



Moving to Work

2016 Annual Plan



SUBMITTED OCTOBER 16, 2015

Seattle Housing Authority

Board of Commissioners

Nora Gibson, Chair
Deborah Canavan Thiele, Vice Chair
Emily Abbey
Aser Ashkir
Kollin Min
Zachary Pullin
Jermaine Smiley

Cabinet

Andrew Lofton, Executive Director
Anne Fiske Zuniga, Deputy Executive Director
Dean Barnes
Rod Brandon
Kerry Coughlin
James Fearn
John Forsyth
Andria Lazaga
Ann-Marie Lindboe
Steve McDowell
Stephanie Van Dyke
Cynthia West
Lisa Wolters
Shelly Yapp

Prepared by

Beka Smith

With contributions from: Mallory Day, Dani Fitts, Holly Henke, Michelle Hoang, Wendy Lance, Miki Naganuma, Tricia Smiley, Jamie Wood, and Scott Woo

C o n t e n t s

I. Introduction	1
II. General Housing Authority Operating Information	3
III. Proposed MTW Activities	12
IV. Approved MTW Activities	14
V. Sources and Uses of Funds	45
VI. Administrative Information	49
Appendix A – Local Asset Management Plan	50
Appendix B – Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Plan	61
Appendix C – Capital Fund Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report	65

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 2016 will be Seattle Housing Authority's eighteenth 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 August 31, 2015 and ended on September 30, 2015. 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 17, 2015 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. Nine residents attended, and seven residents and one community member 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 one comment by phone and three comments by email during the comment period.

What is in this plan?

The 2016 Annual Plan complies with a HUD-prescribed format:

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 2016.

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 2016, 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 2016 align with the primary goals of the MTW program: promoting cost effectiveness, housing choice, and self sufficiency. In 2016 Seattle Housing Authority is proposing a new strategy that would allow the agency to reduce costs and promote energy conservation by self-financing energy conservation projects rather than borrowing funds from a third party. The energy conservation measures will be financed through MTW Block Grant funds and outside funding sources to leverage Seattle Housing Authority's investment.

The proposed new MTW activity is described in greater detail in Section III.

Long-Term MTW Goals

As previously noted, 2016 will be SHA's eighteenth year as an MTW agency. The current agreement between HUD and Seattle Housing Authority extends the agency's MTW status through 2018, as is true for all housing authorities currently participating in the MTW program. MTW agencies and HUD are engaging in discussions that would extend the future of the MTW program through 2028. Seattle Housing Authority is committed to extending this important program in order to preserve the current flexibilities that allow us to tailor our approaches to serve local needs, including unique programs for homeless and other populations, efficiency and cost savings approaches that allow us to preserve our buildings and reduce administrative burdens, and innovative new pilot programs that strive to help our residents and participants pursue self-sufficiency goals.

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 34,000 people, including more than 29,000 people within the city of Seattle. 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 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 6,152 units at the beginning of 2016, 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.

In 2016 101 of these units will be leased to service providers who use the units to provide transitional housing and services to residents. An additional 24 units are used for computer labs, resident councils, and on-site management and 40 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). SSHP 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 2016.

Planned New Public Housing Units to be Added During the Fiscal Year											
AMP Name and Number	Bedroom Size							Total Units	Population Type *	# of UFAS Units	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6+			Fully Accessible	Adaptable
PIC Dev. # /AMP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Type Noted *	N/A	N/A
PIC Dev. Name											
Total Public Housing Units to be Added								0			
* Select Population Type from: Elderly, Disabled, General, Elderly/Disabled, Other If Other, please describe: <input type="text"/>											

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 103 units 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
- Disposition of NewHolly Phase 1 to a new limited partnership as part of a mixed finance refinancing

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.
WA100100001 Yesler Terrace	103	Yesler Terrace redevelopment
WA1001000041 Holly Court	31	Potential long-term lease for emergency housing for families
Total Number of Units to be Removed	184	

