Authority would like to clarify that we will not run EIV during the intermittent years in which participants' income is not being used to update their rent amount.

Seattle Housing Authority is activating two strategies related to self certification of medical expenses in the Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs: 10.H.13 and 10.P.13. Seattle Housing Authority will allow self certification of medical expenses up to \$5,000. Self certification will be optional and no changes will be made to the types of expenses that are eligible or the types of households that are eligible for the deduction.

The agency would like to clarify that our MTW definition of rent burden in 10.H.01, which is 40 percent of gross income, is also used in our annual reassessment of voucher payment standards. This means that Seattle Housing Authority will consider increasing the voucher payment standard within the basic range for units of a particular size when either more than 40 percent of families are paying more than 40 percent of monthly gross income for rent and utilities or more than 25 percent of new voucher holders with vouchers of a particular unit size fail to lease up within 60 days of issuance.

Seattle Housing Authority would also like to clarify that the agency will accept self-certification of asset income when it will not be included in the rent calculation because it falls below the established threshold of \$50,000 (as previously established in MTW strategies 10.P.19 and 10.H.12). However, the agency may require documentation for auditing purposes.

A previous MTW activity from 2005 was accidentally omitted from subsequent reports when Seattle Housing Authority transitioned to HUD's new reporting format in 2009. This MTW activity, still in place, allows Seattle Housing Authority to address noncompliance with the annual review by raising the unit rent to market rate rather than pursuing eviction for noncompliance. (See pages C4 and C8 of Seattle Housing Authority's 2005 annual MTW report for its original inclusion in Seattle Housing Authority's MTW strategies.) This strategy is now categorized as 10.P.21 and will be included in future annual plans and reports. For more information about the policy, see Appendix B.

Seattle Housing Authority is currently engaging in a community-wide discussion of the Stepping Forward rent policy proposal. The importance of this issue requires additional time for the agency and its Board to fully consider all of the feedback that is received. Therefore the new rent policy proposal will not be included in the annual MTW Plan and instead may be proposed as a plan amendment in future months, depending on the input that we receive.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority will add authorizations, metrics, baselines, and benchmarks related to 10.P.21: Market Rate Rent Policy to future plans and reports. This MTW strategy from 2005 was accidentally omitted when transitioning between reporting formats.

Seattle Housing Authority will also add the following metrics in the 2015 MTW Report:

- SS3: Number of heads of household and percent of work-able households employed full time, part time, or unemployed
- SS4: Households receiving TANF assistance

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
10.A.01	Streamlined Income Verification: Seattle Housing Authority may adopt tax credit rules or the rules of other major funders regarding the length of time income verification documents are considered valid for income review processes.	2014 MTW Plan	2014	Active	None
Voucher Strategies					
10.H.01	Rent burden-include exempt income: Exempt income included for purposes of determining affordability of a unit in relation to 40% of household income.	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
10.H.02	Rent cap-use gross income: Rent burden calculated on 40% of Gross Income, up from HUD's standard 30% of Adjusted Income.	2000 MTW Plan	2005	Active	None
10.H.03	Rent Reasonableness at Seattle Housing Authority owned units: Allows Seattle Housing Authority staff to perform Rent Reasonable determination for Seattle Housing Authority owned units.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
10.H.04	Payment standard: Seattle Housing Authority may develop local voucher payment standards.	2002 MTW Plan	2002	Active	None
10.H.05	Absolute minimum rent: The minimum rent for all residents will be established annually by Seattle Housing Authority. No rent will be reduced below the minimum rent amount by a utility allowance.	2003 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
10.H.06	Payment standard-SROs: Seattle Housing Authority may use the studio payment standard for SRO units.	2003 MTW Plan	2003	Active	None
10.H.07	Tenant-based self-sufficiency incentives: Rent policies to foster self-sufficiency among employable households, including income disregards proportional to payroll tax; allowances for employment-related expenses; intensive employment services coupled with time limits; locally-defined hardship waivers.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.H.08	Imputed income from TANF: Impute TANF income if household appears eligible and has not documented ineligibility. TANF not counted toward income if family is sanctioned.	2006 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.H.09	Rent reasonableness streamlining: Allows Seattle Housing Authority to streamline rent reasonable determinations.	2006 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None
10.H.10	Rent reviews for entirely elderly/disabled adult households every three years: Rent reviews conducted for households with 100 percent elderly and/or disabled adults only every three years (within a period of 40 months).	2009 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None
10.H.11	Recategorized as 13.H.02. See Activity #13.				
10.H.12	Asset income threshold: Seattle Housing Authority will establish a threshold for calculating asset income to an amount up to \$50,000.	2010 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None
10.H.13	Streamlined medical deduction: Seattle Housing Authority will allow self certification of medical expenses under \$5,000.	2010 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
10.H.14	Simplified utility allowance schedule: HCV participants' rent will be adjusted for a Utility Estimate based on the number of bedrooms (defined as the lower of voucher size or actual unit size) and tenant responsibility for payment of energy, heat, and sewer/water under their lease, with a proration for energy-efficient units.	2011 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
Public Housing Strategies					
10.P.01	Absolute minimum tenant payment: Tenants pay a minimum rent (\$50 or more) even if rent calculation and/or utility allowance would normally result in a lower rental payment or even reimbursement.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
10.P.02	Earned Income Disregard: HUD's Earned income Disregard is not offered to public housing residents.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
10.P.03	Every third year rent reviews for entirely elderly/disabled adult households: Rent reviews conducted for households with 100 percent elderly and/or disabled adults only every three years (within a period of 40 months).	2001 MTW Plan	2004	Under development	None
10.P.04	Rent freezes: Voluntary rent policy freezes rent in two year intervals.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Inactive	None
10.P.05	TANF rent calculation: Calculate TANF participant rent on 25% of gross income.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Inactive	None
10.P.06	Tenant Trust Accounts: A portion of working public housing residents' income may be deposited in an escrow account for use toward self-sufficiency purposes.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Inactive	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
10.P.07	Ceiling rent 2 year time limit: When a tenant's calculated rent reaches the ceiling rent for their unit, the rent will not be increased beyond the rent ceiling for 24 months. After that time, the tenant's rent is calculated as 30% of adjusted gross income.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Inactive	None
10.P.08	Impute income from public benefits: Seattle Housing Authority may impute income in rent calculation for tenants declaring no income who appear eligible for but decline to collect benefits from the State's Employment Security or Department of Social and Health Services (such as Unemployment or TANF).	2000 Annual Plan	2001	Active	None
10.P.09	Partners develop separate rent policies: Allow partner providers and HOPE VI communities to develop separate rent policies that are in line with program goals and/or to streamline.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.10	Studio vs. 1 bedroom: Differentiate rents for studios vs. 1 bedroom units.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.11	Utility allowance-self-sufficiency and resource conservation: Change utility allowance where metering permits to encourage self-sufficiency and resource conservation.	2005 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.12	Utility allowance-schedule: Seattle Housing Authority may change utility allowances on a schedule different for current residents and new move-ins.	2008 MTW Plan	2008	Active	None
10.P.13	Streamlined for fixed income: Further streamline rent policy and certification process for fixed income households, including self-certification of medical expenses under \$5,000.	2009 MTW Plan	2014	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
10.P.14	Streamlined rent policy for partnership units: Allow non-profit partners operating public housing units to implement simplified rent policies.	2009 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.15	Utility allowance-frequency of utility allowance updates: Seattle Housing Authority may revise the schedule for reviewing and updating utility allowances due to fluctuations in utility rates to no more than annually.	2009 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None
10.P.16	Utility allowance-local benchmark: Seattle Housing Authority may develop new benchmarks for "a reasonable use of utilities by an energy conservative household" - the standard by which utility allowance are calculated.	2009 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
10.P.17	SSHP rent policy: Rents in SSHP units receiving public housing subsidy will be one of four flat rents based on the tenant's percentage of Area Median Income (Under 20 percent, 20-29 percent, 30-39 percent, or 40 percent or over).	2011 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
10.P.18	No HUD-defined flat rents: Seattle Housing Authority does not offer tenants the choice of "flat rents" as required of non-MTW agencies.	2000 MTW Plan	2001	Active	None
10.P.19 (formerly 10.P.17)	Asset income threshold: Seattle Housing Authority will increase the threshold for including asset income in rent contribution calculations to an amount up to \$50,000	2012 MTW Plan	2012	Active	None
10.P.20	Simplified Utility Allowance for HOPE VI communities and incentive for conservation	2013 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None
10.P.21	Market rate rent: Seattle Housing Authority may charge market rate rent as a penalty for noncompliance with the annual review process	2005 MTW Plan	2005	Active	See above

MTW Activity #11 – Resource Conservation

Status

Active - First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2000.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority's resource conservation strategies take advantage of the agency's existing relationships with the City of Seattle and local utility providers, which continuously identify opportunities to increase resource conservation and reduce costs, rather than conducting a HUD-prescribed energy audit every five years.