Other Changes to the Housing Stock Anticipated During the Fiscal Year
<p>Seattle Housing Authority anticipates that approximately 100 units at Yesler Terrace will be off-line as of 2016 due to redevelopment. These units meet the conditions for demolition and timing will be assessed on a case by case basis depending on their viability and phase of redevelopment. In addition two Seattle Senior Housing Program units may be taken off-line for rehabilitation (as well as potentially additional scattered site units that are being considered for asset repositioning), and units at Holly Court that were previously off-line due to fire damage may be remodeled and placed back in service.</p> <p>Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.</p>

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 2016, Seattle Housing Authority will administer a projected 9,666 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 up to 105 new project-based vouchers in 2016. These new project-based vouchers will support 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	
To be determined	105	Homeless housing through the King County Combined Funders allocation	
Anticipated Total New Vouchers to be Project-Based	105	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	3,487
		Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year	3,298

Other HUD-funded housing

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

Special Purpose Vouchers

At the beginning of 2016 Seattle Housing Authority projects it will administer an authorized 683 non-MTW vouchers provided by HUD for special purposes, including 408 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 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 owns 130 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 programs. 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). Seattle Housing Authority's local housing portfolio is not equivalent to HUD's local non-traditional category, but there is some overlap between the two categories, including tax credit units in HOPE VI communities.

Seattle Housing Authority operates more than 1,800 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 2016 Seattle Housing Authority plans to target elevators and roofs at several properties, as well as other capital projects throughout the year, such as security systems, accessibility upgrades, windows, siding, floors, and appliances.

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

In 2016, 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 2016, rather than expenditures based on capital fund year.

- Elevators: SHA will conduct upgrades for one elevator at Jefferson Terrace (WA001000009), Pleasant Valley (WA001000094), and two elevators at Bitter Lake (WA001000095). Design work is scheduled for the elevator at Blakeley Manor (WA001000095).
- Generators: As part of the elevator work at Jefferson Terrace (WA001000009) we intend to replace the generator as replacement parts for the existing generator are obsolete.
- Exteriors: Exterior rehabilitation is expected at Carroll Terrace (WA001000094) as well as completion of exterior projects at Michaelson Manor (WA001000094) and Phinney Terrace (WA001000092).
- Roofs: Seattle Housing Authority anticipates roofing projects at sixteen scattered sites locations (WA001000050 through WA001000057).
- Security: Security upgrades are planned for Westwood Heights (WA001000023), Jefferson Terrace (WA001000009), Tri-Court (WA001000031), and a number of Seattle Senior Housing Program buildings. The selection of buildings for security upgrades will be based on the ongoing security review conducted by a security consultant. Intercom systems will be replaced at ten Seattle Senior Housing Program buildings.
- Accessibility: Uniform Federal Accessibility Standard (UFAS) upgrades are scheduled for common areas in selected SSHP buildings in a first phase of work anticipate to extend throughout the portfolio.

Other capital projects: Various small capital projects are planned for scattered sites buildings, including window replacement, siding repair and replacement, exterior painting, appliances, flooring, cabinet replacement, door repair and replacement, and window furnishings.

Leasing information

In 2016, 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	5,696	68,352
Federal MTW Voucher (HCV) Units to be Utilized	9,000	108,000
Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Property-Based Assistance Programs **	373	4,478
Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	12	144
Total Households Projected to be Served	15,081	180,974
<p>* Calculated by dividing the planned number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.</p> <p>** 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.</p> <p>***Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the PHA has leased/occupied units, according to unit category during the fiscal year.</p>		

We do not anticipate leasing difficulties for public housing units, with the potential exception of scattered site units located in the north end of the city, which in previous years have proven more difficult to lease. Leasing may be a challenge for vouchers in Seattle's rental market, which is increasingly expensive and low in vacancies. Seattle Housing Authority has implemented several tactics to improve leasing success rates and increase opportunities for mobility, including raising voucher payment standards, absorbing households porting into Seattle from housing authorities outside of western Washington, and giving households the option to include exempt income such as food stamps toward their affordability limit. In addition, Seattle Housing Authority has launched a robust housing search assistance program that includes one on one search assistance with a housing counselor, contracted services for housing search and deposit assistance as well as risk reduction funds, and provides participant education through Ready to Rent courses.

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	Seattle's increasingly competitive rental market and limited vacancies pose challenges to voucher holders. Planned strategies to help successful leasing include higher voucher payment standards (increased in 2015), absorbing households porting into Seattle from housing authorities outside of western Washington, and allowing households to include exempt income such as food stamps toward their affordability limit. In addition, Seattle Housing Authority has launched a more robust housing search assistance program that includes one on one search assistance with a housing counselor, contracted services for housing search and deposit assistance as well as risk reduction funds, and participant education through Ready to Rent courses.
Local Non-Traditional	The extremely competitive rental market has also posed challenges for the short-term rental assistance program. To help to address delays in placement Seattle Housing Authority has contributed funding toward staffing to reduce the size of caseloads.

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements

<p>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.</p>
<p>SHA is in compliance with the three statutory objectives.</p>

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

The agency maintains a single tenant-based waiting list, which has been closed since a 2015 lottery. As of the beginning of 2016, Seattle Housing Authority anticipates that approximately 1,300 households will remain on the tenant-based waiting list. Seattle Housing Authority projects that it may reopen the waiting list for tenant-based vouchers in 2017.

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. Most waiting lists are maintained centrally, by program, to maximize efficiencies and housing choice, and 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 2016. Most public housing waiting lists will remain open, and the waiting list for tenant-based vouchers will likely reopen in 2017. Beginning in 2016 the agency plans to begin to include HOPE VI public housing units in the centralized admissions process housed in the Central Office. The table on the following page shows the projected number of households on waiting lists for public housing units and vouchers as of the beginning of 2016.

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	6,374	Partially Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing Units (Service Agency Administered)	Site-Based	300	Open	N/A
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program (Tenant Based)	Community-Wide	1,320	Closed	No
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program (Project Based)	Site-Based	6,500	Partially Open	No
Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program	Site-Based	279	Partially Open	No

* *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: A Place of Our Own, Aridell Mitchell, Avalon Place, Bergan Place, Broadway Crossing, Casa Pacifica, Colonial Gardens, Colwell, Compass Cascade, Council House, Community Psychiatric Clinic multiple sites, Crestwood Place, Dekko Place, Dorothy Day, Emerald City Common, Haddon Hall, Hilltop House, Holden Manor, Kenyon House, Leighton Apartments, Martin Court, Monica's Village, Muslim Housing Services Nihonmachi Terrace, Opportunity Place, Oxford Apartments, Pantages Apartments, Park Place, Sea-Mar Family Housing, Seattle Mental Health, South Shore Court, Starliter, Traugott Terrace, Views At Madison Phase 1, Westwood Heights East, and Women's Residence. 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 housing in SHA public housing units (categorized under Federal MTW Public Housing - Service Agency Administered). Waiting lists are open and anticipated to remain open for Muslim Housing units and tax credit units at NewHolly. They are closed and anticipated to remain closed for tax credit units at High Point.

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.

Beginning in 2016 the agency plans to begin to include admissions for HOPE VI public housing units in the centralized admissions process housed in the Central Office.

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-financed Energy Performance Contracts

Investment into energy conservation measures in public housing is a priority for both Seattle Housing Authority and HUD. With this new activity, Seattle Housing Authority is proposing to use MTW authority to implement a self-directed and self-financed Energy Performance Contract (EPC).

SHA will identify specific properties within the agency's portfolio that require capital investment and would benefit from the installation of new energy conservation measures through an investment grade energy audit. The energy audit will also determine baseline consumption levels for the affected units. These baseline consumption levels will enable the agency to identify total consumption savings for tracking and reporting purposes.

The energy conservation measures will be financed through MTW Block Grant funds and outside funding sources to leverage Seattle Housing Authority's investment. Any investment in the EPC program using MTW Block Grant funds will be in the form of a loan to the affected AMP and debt services payments will be made using the utility savings resulting from the installation of the energy conservation measures. By implementing a self-financed EPC program, Seattle Housing Authority will eliminate borrowing costs and generate new funds for future capital investments in the agency's portfolio.

MTW Activity #11.P.02	Self-financed Energy Performance Contracts: Seattle Housing Authority may self-finance Energy Performance Contracts, including the use of MTW funds.
Targeted MTW statutory objective	Cost Effectiveness: The self-financed EPC program will allow Seattle Housing Authority to eliminate borrowing costs from third party lenders and invest in energy conservation measures to reduce utility expenses in public housing units.
Schedule	After receiving approval Seattle Housing Authority will assess the public housing portfolio to identify potential candidates for inclusion in the EPC program, as well as assessing current opportunities to leverage the agency's investment.