Conservation strategies have already achieved significant energy and cost savings to the agency, including conversion to more efficient toilets and electrical upgrades.

2015 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

No changes are currently anticipated. However, Seattle Housing Authority and HUD will be discussing the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities and this may result in changes to metrics in the 2015 MTW Report.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Public Housing Strategies					
11.P.01	Energy protocol: Employ a cost-benefit approach for resource conservation in lieu of HUD-required energy audits every five years.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None

MTW Activity #12 – Waiting Lists, Preferences, and Admission

Status

Active - First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2000.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority's waiting list, preferences, and admission strategies have two primary objectives: to increase efficiencies and to facilitate partnerships with agencies that provide supportive services. Seattle Housing Authority's MTW flexibilities in this area allow the agency to provide a greater percentage of vouchers to service providers and make decisions if needed to prevent homelessness. These strategies also expedite admission into the

program for partner agencies' clients by allowing agencies to maintain their own waiting lists and allowing applicants referred by selected providers to receive the next available unit.

2015 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

No changes are currently anticipated. However, Seattle Housing Authority and HUD will be discussing the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities and this may result in changes to metrics in the 2015 MTW Report.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
12.A.01	Local preferences: Seattle Housing Authority may establish local preferences for federal housing programs.	2002 MTW Plan	2002	Not currently needed	None
Voucher Strategies					
12.H.01	Recategorized as 9.H.20. See Activity #9.				
12.H.02	Voucher distribution through service provider agencies: Up to 30% of Seattle Housing Authority's tenant-based vouchers may be made available to local nonprofits, transitional housing providers, and divisions of local government that provide direct services for use by their clients without regard to their client's position on Seattle Housing Authority's waiting list.	2000 MTW Plan	2002	Active	None
12.H.03	Special issuance vouchers: Establish a "special issuance" category of vouchers to address circumstances where timely issuance of vouchers can prevent homelessness or rent burden.	2003 MTW Plan	2003	Active	None
12.H.04	Admit applicants owing Seattle Housing Authority money: Provide voucher assistance to households owing Seattle Housing Authority money from prior tenancy under specific circumstances, for example if they enter into a repayment agreement.	2008 MTW Plan	2008	MTW authority no longer required	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
12.H.05	Limit eligibility for applicants in subsidized housing: Implement limits or conditions for tenants living in subsidized housing to participate in the HCV program. For example, before issuing a Public Housing resident a Voucher, they must fulfill the initial term of their public housing lease.	2008 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None
12.H.06	Streamlined eligibility verification: Streamline eligibility verification standards and processes, including allowing income verifications to be valid for up to 180 days.	2009 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None
Public Housing Strategies					
12.P.01	Site-based waiting lists: Applicants can choose from several site-specific and/or next available waiting lists.	1999 MTW Plan	1999	Not currently needed	None
12.P.02	Partners maintain own waiting lists: Allow partners to maintain waiting lists for partner-owned and/or operated units (traditional LIPH units; service provider units, etc.) and use own eligibility and suitability criteria (including no waiting list).	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	None
12.P.03	Expedited waiting list: Allow applicants referred by selected partners (primarily transitional housing providers) to receive expedited processing and receive the "next available unit."	2004 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None
12.P.04	No waiting list: Allows for filling units without a waiting list.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
12.P.05	Eligibility criteria: Unique eligibility criteria for specific units or properties, such as service enriched units.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented (except for the agency units governed by 8.P.01)	Inactive	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
12.P.06	Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) Waiting List Policy: Seattle Housing Authority will not distinguish between senior and non-senior disabled households in filling vacancies in the SSHP portfolio based on bedroom size. The SSHP program will maintain a 90 percent senior, 10 percent non-senior disabled ratio at the AMP level.	2013 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None

MTW Activity #13 – Homeownership and Graduation from Subsidy

Status

Active - First included in the 2004 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2004.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority provides support for the multiple ways that households can successfully move away from housing subsidy – not only through homeownership, but also through unsubsidized rentals in the private market. These strategies include a savings match pilot program, as well as End of Participation clocks for households whose income has increased to the point where they no longer require substantial subsidy.

2015 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority will add HC6: Number of households that purchased a home in the 2015 MTW Report.

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
13.A.01	Down payment assistance: Allocate MTW Block Grant funds to offer a local down payment assistance program.	2004 MTW Plan	2004	Inactive	None
13.A.02	Savings match incentive: Seattle Housing Authority will implement a new program that will match savings for qualifying public housing and HCV households leaving subsidized housing for homeownership or unsubsidized rental units.	2012 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None
Voucher Strategies					
13.H.01	Monthly mortgage assistance: Seattle Housing Authority may develop a homeownership program that includes a monthly mortgage subsidy.	2008 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
13.H.02	180-day EOP clock: The 180-day End of Participation "clock" due to income will start when a family's Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) reaches \$50 or less.	2010 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None
Public Housing Strategies					
13.P.01	End of Participation for higher income households in mixed-income communities: In mixed-income communities, Seattle Housing Authority will remove subsidy when household income exceeds the established limit for six months.	2012 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None

MTW Activity #15 – Combined Program Management

Status

Active - First included in the 2008 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2008.

Description

In some of its communities, Seattle Housing Authority co-locates units funded through project-based vouchers and low income public housing. Combining program management and policies for both of these types of units (referred to as Streamlined Low Income Housing Program, or SLIHP, units) within the same community makes

sense and reduces costs by eliminating redundancies, including duplicative rent reviews and inspections. It also avoids unnecessary disparities between tenants of the two different types of units. Seattle Housing Authority's current implementation of this activity allows for all units subsidized by project-based housing choice vouchers to be operated just like public housing subsidized units in communities that receive both types of subsidy. This streamlined approach includes acceptance of slight differences (generally less than \$1) in rent calculation caused by different data systems of record for vouchers and public housing.

2015 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority will add CE1: Total cost for this activity in the 2015 MTW Report.

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
15.A.01	Combined program management: Combined program management for project-based vouchers and public housing in communities operating both subsidy types.	2008 MTW Plan	2008	Active	None

MTW Activity #18 – Short-Term Assistance

Status

Active – First included in the 2013 MTW Plan and first implemented in 2013.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority is working on multiple fronts with community partners to develop innovative new assistance programs that are designed to be short-term in length. These new programs will help households both access and retain housing through one-time or temporary assistance such as rent, deposits, arrears, utility assistance, moving and relocation costs, and temporary housing as needed. Short-term assistance is paired with targeted services when needed, including connections to employment, childcare services, and domestic violence counseling.

Seattle Housing Authority is also entering into an inter-agency transfer agreement to ensure continued access to stable and safe housing for households that need to move to another jurisdiction due to domestic violence and will assist clients who need to move out of Seattle Housing Authority's jurisdiction as well as those moving into the

local area from a MTW partner agency. The interagency domestic violence transfer program will include short-term assistance with moving and relocation costs as well as supportive services through local partnering domestic violence agencies.

Seattle Housing Authority's MTW activities for short-term assistance also include disregarding one-time or short-term emergency assistance from other sources to prevent households from losing their housing in determining eligibility and rent contribution.

2015 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority is considering participating in a cooperative community initiative at the Bailey Gatzert Elementary School in partnership with the Gates Foundation. Details of the pilot are still being developed, but Seattle Housing Authority will likely use its MTW authority to provide short-term rental assistance (18.H.01) for rapid rehousing for low-income youth and their families identified within the school.

Seattle Housing Authority would also like to clarify that one-time or temporary assistance may include moving and relocation costs and temporary housing as needed, as well as paired services, such as case management and connections to employment, child care, and counseling.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority will add the following metrics in the 2015 MTW Report:

- HC4: Number of households that would otherwise lose assistance or need to move
- HC5: Households able to move to a better unit
- HC7: Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice

Seattle Housing Authority will no longer report on the following metrics:

- SS6: Average S8 subsidy per household
- SS8: Number of households transitioned to unsubsidized housing

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
18.A.01	Interagency Domestic Violence Transfer Program: Seattle Housing Authority will join an inter-jurisdictional transfer program to assist residents and program participants who become victims of domestic violence.	2014 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
18.A.02	Emergency Assistance for Housing Stability: Seattle Housing Authority may disregard one-time or short-term emergency assistance from other sources to prevent households from losing their housing in determining eligibility and rent contribution.	2014 MTW Plan	2014	Active	None
Voucher Strategies					
18.H.01	Short-Term Rental Assistance: Seattle Housing Authority will provide funding for short-term shallow rental assistance paired with services through a cooperative community initiative to help families and youth obtain and retain housing.	2013 MTW Plan	2013	Active	None

MTW Activity #20: Use of Funds for Local Non-Traditional Affordable Housing

Status

Active - First included in the 2013 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented with HUD's definition of local non-traditional activities in 2011.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority may use MTW Block Grant funds to support affordable housing outside of the traditional public housing and voucher programs. This activity includes both short and long term funding for development, capital improvement, and maintenance of affordable housing units. It may also provide financial maintenance, such as the contribution of funds to meet an established Debt Coverage Ratio, required for continued operation of the affordable units. Seattle Housing Authority follows applicable requirements regarding local non-traditional use of MTW funds.

2015 Updates

In 2015, Seattle Housing Authority may use MTW funds for renovations at Longfellow Creek Apartments, which would increase the number of local non-traditional units.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

Seattle Housing Authority will add HC1: Number of new units made available in the 2015 MTW Report.

Further changes to metrics may result as Seattle Housing Authority and HUD discuss the incorporation of standard metrics for existing activities.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
20.A.01	Use of Funds for Local Non-Traditional Affordable Housing: Seattle Housing Authority may use Block Grant funds to develop, capitably improve, and maintain and operate affordable housing outside of the traditional public housing and voucher programs.	2013 MTW Plan	2011	Active	None

Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities

MTW Activity #2 – Family Self-Sufficiency Program

Status

Not yet implemented - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority's Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program supports residents with services and financial incentives that help them to pursue self sufficiency in multiple arenas, including employment, education, and moves to market-rate housing. MTW strategies have been designed to help the Family Self-Sufficiency Program expand its impact by partnering with other agencies, providing incentives for participation, and using local selection criteria, contract terms, and escrow calculation methods.

2015 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority will consider activating existing FSS MTW strategies in 2015, including a locally designed participation contract. The agency may also want to revisit the FSS program more broadly as the agency contemplates a change in rent policy. Determining a course of action for rent reform will likely precede development of new strategies for the FSS program. The agency is currently discussing a proposed new approach to rent for work-likely households in a broad outreach initiative engaging participants, community members, staff, and stakeholders. If the agency decides to pursue rent reform, we will develop a 2015 Plan Amendment that will describe new or updated activities.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

No changes are anticipated.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
2. A.01	FSS: Partner with City: Partner with the City of Seattle to share responsibilities and resources for a new integrated FSS program.	1999 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2.A.02	SJI preference + time limits: Preference for Seattle Jobs Initiative participants coupled with time limits.	1999 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2.A.03	FSS escrow accounts: Use local policies for determining escrow calculation, deposits, and withdrawals.	2007 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2.A.04	FSS participation contract: Locally designed contract terms including length, extensions, interim goals, and graduation requirements.	2007 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2. A. 05	FSS Program Coordinating Committee: Restructure Program Coordinating Committee (PCC) to better align with program goals and local resources.	2007 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2.A.06	FSS program incentives: Provide incentives to FSS participants who do not receive escrow deposits.	2007 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
2.A.07	FSS selection preferences: Up to 100% of FSS enrollments may be selected by local preferences.	2007 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None

MTW Activity #19 – Mobility and Portability

Status

Under development – First included in the 2013 MTW Plan.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority has adopted strategies related to the mobility and portability of vouchers, including a program to help voucher holders access improved housing opportunities when security deposits and other moving costs pose a barrier. Seattle Housing Authority also maintains MTW authority for a strategy aimed as cost effectiveness that would allow Seattle Housing Authority to deny requests for portability moves to another

jurisdiction when the receiving housing authority intends to administer rather than absorb the voucher and the combination of higher payment standards and/or more generous subsidy standards would result in a higher payment standard for the household than the payment standard applicable within Seattle Housing Authority's jurisdiction.

2015 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority continues to develop 19.H.02: Housing Choice Moving Cost Assistance and Support and anticipates that full implementation will occur in 2015. The agency is currently exploring housing search assistance models and best practices for households facing multiple barriers to success (such as criminal backgrounds, prior evictions, and lack of funds for deposits) and is considering expanding services to include funds for deposit assistance, landlord outreach, and a fund to reimburse mitigation and damage claims. These services may be contracted and provided through a local third party with expertise in this area.

Implementation of 19.H.01: Limiting portability in high cost areas is not currently planned, but Seattle Housing Authority will continue to revisit whether this activity should be implemented based on the federal funding context and number of port-outs.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

No changes are anticipated.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
19.H.01	Limiting portability in high cost areas: Seattle Housing Authority may deny requests for portability moves to another jurisdiction when the receiving housing authority intends to administer rather than absorb the voucher and the resulting payment standard would be higher than Seattle Housing Authority's payment standard.	2013 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Inactive	None
19.H.02	Housing Choice Moving Cost Assistance and Support: Seattle Housing Authority will develop an assistance fund for security deposits and similar costs for voucher participants.	2014 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Under development	None

On Hold Activities

MTW Activity #4 – Investment Policies

Status

On Hold - First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan. First implemented in 1999. Placed on hold in 2013.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority's MTW investment policies give the agency greater freedom to pursue additional opportunities to build revenue by making investments allowable under Washington State's investment policies in addition to HUD's investment policies. Each year, Seattle Housing Authority assesses potential investments and makes a decision about whether this MTW flexibility will be needed.

2015 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority annually assesses potential investments to determine which investment policies are most beneficial. The agency does not anticipate using alternate investment policies in 2015. However, Seattle Housing Authority will continue to revisit its investment strategies annually in consideration of both the agency's financial plans and available investment opportunities.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Metrics

No changes are anticipated.

Previously Approved Strategies

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
Agency-wide Strategies					
4.A.01	Investment policies: Seattle Housing Authority may replace HUD investment policies with Washington State investment policies.	1999 MTW Plan	1999	On Hold	None

Closed Out Activities

MTW Activity #6: MTW Block Grant and Fungibility

First implemented with MTW participation in 1999. Closed out in 2011.

While Seattle Housing Authority maintains MTW Block Grant and fungibility authority, we no longer report on this as an MTW activity at HUD's request. Previously approved strategies for this activity were:

- MTW Block Grant: Seattle Housing Authority combines all eligible funding sources into a single MTW Block Grant used to support eligible activities.
- Operating reserve: Maintain an operating reserve consistent with sound management practices.
- Utilization goals: HCV utilization defined by use of budget authority.
- Obligation and expenditure timelines: Seattle Housing Authority may establish timelines for the obligation and expenditure of MTW funds.

While the Block Grant, fungibility, operating reserve, and utilization goals continue to be active and critical elements of Seattle Housing Authority's participation as an MTW agency, this activity may be considered closed out as of 2011, which was the last year that Seattle Housing Authority reported on it as a separate activity. HUD no longer allows Seattle Housing Authority to establish timelines for the obligation and expenditure of MTW funds.

MTW Activity #7: Procurement

First implemented with MTW participation in 1999. Closed out in 2011.

While Seattle Housing Authority's MTW procurement activity was approved by HUD in the 1999 Annual Plan, HUD has since that time taken the position that it is not an allowable MTW activity.

Previously approved strategies for this activity were:

- Construction contract: Locally-designed form of construction contract that retains HUD requirements while providing more protection for Seattle Housing Authority.
- Procurement policies: Adopt alternative procurement system that is competitive, and results in Seattle Housing Authority paying reasonable prices to qualified contractors.
- Wage rate monitoring: Simplified process for monitoring the payment of prevailing wages by contractors.

This activity may be considered closed out as of 2011, which was the last year that Seattle Housing Authority reported on it as a separate activity.

MTW Activity #14 – Related Nonprofits

First approved in the 2004 MTW Annual Plan. Closed out in 2013.

Seattle Housing Authority never implemented this activity, which would have allowed the agency to enter into contracts with related nonprofits. Seattle Housing Authority determined that existing partnership structures were adequate without needing additional MTW authority.

Previously approved strategies for this activity were:

- Related non-profit contracts: Seattle Housing Authority may enter into contracts with any related nonprofit.

This activity may be considered closed out as of 2013. Seattle Housing Authority closed out this activity without implementing it because it found that MTW flexibility was not needed for the activities intended.

MTW Activity #16 – Local Asset Management Program

First included in the 2000 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 2000.

While Seattle Housing Authority maintains Local Asset Management Program (LAMP) authority, we no longer report on this as an MTW activity at HUD's request.

Previously approved strategies for this activity were:

- Local Asset Management Program: Use asset management principles to optimize housing and services.

Although Seattle Housing Authority continues to operate under the LAMP and this remains an essential element of the agency's participation in the MTW program, this activity may be considered closed out at HUD's request as of 2013

MTW Activity #17 – Performance Standards

First included in the 1999 MTW Annual Plan and first implemented in 1999.

While Seattle Housing Authority maintains the authority for alternative evaluation and reporting requirements, we no longer report on this as an MTW activity at HUD's request.