	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Final Projected Outcome
Outcome Measures	CE1: Total cost of interest for borrowed funds for energy performance contracts	\$396,000 in projected interest costs if SHA borrowed from a third party (based on a \$1.3 million project at the long-term applicable federal rate of 2.78% for 20 years)	\$0 spent on interest	\$0 spent on interest
	CE4: Total leveraged funds in dollars	\$0	\$700,000 (based on selection of a \$1.3 million project or similarly substantial portfolio for implementation of an EPC program)	\$700,000
Data sources	SHA maintains detailed records of expenses and revenues, including interest costs and leveraged funds contributed by local partners for energy conservation.			
Authorizations Cited	MTW Agreement: Attachment C.B.1.b.ii and Attachment D.A.3. These authorizations are needed because self-financing and use of MTW block grant funds for Energy Performance Contracts requires the use of MTW authority.			

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 21 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 (*closed out as an MTW activity*)
15. Combined Program Management

16. Local Asset Management Program (*no longer reported as an MTW activity*)
17. Performance Standards (*no longer reported as an MTW activity*)
18. Short-term Assistance
19. Mobility and Portability
20. Local Non-Traditional Affordable Housing
21. Self Sufficiency Assessment and Planning

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 2016.

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.

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.

2016 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 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, and NewHolly Phase 1 to a new limited partnership to enable refinancing.

Seattle Housing Authority may consider implementing existing MTW Activity 1.P.03 to develop local Total Development Cost (TDC) limits for 2016. TDC guidelines are not always consistent with construction costs in the

Seattle market. If Seattle Housing Authority decides to implement local TDC limits in 2016, the agency will submit the proposed methodology to HUD for approval.

MTW strategies 1.P.04 and 1.P.05, which allow streamlined processes for mixed-finance closings, demolition, and disposition, are inactive due to HUD's unwillingness to honor them.

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
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.

2016 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

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					
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
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

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
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	MTW authority no longer required	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.

2016 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

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					
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

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
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.

2016 Updates

No changes are anticipated.

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					
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
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.

2016 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority may raise the cap on the percentage of vouchers that may be project-based to a cap not to exceed 35 percent, as part of our existing MTW strategy (9.H.09). This would allow us to continue to make project-based commitments in the community, which we have found to be highly effective in making service-enriched housing available for multiple populations and in leveraging the value of local dollars. Seattle Housing Authority may implement a cap lower than 35 percent based on a number of factors including the projected impact of project-basing on mobility efforts and on long-term administrative and financial constraints.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

No changes are anticipated for this activity.

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

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modification, or Additions to Authorizations
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
9.H.09	Percent of vouchers that may be project-based: Raise the percentage of vouchers that may be project-based above HUD limits, including exclusion of replacement vouchers and calculation based on authorized number of vouchers.	2000 MTW Plan	2000	Active	See above

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modification, or Additions to Authorizations
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
9.H.17	Program-based vouchers: Allocate floating voucher subsidy to a defined group of units or properties.	2003 MTW Plan	2004	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modification, or Additions to Authorizations
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.

2016 Updates

Rather than restricting local Voucher Payment Standards (10.H.04) to a range based on percentage of Fair Market Rents (FMR), previously defined as 90 to 120 percent of FMR, Seattle Housing Authority will use multiple local market factors when analyzing adjustments, including rent burden and average gross rents paid among current voucher holders, current HUD approved Fair Market Rents, data on rent reasonableness, local vacancy rates, rates

of lease up and success, and location of current voucher rentals. SHA will review Voucher Payment Standards annually to establish standards for each unit size based on the previously described local conditions.

Seattle Housing Authority is revisiting the process for streamlined rent reasonableness procedures (10.H.09). Rather than making re-determination of rent reasonableness contingent on a set percentage of increase or decrease in published FMR, Seattle Housing Authority will consider multiple factors that apply in reassessing rent reasonableness, including an assessment of reasonableness before any increase in the rent to owner, if directed by HUD, or based on any other issues identified by internal audits.