Previously approved strategies for this activity were:

- Local performance standards in lieu of HUD measures: Develop locally relevant performance standards and benchmarks to evaluate the agency performance in lieu of HUD's Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS).

Although Seattle Housing Authority continues to work collaboratively with other MTW agencies and with HUD on alternative evaluation and reporting requirements, this activity may be considered closed out as of 2014.

V. MTW Sources and Uses of Funds

This section describes the agency's projected revenues and expenditures for MTW funds for 2015, local asset management program, and use of MTW Block Grant single fund flexibility.

Sources and uses of MTW funds

The following table summarizes estimated MTW sources of funds for 2015 by Financial Data Schedule (FDS) line item, as required by the new HUD guidance on MTW plans and reports.

Estimated Sources of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year		
PHAs shall provide the estimated sources and amounts of MTW funding by FDS line item.		
Sources		
FDS Line Item	FDS Line Item Name	Dollar Amount
70500 (70300+70400)	Total Tenant Revenue	\$15,596,743
70600	HUD PHA Operating Grants	\$124,241,879
70610	Capital Grants	\$11,915,964
70700 (70710+70720+70730+70740+70750)	Total Fee Revenue	\$4,500
71100+72000	Interest Income	\$21,159
71600	Gain or Loss on Sale of Capital Assets	\$0
71200+71300+71310+71400+71500	Other Income	\$1,642,932
70000	Total Revenue	\$153,423,177

The following table on Estimated Uses of MTW Funding summarizes estimated MTW expenditures for 2015 by pre-populated FDS line item. Unlike the previous Estimated Sources of MTW Funding table, which includes capital grants, the summary of expenditures does not include most capital expenses, which account for approximately \$12.2 million. The FDS line item format captures only select capital costs and excludes others from the table; whereas Seattle Housing Authority budgets all capital funds as a group in the capital budget regardless of the ultimate accounting treatment of the capital fund expenditures. In addition, the Uses table does not include \$9.3 million that Seattle Housing Authority plans to spend on programs and services for voucher and public housing participants, such as supportive and self-sufficiency services, parks operations in low income communities, and planning for and development of low income housing (which are described in the single fund flexibility section that follows). The Uses table also does not capture \$3.9 million for various reserve contributions. As a result of the different categories that are included in the Sources and Uses tables, comparing totals will not correlate.

Estimated Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall provide the estimated uses and amounts of MTW spending by FDS line item.

Uses		
FDS Line Item	FDS Line Item Name	Dollar Amount
91000 (91100+91200+91400+91500+91600+91700+91800+91900)	Total Operating - Administrative	\$23,171,663
91300+91310+92000	Management Fee Expense	\$3,257,573
91810	Allocated Overhead	\$0
92500 (92100+92200+92300+92400)	Total Tenant Services	\$672,415
93000 (93100+93600+93200+93300+93400+93800)	Total Utilities	\$6,064,744
93500+93700	Labor	0
94000 (94100+94200+94300+94500)	Total Ordinary Maintenance	\$11,960,386
95000 (95100+95200+95300+95500)	Total Protective Services	\$702,161
96100 (96110+96120+96130+96140)	Total insurance Premiums	\$1,589,490
96000 (96200+96210+96300+96400+96500+96600+96800)	Total Other General Expenses	\$1,469,788
96700 (96710+96720+96730)	Total Interest Expense and Amortization Cost	\$0
97100+97200	Total Extraordinary Maintenance	\$1,462,000
97300+97350	Housing Assistance Payments + HAP Portability-In	\$77,603,047
97400	Depreciation Expense	\$0
97500+97600+97700+97800	All Other Expenses	\$0
90000	Total Expenses	\$127,953,267

Local Asset Management Program

Seattle Housing Authority has implemented a local asset management program (LAMP) since the inception of its MTW participation. The agency detailed the LAMP in its HUD-approved 2010 MTW Annual Plan, which is provided for ease of reference in Appendix A of this plan. Seattle Housing Authority continues to implement the local asset management program.

The agency has not created a Central Office Cost Center as described in HUD's Asset Management plans. Instead, Seattle Housing Authority uses an indirect services fee (IDSF) that complies with the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87 requirements, but differs from HUD's prescribed options.

Seattle Housing Authority's Indirect Service Fee is more comprehensive than HUD's asset management system. HUD's asset management and fee for service systems focus only on a fee for service at the public housing property level. The agency's LAMP is broader and includes local housing and other activities not found in traditional HUD

programs. Seattle's IDSF is based on anticipated indirect costs for the fiscal year. The fee is updated each year as part of the annual budget process. Pursuant to the requirements of OMB Circular A-87, the IDSF is determined in a reasonable and consistent manner based on total units and leased vouchers. Thus, the IDSF is calculated as a per-housing-unit or per-leased-voucher fee per month charged to each program. For the 2015 budget, the per-unit-month (PUM) cost for housing units is \$53.68 and for leased vouchers is \$22.83.

B. MTW Plan: Local Asset Management Plan	
Is the PHA allocating costs within statute?	No
Is the PHA implementing a local asset management plan (LAMP)?	Yes
<p>If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. The narrative shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.</p>	
Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?	Yes
<p>No significant changes to the Local Asset Management Plan are anticipated.</p>	

Single-fund flexibility

Seattle Housing Authority established a MTW Block Grant Fund under the original MTW Agreement and continues to use single-fund flexibility under the First Amendment to the Amended and Restated MTW Agreement. Seattle Housing Authority's flexibility to use MTW Block Grant resources is central to support its array of low-income housing services and programs. The agency exercises its authority to move MTW funds and project cash flow among projects and programs as the agency deems necessary to further its mission and cost objectives.

The agency analyzes its housing, rental assistance, community service, administrative, and capital needs on an annual basis through the budget process to determine the level of service and resource needs to meet the agency's strategic objectives. MTW flexibility to allocate MTW Block Grant revenues among the Authority's housing and administrative programs enables the agency to balance the mix of housing types, services, capital investments and administrative support to different low-income housing programs and different groups of low-income residents. It enables the agency to tailor resource allocation to best achieve our cost, program, and strategic objectives and therefore maximize our services to low-income residents and applicants having a wide diversity of circumstances, needs, and personal capabilities.

The bulk of Seattle Housing Authority's use of its MTW single fund authority is to provide MTW Block Grant funds for activities in MTW communities and other funds that directly support low income housing and services for Low Income Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher participants. Examples are:

- Community supportive services, such as youth tutoring, mental health case management services for elderly and disabled clients, computer labs and training for residents, education, training, and job

referrals, combined learning and community betterment activities for high school youth, and health and wellness programs

- Parks and open space providing our low-income communities with play opportunities for children, active sports activity for youth, and passive and active exercise options
- Planning, pre-development, and construction management services for public housing redevelopment and opportunities to increase affordable housing for low income people with incomes under 80 percent of median

The MTW Block Grant has also enabled Seattle Housing Authority to continue addressing some of the most urgent capital needs in both MTW communities and other local housing programs with Housing Choice Voucher and Low Income Public Housing eligible housing units and to augment reserves in low income housing programs that serve Housing Choice Voucher and Low Income Public Housing residents. Additionally, single fund flexibility enables SHA to invest in programs to demonstrate cost effective service models, including the effectiveness of short-term or shallow subsidies in the voucher program serving homeless families and youth.

For 2015, Seattle Housing Authority plans to use MTW Block Grant funding flexibility of approximately \$9.3 million for the purposes previously outlined above. The three largest MTW Block Grant uses are for community and supportive services (\$3.9 million); planning and redevelopment of public housing (\$2.2 million); and support of capital repairs and reserve needs of local low-income housing, serving tenants that predominantly qualify for or are subsidized by Housing Choice Voucher or Low Income Public Housing funds (\$2.1 million).

Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Funding

Seattle Housing Authority estimates that in 2015 it will receive approximately \$1.3 million in Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) funding. RHF expenditures will exceed that amount and will be used for Yesler Terrace redevelopment as part of our Choice Neighborhoods Initiative and other low income housing development. For more information, see Seattle Housing Authority's RHF plan in Appendix C.

VI. Administrative Information

This section provides documentation of Board of Commissioners actions regarding this plan and describes agency-directed evaluations of MTW, if any.

Seattle Housing Authority Board of Commissioners resolution

On October 13, 2014, the Board of Commissioners passed a resolution to approve this plan. The resolution approving the plan and certification of compliance with regulations are provided as a separate attachment.

Public Review

The public comment period for the MTW Plan began on September 3, 2014 and continued through October 2, 2014. A public hearing was held on September 25, 2014 at 3:00 pm at the Central Office at 190 Queen Anne Avenue N. Six residents attended and three residents presented testimony at the public hearing.

Agency-directed evaluations

The agency is not currently engaged in any agency-wide evaluations of its MTW program.