Changes in Authorization, Metrics, Baselines, or Benchmarks

No changes are anticipated for this activity.

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	See above

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
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
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	See above
10.H.10	Rent reviews for entirely elderly/disabled adult households every three years: Income 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 and may allow self-certification of assets below the threshold.	2010 MTW Plan	2010	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
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
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: Income 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 and may allow self-certification of assets below the threshold.	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	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
10.P.22	Self employment expenses: Households may declare employment expenses up to 30 percent of gross business income without further validation of deductions.	2015 MTW Plan	2015	Active	None

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.

2016 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

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
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.

2016 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

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					
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

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
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
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	MTW no longer required	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
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
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.

2016 Updates

In 2016 Seattle Housing Authority plans to implement the end of participation policy for higher income households in mixed-income communities (13.P.01). In mixed-income communities, Seattle Housing Authority will remove subsidy when household income exceeds the established limit for six months.

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					
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.

2016 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

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					
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 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 case management, 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.

2016 Updates

In order to support timely enrollment and response for short term rental assistance (18.H.01) Seattle Housing Authority will continue to require social security numbers for all adult household members at enrollment, but will allow social security numbers for dependent children to be provided later in the process if obtaining this documentation creates a barrier to housing for the family.

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					
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
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 through cooperative community initiatives to help families, students, adults, and youth obtain and retain housing.	2013 MTW Plan	2013	Active	See above

MTW Activity #19 – Mobility and Portability

Status

Active – 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.

2016 Updates

We anticipate no changes in this activity.

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 may develop a program for voucher households to provide assistance with housing search, deposits and similar costs, and outreach and incentives for landlord participation funds such as risk reduction funds.	2014 MTW Plan	2015	Active	None

Strategy	Description	First Identified	First Implemented	Current Status	Anticipated Changes, Modifications, or Additions to Authorizations
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.	2015 MTW Plan	2015	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.

2016 Updates

No changes are anticipated.

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					
20.A.01	Use of Funds for Local Non-Traditional Affordable Housing: Seattle Housing Authority may use Block Grant funds to develop, capital 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

Under development - 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 providing incentives for participation and using local selection criteria, contract terms, and escrow calculation methods.

2016 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority is currently developing procedures to implement MTW strategy 2.A.07, which allows for up to 100 percent of FSS enrollments to be selected by local preferences, particularly through referrals from service agency partners. Seattle Housing Authority plans to market this preference to service providers and conduct outreach on the benefits of the FSS program for their participants.

Seattle Housing Authority is also considering implementing three previously inactive MTW strategies for the FSS program:

- 2.A.03: FSS escrow accounts: Use local policies for determining escrow calculation, deposits, and withdrawals.
- 2.A.04: FSS participation contract: Locally designed contract terms including length, extensions, interim goals, and graduation requirements.
- 2.A.06: FSS program incentives: Provide incentives to FSS participants who do not receive escrow deposits.

With implementation Seattle Housing Authority may also change the name of the FSS program and as part of 2.A.06 extend program offerings to a broader array of SHA's housing participants, including non-heads of household and other members not enrolled in HUD's FSS program.

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	Under development	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	Under development	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	Under development	See above
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	Under development	None

MTW Activity #21 – Self Sufficiency Assessment and Planning

Status

Not yet implemented - First included in the 2015 MTW Annual Plan.

Description

Seattle Housing Authority, in partnership with several local workforce, education, and training providers, has developed a new program known as the Workforce Opportunity System pilot. This program is designed to connect current and wait-listed households with education, employment, and financial literacy services.

With this MTW activity, Seattle Housing Authority maintains the authority to make participation in the program mandatory for work-able adults, in order to develop a self-sufficiency assessment and plan. However, at this time

participation in the program is voluntary and therefore the activity is considered inactive, despite the successful launch of the pilot program.

2016 Updates

Seattle Housing Authority launched the Workforce Opportunity System pilot in 2015 and has received positive feedback from participants. Participation in the pilot program has been wholly voluntary. However, voluntary participation has created challenges in enrolling the desired number of households. Seattle Housing Authority continues to assess the potential pros and cons of voluntary and mandatory participation to determine which approach is most beneficial. The agency will continue to monitor enrollment and participation and may make changes such as requiring mandatory participation based on those results.