Capital Fund Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report

This report is provided in Appendix D.

Appendix A – Local Asset Management Plan

This is a republishing of Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP, originally submitted as Appendix A of the 2010 MTW Plan

I. Introduction

The First Amendment to the Amended and Restated Moving to Work (MTW) Agreement (“First Amendment”) allows the Seattle Housing Authority (Seattle Housing Authority or the Authority) to develop a local asset management program (LAMP) for its Public Housing Program. The agency is to describe its LAMP in its next annual MTW plan, to include a description of how it is implementing project-based management, budgeting, accounting, and financial management and any deviations from HUD’s asset management requirements. Under the First Amendment, Seattle Housing Authority agreed its cost accounting and financial reporting methods would comply with federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87 and agreed to describe its cost accounting plan as part of its LAMP, including how the indirect service fee is determined and applied. The materials herein fulfill Seattle Housing Authority’s commitments.

II. Framework for Seattle Housing Authority’s Local Asset Management Program

A. Mission and Values

Seattle Housing Authority was established by the City of Seattle under State of Washington enabling legislation in 1939. Seattle Housing Authority provides affordable housing to about 26,000 low-income people in Seattle, through units Seattle Housing Authority owns and operates or for which Seattle Housing Authority serves as the general partner of a limited partnership and as managing agent, and through rental assistance in the form of tenant-based, project-based, and provider-based vouchers. Seattle Housing Authority is also an active developer of low-income housing to redevelop communities and to rehabilitate and preserve existing assets. Seattle Housing Authority operates according to the following Mission and Values:

Our Mission

Our mission is to enhance the Seattle community by creating and sustaining decent, safe and affordable living environments that foster stability and increase self-sufficiency for people with low-income.

Our Values

As stewards of the public trust, we pursue our mission and responsibilities in a spirit of service, teamwork, and respect. We embrace the values of excellence, collaboration, innovation, and appreciation.

Seattle Housing Authority owns and operates housing in neighborhoods throughout Seattle. These include the four large family communities of NewHolly and Rainier Vista in Southeast Seattle, High Point in West Seattle, and Yesler Terrace in Central Seattle. In the past fifteen years, Seattle Housing Authority has undertaken redevelopment or rehabilitation of three of our four family communities and 21 of our public housing high-rise buildings, using mixed financing with low-income housing tax credit limited partnerships.

Seattle Housing Authority has approximately 590 employees and a total projected operating and capital budget of \$220 million for Calendar Year 2010.

B. Overarching Policy and Cost Objectives

Seattle Housing Authority's mission and values are embraced by our employees and ingrained in our policies and operations. They are the prism through which we view our decisions and actions and the cornerstone to which we return in evaluating our results. In formulating Seattle Housing Authority's Local Asset Management Program (LAMP) our mission and values have served as the foundation of our policy/cost objectives and the key guiding principles that underpin Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP.

Consistent with requirements and definitions of OMB Circular A-87, Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP is led by three overarching policy/cost objectives:

- ❖ ***Cost Effective Affordable Housing:*** To enhance the Seattle community by creating, operating, and sustaining decent, safe, and affordable housing and living environments for low-income people, using cost-effective and efficient methods.
- ❖ ***Housing Opportunities and Choice:*** To expand housing opportunities and choice for low-income individuals and families through creative and innovative community partnerships and through full and efficient use of rental assistance programs.
- ❖ ***Resident Financial Security and/or Self-Sufficiency:*** To promote financial security or economic self-sufficiency for low-income residents, as individual low-income tenants are able, through a network of training, employment services, and support.

C. Local Asset Management Program – Eight Guiding Principles

Over time and with extensive experience, these cost objectives have led Seattle Housing Authority to define an approach to our LAMP that is based on the following principles:

- (1) *In order to most effectively serve low-income individuals seeking housing, Seattle Housing Authority will operate its housing and housing assistance programs as a cohesive whole, as seamlessly as feasible.***

We recognize that different funding sources carry different requirements for eligibility and different rules for operations, financing, and sustaining low-income housing units. It is Seattle Housing Authority's job to make funding and administrative differences as invisible to tenants/participants as we can, so low-income people are best able to navigate the housing choices and rental assistance programs Seattle Housing Authority offers. We also consider it Seattle Housing Authority's job to design our housing operations to bridge differences among programs/fund sources, and to promote consolidated requirements, wherever possible. It is also incumbent on us to use our own and MTW authority to minimize administrative inefficiencies from differing rules and to seek common rules, where possible, to enhance cost effectiveness, as well as reduce the administrative burden on tenants.

This principle has led to several administrative successes, including use of a single set of admissions and lease/tenant requirements for Low Income Public Housing and project-based Housing Choice Voucher

tenants in the same property. Similarly, we have joint funder agreements for program and financial reporting and inspections on low-income housing projects with multiple local and state funders.

An important corollary is Seattle Housing Authority's involvement in a community-wide network of public, nonprofit, and for-profit housing providers, service and educational providers, and coalitions designed to rationalize and maximize housing dollars – whatever the source – and supportive services and educational/training resources to create a comprehensive integrated housing + services program city and county-wide. So, not only is Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP designed to create a cohesive whole of Seattle Housing Authority housing programs, it is also intended to be flexible enough to be an active contributing partner in a city-wide effort to provide affordable housing and services for pathways out of homelessness and out of poverty.

(2) In order to support and promote property performance and financial accountability at the lowest appropriate level, Seattle Housing Authority will operate a robust project and portfolio-based budgeting, management, and reporting system of accountability.

Seattle Housing Authority has operated a property/project-based management, budgeting, accounting, and reporting system for the past decade. Our project-based management systems include:

- Annual budgets developed by on-site property managers and reviewed and consolidated into portfolio requests by area or housing program managers;
- Adopted budgets at the property and/or community level that include allocation of subsidies, where applicable, to balance the projected annual budget – this balanced property budget becomes the basis for assessing actual performance;
- Monthly property-based financial reports comparing year-to-date actual to budgeted performance for the current and prior years;

Quarterly portfolio reviews are conducted with the responsible property manager(s) and the area or housing program managers, with Seattle Housing Authority's Asset Management Team.

Seattle Housing Authority applies the same project/community based budgeting system and accountability to its non-federal programs.

(3) To ensure best practices across Seattle Housing Authority's housing portfolios, Seattle Housing Authority's Asset Management Team provides the forum for review of housing operations policies, practices, financial performance, capital requirements, and management of both Seattle Housing Authority and other housing authorities and providers.

A key element of Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP is the Asset Management Team (AM Team) comprised of upper and property management staff from housing operations, asset management, property services, executive, legal, finance and budget, community services, communications, and rental assistance. This interdisciplinary AM Team meets weekly throughout the year and addresses:

- All critical policy and program issues facing individual properties or applying to a single or multiple portfolios, from rent policy to smoke-free buildings to rules for in-home businesses;
- Portfolio reviews and follow-up, where the team convenes to review with property management staff how well properties are operating in relation to common performance measures (e.g. vacancy rates; turnover time); how the property is doing in relation to budget and key reasons for deviations; and property manager projections and/or concerns about the future;
- Annual assessment of capital repair and improvement needs of each property with property managers and area portfolio administrators in relation to five year projections of capital preservation needs. This annual process addresses the capital needs and priorities of individual properties and priorities across portfolios; and.
- Review and preparation of the annual MTW Plan and Report, where key issues for the future are identified and discussed, priorities for initiatives to be undertaken are defined, and where evaluation of MTW initiatives are reviewed and next steps determined.

The richness and legitimacy of the AM Team processes result directly from the diverse Team composition, the open and transparent consideration of issues, the commitment of top management to participate actively on the AM Team, and the record of follow-up and action on issues considered by the AM Team.

(4) To ensure that the Authority and residents reap the maximum benefits of cost-effective economies of scale, certain direct functions will be provided centrally.

Over time, Seattle Housing Authority has developed a balance of on-site capacity to perform property manager, resident manager and basic maintenance/handyperson services, with asset preservation services performed by a central capacity of trades and specialty staff. Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP reflects this cost-effective balance of on-site and central maintenance services for repairs, unit turnover, landscaping, pest control, and asset preservation as direct costs to properties. Even though certain maintenance functions are performed by central trade crews, the control remains at the property level, as it is the property manager and/or area or program manager who calls the shots as to the level of service required from the "vendor" – the property services group – on a unit turnover, site landscaping, and maintenance and repair work orders. Work is not performed at the property by the central crews without the prior authorization of the portfolio manager or his/her designee. And all services are provided on a fee for service basis.

Similarly, Seattle Housing Authority has adopted procurement policies that balance the need for expedient and on-site response through delegated authorization of certain dollar levels of direct authority for purchases, with Authority-wide economies of scale and conformance to competitive procurement procedures for purchases/work orders in excess of the single bidder levels. Central procurement services are part of Seattle Housing Authority's indirect services fee.

(5) Seattle Housing Authority will optimize direct service dollars for resident/tenant supportive services by waiving indirect costs that would otherwise be born by community service programs and distributing the associated indirect costs to the remaining direct cost centers.

A large share of tenant/resident services are funded from grants and foundations and these funds augment local funds to provide supportive services and self-sufficiency services to residents. In order to optimize available services, the indirect costs will be supported by housing and housing choice objectives.

There are a myriad of reasons that led Seattle Housing Authority to this approach:

- Most services are supported from public and private grants and many of these don't allow indirect cost charges as part of the eligible expenses under the grant;
- Seattle Housing Authority uses local funds from operating surpluses to augment community services funding from grants; these surpluses have derived from operations where indirect services have already been charged;
- Seattle Housing Authority's community services are very diverse, from recreational activities for youth to employment programs to translation services. This diversity makes a common basis for allocating indirect services problematic.
- Most importantly, there is a uniform commitment on the part of housing and housing choice managers to see dollars for services to their tenants/participants maximized. There is unanimous agreement that these program dollars not only support the individuals served, but serve to reduce property management costs they would experience from idle youth and tenants struggling on their own to get a job.

(6) Seattle Housing Authority will achieve administrative efficiencies, maintain a central job cost accounting system for capital assets, and properly align responsibilities and liability by allocating capital assets/improvements to the property level only upon completion of capital projects.

Development and capital projects are managed through central agency units and can take between two and five or more years from budgeting to physical completion. Transfer of fixed assets only when they are fully complete and operational best aligns responsibility for development and close-out vs. housing operations.

The practice of transferring capital assets when they are complete and operational, also best preserves clear lines of accountability and responsibility between development and operations; preserves the relationship and accountability of the contractor to the project manager; aligns with demarcations between builders risk and property insurance applicability; protects warranty provisions and requirements through commissioning; and, maintains continuity in the owner's representative to ensure all construction contract requirements are met through occupancy permits, punch list completion, building systems commissioning, and project acceptance.

(7) Seattle Housing Authority will promote service accountability and incorporate conservation incentives by charging fees for service for selected central services.

This approach, rather than an indirect cost approach, is preferred where services can be differentiated on a clear, uniform, and measureable basis. This is true for information technology services and for Fleet Management services. The costs of information technology services are distributed based on numbers of personal computers, "thin clients", and printers; the fees differentiate the operating costs of these equipment

items and provide incentives for shared equipment use for printers and use of the lower cost thin client computers.

The Fleet service fee encompasses vehicle insurance, maintenance, and replacement. Fuel consumption is a direct cost to send a direct conservation signal. The maintenance component of the fleet charge is based on a defined maintenance schedule for each vehicle given its age and usage. The replacement component is based on expected life of each vehicle in the fleet, a defined replacement schedule, and replacement with the most appropriate vehicle technology and conservation features.

(8) Seattle Housing Authority will use its MTW block grant authority and flexibility to optimize housing opportunities provided by Seattle Housing Authority to low-income people in Seattle.

Seattle Housing Authority flexibility to use MTW Block Grant resources to support its low-income housing programs is central to our Local Asset Management Program (LAMP). Seattle Housing Authority will exercise our contractual authority to move our MTW funds and project cash flow among projects and programs as the Authority deems necessary to further our mission and cost objectives. MTW flexibility to allocate MTW Block Grant revenues among the Authority's housing and administrative programs enables Seattle Housing Authority to balance the mix of housing types and services to different low-income housing programs and different groups of low-income residents. It enables Seattle Housing Authority to tailor resource allocation to best achieve our cost objectives and therefore maximize our services to low-income residents and applicants having a wide diversity of circumstances, needs, and personal capabilities. As long as the ultimate purpose of a grant or program is low income housing, it is eligible for MTW funds.

III. Seattle Housing Authority's Local Asset Management Program (LAMP) Implementation

A. Comprehensive Operations

Consistent with the guiding principles above, a fundamental driver of Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP is its application comprehensively to the totality of Seattle Housing Authority's MTW program. Seattle Housing Authority's use of MTW resource and regulatory flexibility and Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP encompass our entire operations; accordingly:

- We apply our indirect service fees to all our housing and rental assistance programs;
- We expect all our properties, regardless of fund source, to be accountable for property-based management, budgeting, and financial reporting;
- We exercise MTW authority to assist in creating management and operational efficiencies across programs and to promote applicant and resident-friendly administrative requirements for securing and maintaining their residency; and,
- We use our MTW Block Grant flexibility across all of Seattle Housing Authority's housing programs and activities to create the whole that best addresses our needs at the time.

Seattle Housing Authority's application of its LAMP and indirect service fees to its entire operations is more comprehensive than HUD's asset management system. HUD addresses fee for service principally at the low income public housing property level and does not address Seattle Housing Authority's comprehensive operations, which include other housing programs, business activities, and component units.

B. Project-based Portfolio Management

We have reflected in our guiding principles above the centrality of project/property-based and program-based budgeting, management, reporting and accountability in our asset management program and our implementing practices. We also assign priority to our multi-disciplinary central Asset Management Team in its role to constantly bring best practices, evaluations, and follow-up to inform Seattle Housing Authority's property management practices and policies. Please refer to the section above to review specific elements of our project-based accountability system.

A fundamental principle we have applied in designing our LAMP is to align responsibility and authority and to do so at the lowest appropriate level. Thus, where it makes the most sense from the standpoints of program effectiveness and cost efficiency, the Seattle Housing Authority LAMP assigns budget and management accountability at the property level. We are then committed to providing property managers with the tools and information necessary for them to effectively operate their properties and manage their budgets.

We apply the same principle of aligning responsibility and accountability for those services that are managed centrally, and, where those services are direct property services, such as landscaping, decorating, or specialty trades work, we assign the ultimate authority for determining the scope of work to be performed to the affected property manager.

In LIPH properties, we budget subsidy dollars with the intent that properties will break even. Over the course of the year, we gauge performance at the property level in relation to that aim. When a property falls behind, we use our quarterly portfolio reviews to discern why and agree on corrective actions and then track their effectiveness in subsequent quarters. We reserve our MTW authority to move subsidy and cash flow among our LIPH properties based on our considered assessment of reasons for surplus or deficit operations. We also use our quarterly reviews to identify properties whose performance warrants placement on a "watch" list.

C. Cost Allocation Approach

Classification of Costs

Under OMB Circular A-87, there is no universal rule for classifying certain costs as either direct or indirect under every accounting system. A cost may be direct with respect to some specific service or function, but indirect with respect to the Federal award or other final cost objective. Therefore, it is essential that each item of cost be treated consistently in like circumstances, either as a direct or an indirect cost. Consistent with OMB Circular A-87 cost principles, Seattle Housing Authority has identified all of its direct costs and segregated all its costs into pools, as either a direct or an indirect cost pool. We have further divided the indirect services pool to assign costs as "equal burden" or hard housing unit based, as described below.

Cost Objectives

OMB Circular A-87 defines cost objective as follows: *Cost objective means a function, organizational subdivision, contract, grant, or other activity for which cost data are needed and for which costs are incurred.* The Cost Objectives for Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP are the three overarching policy/cost objectives described earlier:

- Cost Effective Affordable Housing;
- Housing Opportunities and Choice; and,
- Resident Financial Security and/or Self-Sufficiency

Costs that can be identified specifically with one of the three objectives are counted as a direct cost to that objective. Costs that benefit more than one objective are counted as indirect costs.

Seattle Housing Authority Direct Costs

OMB Circular A-87 defines direct costs as follows: *Direct costs are those that can be identified specifically with a particular final cost objective.* Seattle Housing Authority's direct costs include but are not limited to:

- Contract costs readily identifiable with delivering housing assistance to low-income families.
- Housing Assistance Payments, including utility allowances, for vouchers
- Utilities
- Surface Water Management fee
- Insurance
- Bank charges
- Property-based audits
- Staff training
- Interest expense
- Information technology fees
- Portability administrative fees
- Rental Assistance department costs for administering Housing Choice Vouchers including inspection activities
- Operating costs directly attributable to operating Seattle Housing Authority-owned properties
- Fleet management fees
- Central maintenance services for unit or property repairs or maintenance
- Central maintenance services include, but are not limited to, landscaping, pest control, decorating and unit turnover
- Operating subsidies paid to mixed income, mixed finance communities
- Community Services department costs directly attributable to tenants services

- Gap financing real estate transactions
- Acquisition costs
- Demolition, relocation and leasing incentive fees in repositioning Seattle Housing Authority-owned real estate
- Homeownership activities for low-income families
- Leasing incentive fees
- Certain legal expenses
- Professional services at or on behalf of properties or a portfolio, including security services
- Extraordinary site work
- Any other activities that can be readily identifiable with delivering housing assistance to low-income families
- Any cost identified for which a grant award is made. Such costs will be determined as Seattle Housing Authority receives grants
- Direct Finance staff costs
- Direct area administration staff costs

Seattle Housing Authority Indirect Costs

OMB Circular A-87 defines indirect costs as *those (a) incurred for a common or joint purpose benefiting more than one cost objective, and (b) not readily assignable to the cost objectives specifically benefitted, without effort disproportionate to the results achieved.* Seattle Housing Authority's indirect costs include, but are not limited to:

- Executive
- Communications
- Most of Legal
- Development
- Finance
- Purchasing
- Human Resources
- Housing Finance and Asset Management
- Administration staff and related expenses of the Housing Operations and Rental Assistance Departments that cannot be identified to a specific cost objective.