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					
21.A.01	Self-sufficiency Assessment and Plan: SHA may make self-sufficiency assessments and planning mandatory for work-able adults	2015 MTW Plan	Has not been implemented	Not yet implemented	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.

2016 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 2016. 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. Closed out in 2013.

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. Closed out in 2014.

Seattle Housing Authority has used alternative performance measurements since becoming a MTW agency in 1999. Because MTW agencies are allowed to try out new strategies that fall outside of regular HUD activities, some of the standard measures that HUD uses to measure housing authorities' accomplishments may not apply to MTW agencies. Seattle Housing Authority continues to collaborate with other housing authorities and with HUD to develop HUD-approved measures for MTW agencies that can serve as alternatives to systems such as HUD's Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS).

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 maintain and refine alternate performance standards, this activity may be considered closed out at HUD's request as of 2014.

V. MTW Sources and Uses of Funds

This section describes the agency's projected revenues and expenditures for MTW funds for 2016, 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 2016 by Financial Data Schedule (FDS) line item, as required by 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	\$16,087,773
70600	HUD PHA Operating Grants	\$128,986,360
70610	Capital Funding	\$11,178,000
70700 (70710+70720+70730+70740+70750)	Total Fee Revenue	\$4,500
71100+72000	Interest Income	\$47,246
71600	Gain or Loss on Sale of Capital Assets	\$0
71200+71300+71310+71400+71500	Other Income	\$1,573,652
	Total Revenue	\$157,877,531

The following table on Estimated Uses of MTW Funding summarizes estimated MTW expenditures for 2016 by FDS line item. The summary of expenditures reflects the FDS format provided last year and does not include most capital expenses, which account for approximately \$12.6 million. The FDS line item format accounts for only select capital costs and excludes others from the table; whereas Seattle Housing Authority budgets all capital funds as a group regardless of the ultimate accounting treatment of the capital fund expenditures. In addition, the Uses table does not include \$13.2 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 \$0.8 million for required replacement reserve contributions.

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	\$22,296,504
91300+91310+92000	Management Fee Expense	\$5,523,994
91810	Allocated Overhead	\$0
92500 (92100+92200+92300+92400)	Total Tenant Services	\$758,497
93000 (93100+93600+93200+93300+93400+93800)	Total Utilities	\$5,933,920
93500+93700	Labor	0
94000 (94100+94200+94300+94500)	Total Ordinary Maintenance	\$12,549,454
95000 (95100+95200+95300+95500)	Total Protective Services	\$610,962
96100 (96110+96120+96130+96140)	Total insurance Premiums	\$1,602,531
96000 (96200+96210+96300+96400+96500+96600+96800)	Total Other General Expenses	\$1,903,429
96700 (96710+96720+96730)	Total Interest Expense and Amortization Cost	\$0
97100+97200	Total Extraordinary Maintenance	\$535,000
97300+97350	Housing Assistance Payments + HAP Portability-In	\$78,695,992
97400	Depreciation Expense	\$0
97500+97600+97700+97800	All Other Expenses	\$0
	Total Expenses	\$130,410,283

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; see Appendix A for a copy of the LAMP. Seattle Housing Authority continues to implement the local asset management program and no significant changes have been made to Seattle Housing's LAMP. However, Seattle Housing Authority updated its Indirect Service Fee (see below) and relabeled and referenced the newly adopted A-136 Federal Circular that supersedes A-87.

Seattle Housing Authority has created a Central Services Operating Center (CSOC) to reflect the agency's indirect services that complies with the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-136 requirements, but differs from HUD's prescribed options. SHA's implementation of the indirect services charges is expressed as the CSOC fee or Indirect Service Fee (IDSF).

Seattle Housing Authority's IDSF 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. Seattle Housing Authority'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-136, 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 2016 budget, the per-unit-month (PUM) cost for housing units is \$52.05 and for leased vouchers is \$22.63.

B. MTW Plan: Local Asset Management Plan	
Is the PHA allocating costs within statute?	Yes
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. Seattle Housing Authority is in compliance with our MTW contract requirements and OMB directives.</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 important in supporting the agency's array of low-income housing services and programs and its local partnerships to meet locally defined needs. 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, cost objectives, statutory compliance, and local housing needs.