Seattle Housing Authority Indirect Service Fee – Base, Derivation and Allocation

Seattle Housing Authority has established an Indirect Services Fee (IS; ISF) based on anticipated indirect costs for the fiscal year. Per the requirements of OMB Circular A-87, the ISF is determined in a reasonable and consistent manner based on total units and leased vouchers. Thus, the ISF is calculated as a per-housing-unit or per-leased-voucher fee per month charged to each program.

Equitable Distribution Base

According to OMB Circular A-87, *the distribution base may be (1) total direct costs (excluding capital expenditure), (2) direct salaries and wages, or (3) another base which results in an equitable distribution.* Seattle Housing Authority has found that unit count and leased voucher is an equitable distribution base when compared to other potential measures. Testing of prior year figures has shown that there is no material financial difference between direct labor dollar allocations and unit allocations. Total units and leased vouchers are a far easier, more direct and transparent, and more efficient method of allocating indirect service costs than using direct labor to distribute indirect service costs. Direct labor has other complications because of the way Seattle Housing Authority charges for maintenance services. Using housing units and leased vouchers removes any distortion that total direct salaries and wages might introduce. Units leased vouchers is an equitable distribution base which best measures the relative benefits.

Derivation and Allocation

According to OMB Circular A-87, where a grantee agency's indirect costs benefit its major functions in varying degrees, such costs shall be accumulated into separate cost groupings. Each grouping shall then be allocated individually to benefitted functions by means of a base which best measures the relative benefits. Seattle Housing Authority divides indirect costs into two pools, "Equal Burden" costs and "Hard Unit" costs. Equal Burden costs are costs that equally benefit leased voucher activity and hard, existing housing unit activity. Hard Unit costs primarily benefit the hard, existing housing unit activity.

Before calculating the per unit indirect service fees, Seattle Housing Authority's indirect costs are offset by designated revenue. Offsetting revenue includes 10 percent of the MTW Capital Grant award, a portion of the developer fee paid by limited partnerships, laundry revenue and antenna revenue.

A per unit cost is calculated using the remaining net indirect costs divided by the number of units and the number of leased vouchers. For the 2010 budget, the per unit per month (PUM) cost for housing units is \$52.10 and for leased vouchers is \$21.21.

Annual Review of Indirect Service Fee Charges

Seattle Housing Authority will annually review its indirect service fee charges in relation to actual indirect costs and will incorporate appropriate adjustments in indirect service fees for the subsequent year, based on this analysis.

D. Differences – HUD Asset Management vs. Seattle Housing Authority Local Asset Management Program

Under the First Amendment, Seattle Housing Authority is allowed to define costs differently than the standard definitions published in HUD's Financial Management Guidebook pertaining to the implementation of 24 CFR 990. Seattle Housing Authority is required to describe in this MTW Annual Plan differences between our Local Asset Management Program and HUD's asset management program. Below are several key differences:

- Seattle Housing Authority determined to implement an indirect service fee that is much more comprehensive than HUD's asset management system. HUD's asset management system and fee for service is limited in focusing only on a fee for service at the Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) property level. Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP is much broader and includes local housing and other activities

not found in traditional HUD programs. Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP addresses the entire Seattle Housing Authority operation.

- Seattle Housing Authority has defined its cost objectives at a different level than HUD's asset management program. Seattle Housing Authority has defined three cost objectives under the umbrella of the MTW program, which is consistent with the issuance of the CFDA number and with the First Amendment to the MTW Agreement. HUD defined its cost objectives at the property level and Seattle Housing Authority defined its cost objectives at the program level. Because the cost objectives are defined differently, direct and indirect costs will be differently identified, as reflected in our LAMP.
- HUD's rules are restrictive regarding cash flow between projects, programs, and business activities. Seattle Housing Authority intends to use its MTW resources and regulatory flexibility to move its MTW funds and project cash flow among projects without limitation and to ensure that our operations best serve our mission, our LAMP cost objectives, and ultimately the low-income people we serve.
- HUD intends to maintain all maintenance staff at the property level. Seattle Housing Authority's LAMP reflects a cost-effective balance of on-site and central maintenance services for repairs, unit turnover, landscaping, and asset preservation as direct costs to properties.

HUD's asset management approach records capital project work-in-progress quarterly. Seattle Housing Authority's capital projects are managed through central agency units and can take between two and five or more years from budgeting to physical completion. Transfer of fixed assets only when they are fully complete and operational best aligns responsibility for development and close-out vs. housing operations.

Balance Sheet Accounts

The following balance sheet accounts will be reported in compliance with HUD's Asset Management Requirements:

- Accounts Receivable
- Notes Receivable
- Accrued Interest Receivable
- Leases
- Fixed Assets
- Reserves
- Advances
- Restricted Investments
- Notes Payable – short term
- Deferred credits
- Long Term Liabilities
- Mortgages
- Bonds

Appendix B – Market Rate Rent Policy

This activity was previously approved in 2005, but was unintentionally omitted from the list of ongoing MTW strategies with the transition to a new reporting format in 2009. (See pages C4 and C8 of Seattle Housing Authority’s 2005 annual MTW report for its original inclusion in Seattle Housing Authority’s MTW strategies.) This activity is ongoing and will be categorized in future plans and reports as #10.P.21.

MTW Activity #10.P.21

Seattle Housing Authority may institute market rate rents as a penalty for noncompliance with the annual review process, as an alternative to initiating eviction proceedings. If a resident fails to comply with Seattle Housing Authority’s request to complete the required annual recertification, the resident may be required to pay the full market rent or maximum tax credit rent, whichever applies to the unit. Once the resident submits the information needed to complete the annual review, their rent level will return to the regular public housing rent calculation.

Targeted MTW Statutory Objective:

Housing choice: allows individuals to continue to live in subsidized housing by providing a further opportunity to remedy noncompliance rather than beginning eviction procedures.

Schedule:

Seattle Housing Authority implemented this policy in 2005 and the policy is ongoing. This strategy was originally authorized with Seattle Housing Authority’s 2005 rent reform, but was unintentionally left off of the list of ongoing MTW strategies with the transition to a new reporting format in 2009.

Outcome Measures:

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark
HC4: Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move	69 public housing evictions in 2013	69 public housing evictions (We anticipate no change in this metric, as the policy is already in place.)

Data Sources:

Yardi, the data system of record for Seattle Housing Authority’s public housing program, maintains records of participants’ rents and evictions.

Authorizations Cited:

Moving to Work Agreement, Attachment C (C)(4), (C)(11)

Hardship Policy:

Households may request a grievance hearing in relation to this policy and their circumstances will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Appendix C – Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Plan

In the following pages is a republishing of Seattle Housing Authority’s Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Plan, originally submitted to HUD as a standalone document. The RHF Plan was also included in the appendices of the 2013 MTW Plan and is republished here for ease of reference.

Seattle Housing Authority Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Plan

Introduction

Since 2001, Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) has used first and second increment RHF funding to create new affordable housing with several large-scale mixed finance projects at NewHolly, Rainier Vista, and High Point. In total, we have spent more to replace housing (\$26.7 million) than we have received in first and second RHF funding combined (\$20.6 million). Please see the tables below.

RHF Funds Received since 2001			
	1st Increment	2nd Increment	TOTAL RHF
2001	\$139,997		\$139,997
2002	\$151,573		\$151,573
2003	\$929,706		\$929,706
2004	\$1,924,591		\$1,924,591
2005	\$1,151,306		\$1,151,306
2006	\$217,070	\$716,085	\$933,155
2007	\$718,411	\$755,174	\$1,473,585
2008	\$2,686,260	\$719,088	\$3,405,348
2009	\$1,163,627	\$852,533	\$2,016,160
2010	\$1,946,628	\$1,131,739	\$3,078,367
2011	\$1,666,585	\$1,076,820	\$2,743,405
2012	\$1,063,696	\$1,620,294	\$2,683,990
Total	\$13,759,450	\$6,871,733	\$20,631,183

Funds Spent to Replace Housing	
Project	Amount
NewHolly II	\$1,766,796
Rainier Vista I	\$5,114,164
New Holly III	\$5,354,000
High Point I (North)	\$7,500,000
High Point II (South)	\$2,400,000
Rainier Vista II (Tamarack/South)	\$2,649,634
Rainier Vista III (Northeast/North)	\$1,956,452
Total	\$26,741,046

In the following sections of the plan we break this information down separately for first and second increment RHF funds as is required by HUD guidance.