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 Seattle Housing 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 residents and different low-income housing programs. 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 to meet their varied needs.

The bulk of Seattle Housing Authority's use of its MTW single fund authority is to provide funds for activities in MTW communities, support of 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, job referrals, combined learning, and community betterment activities for high school youth; and health and wellness programs.
- Parks and open space that provide our low-income communities with play opportunities for children, active sports activity for youth, and passive and active exercise options for all.
- 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 the area median income.

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 Vouchers and Low Income Public Housing units
- Augment reserves in low income housing programs that serve Housing Choice Voucher and Low Income Public Housing residents
- Invest in programs to demonstrate cost effective service models, including the effectiveness of short-term or shallow subsidies in the voucher program serving homeless adults, families, and youth
- Create work opportunity programs for our residents and voucher holders so that they can obtain living wage employment and move out of subsidized housing.

For 2016, Seattle Housing Authority plans to use MTW Block Grant funding flexibility of approximately \$13.2 million for the purposes previously outlined. The three largest MTW Block Grant uses are for community and supportive services (\$4.2 million); planning and redevelopment of public housing (\$2.8 million); and support of capital repairs of local low-income housing, serving tenants that predominantly qualify for or are subsidized by Housing Choice Voucher or Low Income Public Housing funds (\$1.9 million).

Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Funding

Seattle Housing Authority estimates that in 2016 it will receive approximately \$300,000 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 B.

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 12, 2015, 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 August 31, 2015 and continued through September 30, 2015. A public hearing was held on September 17, 2015 at 3:00 pm at the Central Office at 190 Queen Anne Avenue N. Nine residents attended and seven residents and one community member 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 C.

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 – 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 and 2014 MTW Plans 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 C – Capital Fund Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report

In the following pages is Seattle Housing Authority's Capital Fund Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report for capital funds with estimated balances projected to continue into 2016.

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		FFY of Grant Approval: 2015	
		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19P001501-15 Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: WA19R150115, WA19R150215		ESTIMATE FOR 2015 GRANT	
		Date of CFFP: Dec 2005 – Dec 2007			
<input type="checkbox"/> Type of Grant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending: 12/31/2016 ESTIMATE <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				
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

PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority
Grant Type and Number: Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19P001501-15
ESTIMATE FOR 2015 GRANT
Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: WA19R150115, WA19R150215

FFY of Grant: 2015
FFY of Grant Approval: 2015

Type of Grant


☐ Original Annual Statement

☐ Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies

☐ Revised Annual Statement (revision no:)

☒ Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending: 12/31/2016 ESTIMATE

☐ Final Performance and Evaluation Report

Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost	Revised ²	Obligated	Total Actual Cost ¹	Expended
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)	10,235,652		4,901,542	4,901,542	
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities					
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 		Date 8/24/2015	Signature of Public Housing Director		Date	

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

[illegible]

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

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

Federal FFY of Grant: 2015

[illegible]

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.

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: 2014	
PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority		Grant Type and Number		FFY of Grant Approval: 2014	
		Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19P001501-14 Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: WA19R150114, WA19R150214 Date of CFFP: Dec 2005 – Dec 2007		ESTIMATE FOR 2014 GRANT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending: 12/31/2016		<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	Obligated	Total Actual Cost¹
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				
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs		11,162,000		10,500,000
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

PHA Name: Seattle Housing Authority
Grant Type and Number: Capital Fund Program Grant No: WA19P001501-14
Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: WA19R150114, WA19R150214
ESTIMATE FOR 2014 GRANT

FFY of Grant: 2014
FFY of Grant Approval: 2014

Type of Grant
☐ Original Annual Statement
☒ Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending: 12/31/2016 ESTIMATE
☐ Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies

☐ Revised Annual Statement (revision no:)

☐ Final Performance and Evaluation Report

Line	Summary by Development Account	Original	Total Estimated Cost	Revised ²	Obligated	Total Actual Cost ¹	Expended
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			11,162,000		10,500,000
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities						
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		Date	Signature of Public Housing Director		Date		

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

Federal FY of Grant: 2015

Federal FFY of Grant: 2015

[illegible]

ended.