First Increment Funding

SHA is currently receiving first increment RHF funds as a result of the demolition and/or disposition of public housing units at multiple sites. SHA plans to utilize these RHF funds pursuant to Option 3 of SHA's MTW Agreement. SHA intends to continue to combine RHF funds into the MTW Block Grant, spend five years worth of first increment RHF funds on replacement housing, and be eligible for the second increment of RHF funds. SHA needs all five years of first increment RHF funding in order to have sufficient funds to develop new affordable housing units.

First Increment RHF Funds Received (Actual)	
FY 2001	\$139,997
FY 2002	\$151,573
FY 2003	\$929,706
FY 2004	\$1,924,591
FY 2005	\$1,151,306
FY 2006	\$217,070
FY 2007	\$718,411

FY 2008	\$2,686,260
FY 2009	\$1,163,627
FY 2010	\$1,946,628
FY 2011	\$1,666,585
FY 2012	\$1,063,696
Total First Increment	\$13,759,450

Anticipated Future First Increment RHF Funds to be Received from Existing Grants (Estimated)*		
Fiscal Year	Estimated Grant Funding Anticipated	Project Numbers
2013	\$1,528,481	WA001000006, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056
2014	\$2,600	WA001000050
2015	\$2,600	WA001000050
Total First Increment*	\$1,533,681	WA001000006, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056

***Estimated total future funding does not include first increment RHF funds for new projects, such as future RHF funds for the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace, for which SHA has already secured approval. SHA intends to continue with the same approach to first increment RHF funding outlined in this plan with the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, as well as other future projects. The estimated total future funding also does not include the potential impacts of sequestration.**

First increment RHF funding will be used to fill gaps in financing as needed to develop affordable housing units. SHA will ensure that the requisite number of affordable housing units required under the “Proportionality Test” will be developed. SHA will develop new units in accordance with the requirements found in SHA’s MTW Agreement and will meet the obligation and disbursement deadlines.

Second Increment Funding

Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) is currently receiving second increment RHF funds as a result of the demolition and/or disposition of public housing units at multiple sites. SHA plans to utilize these RHF funds pursuant to Option 3 of SHA's MTW Agreement. SHA intends to continue to combined RHF funds into the MTW Block Grant and spend five years worth of second increment RHF funds on replacement housing. SHA needs all five years of second increment RHF funding in order to have sufficient funds to develop new affordable housing units.

Second Increment RHF Funds Received (Actual)	
FY 2006	\$716,085
FY 2007	\$755,174
FY 2008	\$719,088
FY 2009	\$852,533
FY 2010	\$1,131,739
FY 2011	\$1,076,820
FY 2012	\$1,620,294
Total Second Increment	\$6,871,733

Anticipated Future Second Increment RHF Funds to be Received from Existing Grants (Estimated)*		
Fiscal Year	Estimated Grant Funding Anticipated	Project Numbers
2013	\$1,167,836	WA001000001, WA001000007, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056, WA001000059
2014	\$2,217,716	WA001000006, WA001000007, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056, WA001000059
2015	\$1,827,624	WA001000006, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056, WA001000059
2016	\$1,666,582	WA001000006, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056
2017	\$1,592,114	WA001000006, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056
2018	\$1,531,081	WA001000006, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056
2019	\$2,600	WA001000050
2020	\$2,600	WA001000050

Total Second Increment*	\$10,008,152	WA001000001, WA001000006, WA001000007, WA001000008, WA001000050, WA001000052, WA001000054, WA001000056, WA001000059
-------------------------	--------------	---

***Estimated total future funding does not include second increment RHF funds for new projects, such as future RHF funds for the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace. SHA intends to continue with the same approach to second increment RHF funding outlined in this plan with the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, as well as other future projects. The estimated total future funding also does not include the potential impacts of sequestration.**

Second increment RHF funding will be used to fill gaps in financing as needed to develop affordable housing units. SHA will ensure that the requisite number of affordable housing units required under the “Proportionality Test” will be developed. SHA will develop new units in accordance with the requirements found in SHA’s MTW Agreement and will meet the obligation and disbursement deadlines.

SHA confirms that its amended FY 2012 MTW Annual Plan was approved by HUD on May 4, 2012. SHA is in compliance with the obligation and expenditure deadlines on all of its Capital Fund Grants and is current on its LOCCS reporting.

SHA has obtained a firm commitment of additional funds other than public housing funds to meet the leveraging requirement. In total, SHA has leveraged more than \$100 million in funding from city, state, and foundation funders, as well as permanent debt. These leveraged funds substantially exceed the standard of one third of SHA’s RHF second increment funds, or \$3,336,050. In fact, for every \$1 spent from the MTW Block Grant, SHA has leveraged \$5.99 in other funds.

Leveraged Funds, 2001-2012								
	NewHolly II	NewHolly III	Rainier Vista I	Rainier Vista II	Rainier Vista III	High Point I	High Point II	Total
Permanent Mortgage	\$2,440,000	\$7,980,000	\$5,275,000	\$2,100,000	\$2,700,000	\$10,600,000	\$16,500,000	\$47,595,000
City of Seattle	\$1,700,000	\$2,066,671						\$3,766,671
State Housing Trust Funds	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000				\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$8,000,000
Federal Home Loan Bank	\$300,000	\$820,000						\$1,120,000
Tax Credit Equity	\$6,369,307	\$16,863,640	\$12,368,888	\$3,422,215	\$4,572,452	\$27,181,493	\$27,181,888	\$97,959,883
Seattle Public Utilities						\$742,500	\$300,000	\$1,042,500
Sound Families							\$400,000	\$400,000
Healthy Homes						\$185,000	\$140,000	\$325,000
Total	\$12,809,307	\$29,730,311	\$17,643,888	\$5,522,215	\$7,272,452	\$40,708,993	\$46,521,888	\$160,209,054

Appendix D – Capital Fund Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report

In the following pages is Seattle Housing Authority's Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report for capital funds with balances projected to continue into 2015.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 06/30/2017

Part I: Summary				FFY of Grant: 2015 FFY of Grant Approval: 2015	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority		Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19P001501-15 Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: WA19R150115, WA19R150215 Date of CFFP: Dec 2005 – Dec 2007		ESTIMATE FOR 2015 GRANT	
Type of Grant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending:		<input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies <input type="checkbox"/> Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending:		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no:) <input type="checkbox"/> Final Performance and Evaluation Report	
Line	Summary by Development Account	Original	Total Estimated Cost Revised ²	Obligated	Total Actual Cost ¹ Expended
1	Total non-CFP Funds				
2	1406 Operations (may not exceed 20% of line 21) ³				
3	1408 Management Improvements				
4	1410 Administration (may not exceed 10% of line 21)				
5	1411 Audit				
6	1415 Liquidated Damages				
7	1430 Fees and Costs				
8	1440 Site Acquisition				
9	1450 Site Improvement				
10	1460 Dwelling Structures				
11	1465.1 Dwelling Equipment—Nonexpendable				
12	1470 Non-dwelling Structures				
13	1475 Non-dwelling Equipment				
14	1485 Demolition				
15	1492 Moving to Work Demonstration	11,162,000		2,996,027.50	0
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs				
17	1499 Development Activities ⁴				

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
Capital Fund Financing Program**

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 06/30/2017

Part I: Summary		FFY of Grant: 2015	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority	Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19P001501-15 Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: WA19R150115, WA19R150215	ESTIMATE FOR 2015 GRANT	
Type of Grant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies <input type="checkbox"/> Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending:		<input type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no:) <input type="checkbox"/> Final Performance and Evaluation Report	
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost	Total Actual Cost ¹
		Original	Obligated
18a	1501 Collateralization or Debt Service paid by the PHA		
18ba	9000 Collateralization or Debt Service paid Via System of Direct Payment		
19	1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line 20)		
20	Amount of Annual Grant: (sum of lines 2 - 19)	11,162,000	2,996,027.50
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities		0
22	Amount of line 20 Related to Section 504 Activities		
23	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Soft Costs		
24	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Hard Costs		
25	Amount of line 20 Related to Energy Conservation Measures		
Signature of Executive Director 		Signature of Public Housing Director 	
Date 12/01/2015		Date 12/01/2015	

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.
² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.
³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.
⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 06/30/2017

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB No. 2577-0226
Expires 06/30/2017

¹ Obligation and expenditure end dated can only be revised with HUD approval pursuant to Section 9j of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended.