

Spring 2022

## Housing Choice Vouchers: Moving to Work Program in California

Benjamin Tran  
*San Jose State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd\\_projects](https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects)



Part of the [Policy Design, Analysis, and Evaluation Commons](#), [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Tran, Benjamin, "Housing Choice Vouchers: Moving to Work Program in California" (2022). *Master's Projects*. 1070.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.76fp-x8sh>

[https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd\\_projects/1070](https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects/1070)

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@sjsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@sjsu.edu).

**Housing Choice Vouchers:  
Moving to Work Program in California**

by

Benjamin Tran

A Thesis Quality Research Paper  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the  
Requirements for the  
Master's Degree

in

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Professor Frances Edwards, Ph.D.  
Adviser

The Graduate School  
San Jose State University  
May 2022

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	3
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	9
BACKGROUND.....	11
a. Research Question	
b. Bay Area Housing Market	
c. Housing Cost Burdened Households	
d. What is the HUD MTW Program?	
e. MTW Activities	
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	19
a. Problems with HCVs	
b. Importance of HCVs	
c. Critique of MTW	
METHODOLOGY.....	23
a. Type of Analysis	
b. Data Collection	
c. IRB Exclusion	
FINDINGS.....	26
Oakland.....	26
San Bernardino .....	49
San Diego .....	73
San Mateo .....	113
Santa Ana .....	136
Tulare .....	162
ANALYSIS.....	170
Oakland.....	170
San Bernardino .....	175
San Diego .....	181
San Mateo .....	189
Santa Ana .....	194
Tulare .....	200

CONCLUSION.....203  
REFERENCES.....205

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: HUD Income Categories for Housing Subsidies, 2021 in Santa Clara County.....	12
Table 2: Program Evaluation Methodology.....	25
Table 3: MTW Program Goals.....	25

### **Oakland**

Table 4: MTW Activity #06-01.....	27
Table 5: MTW Activity #06-02.....	28
Table 6: MTW Activity #06-03.....	28
Table 7: MTW Activity #08-01.....	30
Table 8: MTW Activity #10-01.....	31
Table 9: MTW Activity #10-02.....	32
Table 10: MTW Activity #10-03.....	33
Table 11: MTW Activity #10-05.....	34
Table 12: MTW Activity #10-09.....	35
Table 13: MTW Activity #11-01.....	36
Table 14: MTW Activity #11-02.....	37
Table 15: MTW Activity #11-03.....	38
Table 16: MTW Activity #11-05.....	40
Table 17: MTW Activity #12-01.....	41
Table 18: MTW Activity #12-01.....	42
Table 19: MTW Activity #14-01.....	43
Table 20: MTW Activity #14-01.....	44
Table 21: MTW Activity #15-01.....	45
Table 22: MTW Activity #15-02.....	47
Table 23: MTW Activity #17-01.....	48

### **San Bernardino**

Table 24: MTW Activity #4.....	50
Table 25: MTW Activity #4.....	51
Table 26: MTW Activity #5.....	52
Table 27: MTW Activity #7.....	53
Table 28: MTW Activity #8.....	54

Table 29: MTW Activity #9.....	55
Table 30: MTW Activity #10.....	56
Table 31: MTW Activity #11.....	57
Table 32: MTW Activity #12.....	58
Table 33: MTW Activity #13.....	59
Table 34: MTW Activity #15.....	60
Table 35: MTW Activity #15.....	61
Table 36: MTW Activity #15.....	62
Table 37: MTW Activity #17.....	63
Table 38: MTW Activity #18.....	64
Table 39: MTW Activity #19.....	65
Table 40: MTW Activity #19.....	66
Table 41: MTW Activity #20.....	67
Table 42: MTW Activity #20.....	68
Table 43: MTW Activity #22.....	69
Table 44: MTW Activity #22.....	70
Table 45: MTW Activity #23.....	71
Table 46: MTW Activity #24.....	72
Table 47: MTW Activity #25.....	73
<b>San Diego</b>	
Table 48: MTW Activity 2010-1.....	74
Table 49: MTW Activity 2010-2.....	75
Table 50: MTW Activity 2010-3.....	76
Table 51: MTW Activity 2010-4.....	76
Table 52: MTW Activity 2010-5.....	77
Table 53: MTW Activity 2010-6.....	78
Table 54: MTW Activity 2010-7.....	79
Table 55: MTW Activity 2010-7.....	80
Table 56: MTW Activity 2010-9.....	81
Table 57: MTW Activity 2011-1.....	82
Table 58: MTW Activity 2011-2.....	83

Table 59: MTW Activity 2011-3.....	84
Table 60: MTW Activity 2011-4.....	85
Table 61: MTW Activity 2011-5.....	86
Table 62: MTW Activity 2011-6.....	87
Table 63: MTW Activity 2011-7.....	88
Table 64: MTW Activity 2011-8.....	89
Table 65: MTW Activity 2011-8.....	90
Table 66: MTW Activity 2011-8.....	91
Table 67: MTW Activity 2012-1.....	92
Table 68: MTW Activity 2012-1.....	93
Table 69: MTW Activity 2012-1.....	94
Table 70: MTW Activity 2012-2.....	95
Table 71: MTW Activity 2012-3.....	96
Table 72: MTW Activity 2013-1.....	97
Table 73: MTW Activity 2013-2.....	98
Table 74: MTW Activity 2013-2.....	99
Table 75: MTW Activity 2013-2.....	100
Table 76: MTW Activity 2013-3.....	101
Table 77: MTW Activity 2013-4.....	102
Table 78: MTW Activity 2013-6.....	103
Table 79: MTW Activity 2014-2.....	104
Table 80: MTW Activity 2015-1.....	105
Table 81: MTW Activity 2016-1.....	106
Table 82: MTW Activity 2016-1.....	107
Table 83: MTW Activity 2016-2.....	108
Table 84: MTW Activity 2016-3.....	109
Table 85: MTW Activity 2017-1.....	110
Table 86: MTW Activity 2018-1.....	111
Table 87: MTW Activity 2018-1.....	112
Table 88: MTW Activity 2020-1.....	113

**San Mateo**

Table 89: MTW Activity 2000-3.....114

Table 90: MTW Activity 2009-2.....115

Table 91: MTW Activity 2009-2.....116

Table 92: MTW Activity 2010-6.....117

Table 93: MTW Activity 2010-7.....118

Table 94: MTW Activity 2010-8.....119

Table 95: MTW Activity 2010-9.....120

Table 96: MTW Activity 2010-10.....121

Table 97: MTW Activity 2011-15.....122

Table 98: MTW Activity 2011-16.....123

Table 99: MTW Activity 2011-17.....124

Table 100: MTW Activity 2011-18.....125

Table 101: MTW Activity 2011-19.....126

Table 102: MTW Activity 2011-27.....127

Table 103: MTW Activity 2012-21.....128

Table 104: MTW Activity 2012-23.....128

Table 105: MTW Activity 2012-24.....129

Table 106: MTW Activity 2012-26.....130

Table 107: MTW Activity 2013-28.....131

Table 108: MTW Activity 2013-28.....132

Table 109: MTW Activity 2014-29.....132

Table 110: MTW Activity 2015-30.....133

Table 111: MTW Activity 2015-32.....134

Table 112: MTW Activity 2015-34.....135

Table 113: MTW Activity 2015-35.....136

**Santa Clara**

Table 114: MTW Activity 2009-1.....137

Table 115: MTW Activity 2009-2.....138

Table 116: MTW Activity 2009-5.....139

Table 117: MTW Activity 2009-8.....140



Table 118: MTW Activity 2009-9.....	141
Table 119: MTW Activity 2009-11.....	142
Table 120: MTW Activity 2009-13.....	142
Table 121: MTW Activity 2009-14.....	143
Table 122: MTW Activity 2010-2.....	144
Table 123: MTW Activity 2010-3.....	145
Table 124: MTW Activity 2010-4.....	146
Table 125: MTW Activity 2011-1.....	147
Table 126: MTW Activity 2011-2.....	148
Table 127: MTW Activity 2012-2.....	148
Table 128: MTW Activity 2012-3.....	149
Table 129: MTW Activity 2012-4.....	150
Table 130: MTW Activity 2013-1.....	151
Table 131: MTW Activity 2014-4.....	152
Table 132: MTW Activity 2015-2.....	153
Table 133: MTW Activity 2015-3.....	154
Table 134: MTW Activity 2016-2.....	155
Table 135: MTW Activity 2017-1.....	155
Table 136: MTW Activity 2017-2.....	156
Table 137: MTW Activity 2017-3.....	157
Table 138: MTW Activity 2019-2.....	158
Table 139: MTW Activity 2019-3.....	159
Table 140: MTW Activity 2019-4.....	159
Table 141: MTW Activity 2020-01.....	160
Table 142: MTW Activity 2020-03.....	160
Table 143: MTW Activity 2020-04.....	161
Table 144: MTW Activity 2020-05.....	161
Table 145: MTW Activity 2020-06.....	162
<b>Tulare</b>	
Table 146: MTW Activity One.....	163
Table 147: MTW Activity One.....	164

Table 148: MTW Activity Two.....	165
Table 149: MTW Activity Four.....	166
Table 150: MTW Activity Five.....	167
Table 151: MTW Activity Six.....	169

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACSO	Alameda County Sheriff's Office
AMI	Average Median Income
CACC	Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract
CHDR	Chronically Homeless Direct Referral
CoP	Contract of Participation
DADS	Dads Acquiring Developing Skills
EID	Earned Income Disallowance
EIV	Enterprise Income Verification
FMR	Fair Market Rents
FSS	Family Self Sufficiency
HACSB	Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino
HACSM	Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo
HAP	Housing Assistance Payment
HATC	Housing Authority of the County of Tulare
HCV	Housing Choice Voucher
HOH	Head of Household
HQS	Housing Quality Standards
HRP	Housing Readiness Program
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
Kin-GAP	Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment
LIHTC	Low Income Housing Tax Credit
MOMS	Maximizing Opportunities for Mothers to Succeed

MTW	Moving To Work
OHA	Oakland Housing Authority
PACT	Parents and Children Together
PBV	Project Based Voucher
PHA	Public Housing Authority
RFP	Request For Proposal
RFTA	Request for Tenancy Approval
SCCHA	Santa Clara County Housing Authority
SDHC	San Diego Housing Commission
SDSU	San Diego State University
SNDR	Special Needs Direct Referral
SRO	Single Room Occupancy
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
TIC	Tenant Income Certification
TTP	Total Tenant Payment
UAP	Utility Allowance Payment
VASH	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing
VAWA	Violence Against Women Act

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Research Question:**

This research project examined whether the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD's) Moving To Work (MTW) program enabled California's public housing authorities to provide more efficient service, while meeting MTW program goals, from 2015 to 2020.

### **Bay Area Housing Market**

It is widely known that the San Francisco Bay Area lacks affordable housing and has high rents (Ghaffary, 2019). The Bay Area should have added over one million housing units since 2000 to meet the increase in ever-growing population and job market, but has only managed to build 380,000 housing units in all price points (Terplan, 2019). Currently, there are about 35 affordable housing units for every 100 extremely low-income households in the Bay Area, and the ratio worsens to 29 homes for every 100 extremely low-income households in the South Bay (Aurand et al., 2021). Table 1 shows the income limits that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines as needing housing subsidies in 2021. Low income is 80% of the area median income (AMI), very low income is 50% of the AMI, and extremely low income is based on the US poverty line (Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, 2021).

Table 1: HUD Income Categories for Housing Subsidies, 2021 in Santa Clara County

Household Size	50% of Area Median Income (AMI): Very low income	Extremely Low Income: Based on US Poverty Line
1 PERSON	\$58,000	24,850
2 PERSONS	\$66,300	28,400
3 PERSONS	\$74,600	31,950
4 PERSONS	\$82,850	36,450
5 PERSONS	\$89,500	38,300
6 PERSONS	\$96,150	41,150
7 PERSONS	\$102,750	44,00
8 PERSONS	\$109,400	46,600

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2021; Los Angeles County Housing Authority, 2021.

Most of the missing housing units impacted those earning less than the area’s median income of \$124,055 (United States Census Bureau, 2021). This impact resulted in the demographic being more susceptible to homelessness due to housing inventory and income strains (Terplan, 2019). More people are moving into the Bay Area than units being built to house them, causing housing costs to increase. Higher density housing would help solve this problem, but there has not been an increase in the production of apartments, as apartments as a percentage of housing units are the same as in the 1980s (Terplan, 2019). From 2011 to 2017, the Bay Area’s ratio of new jobs to new housing units built was four new jobs for every three housing units built, which is considerably higher than the recommended ratio of one new job for every five housing units built that is recommended by the Environmental Protection Agency to avoid displacement and congestion (Bellisario et al., 2021).

When the affordable housing supply is limited, the people who want to live in the area must compete by bidding up prices. Some factors that suppress new housing construction are

community resistance, environmental policies, zoning and land constraints, which are especially prevalent in the Bay Area. This relationship between development and housing costs holds true across the nation, which shows that this situation in the Bay Area is not unique (Taylor, 2015). Competition for housing has caused the Bay Area to grow significantly wealthier, as new residents were those who could afford the elevated and increasing prices (Terplan, 2019).

The Bay Area has some of the highest rental costs in the nation, with San Francisco being the second and San Jose being the fourth most expensive (Esajian, 2020). In 2022 the average cost for a 740 square foot apartment in San Francisco was \$3,200 (Rent Café, 2022a), while the average cost for an 884 square foot apartment in San Jose was \$2,754 (Rent Café, 2022b). This means that a renter would need an income of at least \$9,600 a month (\$115,200 a year) to rent the average San Francisco apartment, or \$8,262 (\$99,144 a year) to rent the average San Jose apartment. Based on Table 1, a family of four in the very low income range could afford no more than \$2,400 per month in rent, while a family of four in the extremely low income range could afford no more than \$1,064 per month in rent.

To alleviate the lack of low-income housing, the Tax Reform Act of 1986 created the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), giving private investors federal income tax credit as an incentive to make investments in affordable rental housing (Sally et al., 2018). Many say the program has successfully produced housing, as 45,905 projects and 2.97 million housing units have been created between 1987 and 2015 (Sally et al., 2018). In addition, these particular units helped increase the supply of affordable housing due to the 15–30-year restrictions on maximum rent to ensure affordability of the housing built with the tax credit subsidies (Novogradac, 2016). Although LIHTC encourages construction, rehabilitation, and revitalization of low-income

neighborhoods, experts support Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) to aid low-income households at a lower cost (The President's Economic Recovery Advisory Board, 2010).

### **Housing Cost Burdened Households**

The housing shortage results in high housing costs, forcing low-income households to spend more on housing and less on other essentials (Taylor, 2015). A Harvard University study has shown that low-income households paying more than half of their income on housing spent 39% less money on food than those who spent less than half of their income on housing (Taylor, 2015), forcing households to choose between food or shelter. HUD reported that most households that receive no housing assistance and have low incomes need to pay over half of their income for rent (Watson et al., 2020). Research by Zillow also shows that neighborhoods with households spending over 32% of their income on rent can expect a faster increase in homelessness (Glynn et al., 2021). The Bay Area's homeless population continues to grow larger and faster, while becoming less sheltered. The numbers show that the Bay Area's growth in homeless population accounted for over a quarter of the nation's growth in homelessness between 2017 and 2020 (Bellisario et al., 2021). This fast growth caused the homeless population without access to basic shelter to increase from 67% to 73% during that time.

### **What is the HUD MTW Program?**

President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty created HUD on November 9, 1965 (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2018). The department's mission is to solve the nation's housing needs, to improve communities, and enforce fair housing laws (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2018). In 1974, the Section 8 program was created as primarily a project-based rental assistance program that helped people below specified income limits (Congressional Research Service, 2014). This program continued until project-



based assistance became heavily criticized for high costs and the concentration of low-income families in high-poverty areas (Congressional Research Service, 2014). As a result, funding was cut for new project-based rental assistance contracts, and public housing authorities used the HCV program to replace them (Congressional Research Service, 2014). However, this program also had limited success in moving families into stable homes.

Congress established the MTW program in 1996 to overcome the shortcomings of the HCV program. It links broad federal goals to locally designed solutions. The MTW program is a demonstration program that gives public housing authorities the power to create and test innovative strategies at the local level, in an effort to use federal funding more efficiently, while helping low-income residents become more self-sufficient (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2021). The MTW program allows public housing authorities to exempt themselves from certain housing and voucher rules, which provides flexibility in the use of funding. The MTW program has given public housing authorities the chance to showcase the success of their innovative policy changes at the local level, and some of these changes have been expanded nationwide (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2021).

There are currently 80 public housing authorities participating in the MTW program, and HUD plans to increase this number by 59 public housing authorities by 2022 (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2021). The HCV Program, also called Section 8, is one of the most important programs that the department funds. The vouchers allow participants to limit their rental cost to 30% of their income, and the HUD voucher pays the landlord the balance of the rent that exceeds the 30% amount. HCVs effectively relieve demand-side constraints by reducing the rental cost burden for households using the program, enabling them to rent properties whose rent exceeds their ability to pay.

## **MTW Activities**

As an MTW agency, the Santa Clara County Housing Authority (SCCHA) has the authority to implement policies that waive certain program regulations. Although housing authorities cannot do much to change low vacancy rates, they can improve the chances of voucher holders finding safe and affordable housing. Different strategies can have widely varying costs tied to them (Finkel et al., 2003).

### ***Direct Services to HCV Holders and Landlords***

The success of voucher holders is higher when they are given briefing packets that include an updated list of owners willing to accept vouchers, school quality information, and LIHTC units lists (Rice, 2019). One way the SCCHA has increased the number of landlords who lease to the HCV program is to provide incentives, such as vacancy payments to reduce losses to landlords while in-between tenants (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019). Accurate information has been shown to streamline the lease process, so the SCCHA has revised its process to reduce redundant information to avoid mismatches that require staff time to resolve. This administrative change improved customer service by reducing the time needed to complete the Request for Tenancy Approval (RFTA) packet, and start the voucher holder's lease (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019). Customer service should focus on fast and accurate responses to inquiries, prompt initial inspections after RFTA, on-time payments, and increased landlord satisfaction by identifying issues through surveys (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2020).

One of the biggest problems that voucher holders complain about is the inability to find housing after receiving the voucher, and housing authorities have the discretion to allow voucher holders to search for more than 60 days. By allowing more days to search for housing, voucher

holders will have a significantly higher chance of successfully finding housing, while incurring little administrative costs. Voucher utilization and success rates are important to increase renewal funding, as excess or unused funds can result in a renewal funding decline (Rice, 2019).

A method that has been successful in improving leasing success rates is assisting voucher holders during their housing search, as periodic contact is effective (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2020). The SCCHA has contracted an experienced non-profit housing locator services provider to assist voucher holders in finding a home to rent when they cannot find housing in the first 120 days after receiving a HCV (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2021b).

### ***Temporary Policy Changes***

In 2020 a novel corona virus developed in Wuhan, China that created an international pandemic. The disease was named SARS-COVID-19, and resulted in a public health crisis. The immediate response was a lockdown order to prevent the spread of the disease when there was no treatment and no cure. The result was that schools were closed, all non-essential businesses were closed, and many people lost their income as they were unable to go to work (Hansen, 2020).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, public housing authorities implemented temporary policy changes to increase efficiencies, such as waiving income verification hierarchy requirements for initial eligibility assistance and regular and interim re-examinations (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2021a). The new income verification requirements saved staff time required to process verifications. Due to the increased cost-effectiveness of changing the verification requirements, and the uncertainty of COVID-19 impacts, the SCCHA proposed an activity change to continue the reduced frequency of tenant re-examinations, allowing an extra

year between tenant re-examinations (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020b). The reduction in the frequency of tenant re-examinations reduced administrative costs, and therefore supported the MTW goal of increasing cost-effectiveness. This is an example of how a MTW agency could test policies and implement them for the long term if they showed success in the short term.

### ***Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program***

Another important element of the MTW program is to promote participants' economic self-sufficiency. Families that already have a Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) are eligible to enroll in the Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSS). The goal is to use "case management services and financial incentives" to move families into financial independence (The City of Alameda, 2022, n.p.).

The program's emphasis is on employment, career development, education, training, independence from public assistance and credit readiness. The FSS financial incentive is the Escrow (savings) Account. When an FSS participant's rental share increases as the result of increased earned income, a specified amount of money is deposited into an interest earning savings account on behalf of that qualifying family. Upon successful completion of the five-year FSS program, qualifying families will have access to those accumulated funds. (The City of Alameda, 2022, n.p.)

The California PHAs that are participating in the MTW program are all using some elements of FSS as goals.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Problems with HCV:

HUD planned for the HCV program to provide more efficient subsidized housing in the private market. HUD had a goal of deconcentrating poverty using this program (Williamson et al., 2009). The family's location can significantly affect the quality of services that are available to them, such as schools, transportation, access to jobs, and access to fresh and reasonably priced food. Living in lower-poverty neighborhoods can improve children's academic performance and lead to higher employment rates for adults (Mazzara & Knudsen, 2019). A problem with the HCV program is that low-income voucher holders have difficulty using their vouchers outside of high-poverty neighborhoods because the combination of the voucher and the tenant's share of the rent equates to a low monthly rent. Research shows that the HCV program fails to move households into noticeably better neighborhoods than they lived in previously (Varady, 2010).

The biggest factors are market constraints, access to information, and discrimination (Tighe et al., 2016). These factors affect each other, as discrimination by landlords affects market constraints, and access to information is controlled by landlords and their advertising preferences. Market constraints can affect where HCV participants live, as a HUD report estimated that 30% of voucher holders resided in units that were also subsidized through another mechanism (Williamson et al., 2009). This shows how the limited availability of affordable housing units in the private market forced HCV recipients into LIHTC units.

Constrained markets and limited information often lead to a voucher holder choosing to live in a distressed neighborhood where landlords advertise that they accept HCVs (Pendall, 2000). Research has shown that voucher denials are higher in low-poverty areas, where many landlords refuse to include welfare-related sources of income in estimating a potential tenant's

ability to pay. Laws in California that prevent a source of income discrimination have reduced voucher denials.

Success and the time it takes to find housing correlate with the vacancy rate. The time it takes a voucher holder to find housing can range from 59 days with a 7-10% vacancy rate, up to 94 days with a 2% or lower vacancy rate, if they find housing at all. An 80% success rate corresponds to a vacancy rate of 7-10%, and can drop to 61% if the vacancy rate is 2% (Rice, 2019).

Much of the discrimination against voucher holders stems from misconceptions and stereotypes regarding the poor, resulting in unwarranted negative attitudes towards subsidized housing programs. Research shows that people's attitudes about subsidized housing indicate that they are most often not based on any reliable evidence nor the realities of subsidized housing today, but rather on stereotypes derived from past experiences (Tighe et al., 2016). To combat discrimination based on the source of income, the California legislature passed the Fair Employment and Housing Act that protects people from housing discrimination based on protected categories and these have been expanded to include sources of income. This amendment adds people using federal, state, or local housing subsidies to the list of protected groups and went into effect in California on January 1, 2020. Research has shown that source of income discrimination prevention laws can increase voucher utilization by 5% to 12% (Freeman, 2011).

The biggest problem with HCVs is the lack of funding for the program. Insufficient funding blocks 3 in 4 eligible households from receiving assistance, and those who are fortunate enough to receive a voucher must spend years on a waiting list (Mazzara, 2021). HCVs are important because supply investments generally do not provide affordable housing for low-

income renters who struggle the most to afford it (Mazzara, 2021). One study estimated that 9.3 million people in the nation would be lifted above the poverty line if vouchers were given to all eligible households (Collyer et al., 2020). Public housing authorities spend virtually every dollar that is provided to them through federal funding. From 2011 to 2020, agencies spent over 99% of their received budget, averaging 99.9% which dipped to 99.3% due to pandemic disruptions (Fischer, 2021).

HCVs have been effective even in areas where there is a housing shortage. Still, well-run housing agencies can achieve over 80% success in housing families that are issued vouchers (Fischer, 2021). Researchers estimate that \$62 billion to \$100 billion is needed per year to ensure that all eligible applicants receive HCV assistance, which is much greater than the \$24 billion allotted to tenant-based rental assistance in 2020. California would require \$14.5 billion to cover 3.5 million people (Mcbain et al., 2021).

### **Importance of HCV:**

Research has shown that HCVs are “highly effective at reducing homelessness, housing instability, and overcrowding” (Oliva, 2021). One study shows that HCVs can reduce homelessness by 75% (Oliva, 2021). HCVs positively improve social behaviors in children and reduce the chances of them entering foster care. Tight supply and barriers in the private rental market lead to only a small number of voucher recipients moving out of the area, but this subgroup tends to move to lower-poverty neighborhoods (Cohen, 2020). This is an important opportunity because more than two-thirds of households receiving benefits are headed by a person of color (Fischer et al., 2021). Source of income anti-discrimination laws have been shown to help voucher holders become less racially segregated in areas with such laws in effect (Metzger, 2014). Studies have shown that rent calculations at the zip-code level, instead of the

metropolitan level, increase the odds that voucher households will live in neighborhoods with a history of greater opportunity (Dastrup et al., 2018).

### **Critique of MTW:**

Abt Associates published a report on the performance of public housing authorities participating in the MTW program. The report showed that in 2014, MTW agencies provided assistance to 8,000 families through programs funded with dollars transferred from public housing or voucher programs (Buron et al., 2017). This statistic alone makes it seem as if MTW agencies were more successful, but this is not true compared to funding data from HUD (Fischer, 2017). The data shows that the MTW agencies provided housing assistance to about 60,000 fewer families than they could have under the HCV program with the funds provided, showing a huge inefficiency (Fischer, 2017). This overall number may seem daunting, but it is still true that public housing authorities are using the MTW flexibility to increase efficiency. The problem with serving less people than it should have is that public housing authorities are mandated to serve at least as many households as before they joined the MTW program. Another overall problem with MTW is that agencies spent about 21% more to administer a voucher than non-participating agencies (Fischer, 2017).



## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Type of Analysis**

This research used a program evaluation methodology to guide the collection of data and analyze the success of California public housing authorities (PHAs) that participated in the MTW program in achieving their individual goals. A program evaluation was appropriate due to its ability to “compare program results to planned objectives” (Sylvia & Sylvia, 2012, pg. 28). The research showed the changes each PHA was allowed to make, and the impact of each change. The activities were summarized for each PHA to determine effectiveness on an individual housing authority level. The research analyzed the activities to draw conclusions about the efficacy of the MTW program overall in achieving enhanced services to landlords and tenants, better efficiency for the PHA, and better outcomes for the tenants.

Table 2: Program Evaluation Methodology

Problem Statement	Solution	Implementation	Evaluation
PHAs receive limited funding, and one of the biggest problems of the HCV program is its lack of funding.	The MTW Program allowed PHAs more discretion in their use of available funds, and allowed policy changes to facilitate efficiency.	PHA applied to join the MTW program. Policy changes were made after the approval of the program.	This methodology evaluated the findings gathered from MTW annual reports and measured them against HUD metrics to analyze the achievement of MTW program goals.

Table 3: MTW Program Goals

Decrease administrative costs and increase cost-effectiveness in housing program operations	Promote participants' economic self-sufficiency	Expand participants' housing choices
---	---	--------------------------------------

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015.

**Data Collection and Selection:**

The research uses data pertaining to the success of the MTW Program for the six participating California PHAs: Oakland, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Tulare . The PHA submitted his data to HUD annually as a requirement of participation in the MTW program. Data for his research was collected for fiscal years 2015 to 2020, and organized

by PHA for analysis. The reports collected highlighted the changes implemented by each PHA, measured results, and compared those results to HUD benchmarks. These agencies have participated in MTW for more than five years, and have all received funding from HUD to administer the HCV Program. The PHAs were chosen due to their location in California, which has a highly competitive rental market.

Data is displayed in the Findings section, grouped for each PHA. Each PHA used its own numbering system to name and track the various MTW activities.

**IRB Exclusion:**

This study qualifies for an exclusion from San Jose State University Institutional Review Board review because there are no human subjects. All data was collected from publicly available HUD materials that are public record, and contain only aggregated PHA-level data.

## FINDINGS

### Oakland Housing Authority (OHA)

Table 4: MTW Activity #06-01

	Activity #06-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
	Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage	3.9%	Yes(5%)	3.9%	Yes(5%)	3.9%	Yes(5%)
Average applicant time on wait list in months	Campbell Village	77	No(48)	68	No(48)	71	No(48)
	Lockwood Gardens	66	No(48)	54	No(48)	32	Yes(48)
	Peralta Villa	66	No(48)	54	No(48)	32	Yes(48)
	Harrison Towers	78	No(48)	69	No(48)	57	No(48)
	Adel Court	83	No(48)	70	No(48)	59	No(48)
	Oak Grove North	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	57	No(48)
	Oak Grove South	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	53	No(48)
	Palo Vista Gardens	58	Yes(48)	33	Yes(48)	21	Yes(48)
	Linden Court	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	56	No(48)
	Mandela Gateway	78	No(48)	64	No(48)	61	No(48)
	Chestnut Court	70	No(48)	70	No(48)	3	Yes(48)
	Foothill Family Apts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	101	No(48)
	Lion Creek Crossing	42	No(48)	53	No(48)	28	Yes(48)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #06-01 established site-based waiting lists at all public housing sites, housing developments with Project Based Voucher (PBV) allocations, and HOPE VI sites. Many factors contributed to the time spent on waitlists, such as vacancy and turnover. For example, the Oak Grove North and South apartments were not leased to new residents during rehabilitation, which increased waitlist times (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 5: MTW Activity #06-02

Activity #06-02	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$7,500 per RFP)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	N/A	N/A	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=100 hours per RFP)	15	Yes(35)	N/A	N/A	30	Yes(70)	15	Yes(35)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #06-02 allowed the allocation of PBV units to developments owned by the OHA without using a competitive process. The cost of the task prior to implementation of the activity was \$7,500 per RFP, and the expected benchmark for staff time consumption was 15 hours per RFP (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 6: MTW Activity #06-03

Activity #06-03	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of projects awarded	9	N/A	3	N/A	1	N/A	6	N/A	3	N/A
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$7,500 per RFP)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=100 hours per RFP)	135	Yes(135)	45	Yes(45)	15	Yes(15)	90	Yes(90)	45	Yes(45)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019.

Activity #06-03 allowed the allocation of PBV units to qualifying housing developments using a competitive process, such as RFP or other existing competitive processes. The objective of this activity was to reduce the administrative time and development costs associated with issuing an RFP. The cost of the task prior to implementation of the activity was \$7,500 per RFP, and the expected benchmark for staff time consumption was 15 hours per RFP. This activity also increases housing choices by creating new or replacement affordable housing. The state has eliminated redevelopment agencies, resulting in lost low income housing funds to the city, which has resulted in fewer awards, slowing the development of new high-quality units created by this activity (Oakland Housing Authority, 2019).

Table 7: MTW Activity #08-01

Activity #08-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	66	Yes(66)	0	Yes(0)	59	No(604)	71	No(130)	225	Yes(130)	317	No(388)
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)	80	Yes(80)	31	No(175)	51	No(66)	38	No(100)	0	No(100)	0	No(100)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	65	Yes(65)	0	Yes(0)	110	No(670)	71	No(239)	68	No(239)	317	No(400)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #08-01 leveraged funds through single fund flexibility to preserve affordable housing resources. This activity also allowed the creation of new affordable housing

opportunities in Oakland. Through this activity OHA constructed and leased affordable housing units (Oakland Housing Authority, 2019).

Table 8: MTW Activity #10-01

Activity #10-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$636,435	Yes(\$250,000)	\$468,786	Yes(\$250,000)	\$392,836	Yes(\$250,000)	\$426,773	Yes(\$100,000)	\$277,808	Yes(\$100,000)	\$238,126	Yes(\$100,000)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #10-01 allowed OHA to partner with the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office (ACSO) to operate the Parents and Children Together (PACT) program. The PACT program accepted referrals from the Maximizing Opportunities for Mothers to Succeed (MOMS) and Dads Acquiring Developing Skills (DADS) programs run by the ACSO. This MTW activity’s objective was to improve outcomes and enhance program coordination with relevant partners by increasing resources in the PACT program (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The OHA implemented this activity in conjunction with Activity #11-05 (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).



Table 9: MTW Activity #10-02

Activity #10-02												
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$47,711)	Yes(10)	N/A	N/A	N/A	No(18)					
2015	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$47,711)	Yes(10)	N/A	N/A	N/A	16					
2016	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$47,711)	Yes(10)	Yes(\$200)	N/A	N/A	No(18)					
2017	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$47,711)	Yes(10)	No(\$200)	N/A	N/A	Yes(18)					
2018	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$47,711)	Yes(10)	Yes(\$200)	N/A	N/A	Yes(18)					
2019	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$47,711)	Yes(10)	Yes(\$200)	N/A	N/A	Yes(18)					
2020	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$47,711)	Yes(5)	Yes(\$0)	Yes(\$5,191,848)	No(18)	4					
		\$81,985	0	\$0	\$13,483,309							
		Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$47,711)										
		Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$995)										
		Average PHA rental revenue/HAP in dollars for the year (Baseline=\$4,343,040)										
		Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=11)										
		Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)										

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #10-02 allowed HCV recipients receiving a Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) of \$0 to remain in the program for up to 24 months before being terminated (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). While households benefited from the protections of this activity, most families

returned to subsidy and did not exit the program to full self-sufficiency (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The households likely did not exit to full self-sufficiency due to the extremely competitive rental market, which showed the need for this activity, as well as its positive impact (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 10: MTW Activity #10-03

Activity #10-03	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$5,600)	\$1,400	No(\$700)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=80)	20	No(10)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #10-03 allowed the OHA to execute HAP contracts for non-contiguous buildings, which reduced agency costs tied to staff time preparing and managing HAP contracts (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The OHA did not use this activity in fiscal years 2015 to 2019.

Table 11: MTW Activity #10-05

Activity #10-05	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)	0	No(60)	0	No(60)	3	No(60)	9	No(60)
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$645)	\$0	No(\$0)	\$0	No(\$0)	\$1,625	Yes(\$0)	\$1,625	Yes(\$0)
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #10-05 allowed landlords to accept lower HAP in PBV units and was on hold until fiscal year 2017 (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Participants of Public Housing or HCV programs may be “over-housed” based on occupancy policies. This activity allowed landlords to accept a lower HAP based on family size instead of the number of actual bedrooms in the unit (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity was also used when there were no qualifying waitlist applicants for the size units available, and the goal was to preserve housing and prevent displacement (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 12: MTW Activity #10-09

Activity #10-09	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on waitlist in months (Baseline=0)	60	Yes(60)	60	Yes(60)
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	6	No(10)	6	No(10)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #10-09 allowed OHA to extend or reduce the minimum stay requirement at its discretion for tenants in PBV units, as well as prioritize families on the HCV waitlist at its discretion (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Initially, there was a 12-month minimum stay requirement, and this activity was implemented to increase the housing choice of program recipients (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). However, this activity did not apply to families with an approved reasonable accommodation, who experienced a family composition change, or presented a compelling reason to move (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 13: MTW Activity #11-01

Activity #11-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=3)	0	Yes(0)	3	Yes(0)	6	Yes(0)	5	Yes(0)	4	Yes(0)	6	Yes(0)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	14	Yes(0)	14	Yes(0)	24	Yes(0)	15	Yes(0)	28	Yes(0)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #11-01 applied to new participants of the PBV program and families that would need to relocate due to changes in their household composition (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity allowed the OHA to modify PBV occupancy standards to align with other state or locally administered funding in a development, such as the LIHTC program (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The modified occupancy standards resulted in families qualifying for a larger number of bedrooms than they would have without this activity (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 14: MTW Activity #11-02

Activity #11-02	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=25)	6	Yes(5)	0	Yes(5)	N/A	N/A
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	13	No(15)	30	Yes(15)	58	Yes(15)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choices (Baseline=0)	15	Yes(15)	26	Yes(15)	53	Yes(15)
Rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$35,201,999)	\$39,232,634	Yes(\$1,500,000)	\$38,337,355	Yes(\$1,500,000)	\$116	Yes(\$0)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #11-02 was implemented in fiscal year 2018 and adopted a standardized policy to allow residents to transfer between various programs in the OHA portfolio (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity allowed the OHA to manage provisions relating to the length of required tenancy, wait list times, and the maximum number of issued vouchers to achieve program goals (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 15: MTW Activity #11-03

Activity #11-03	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	107	No(135)
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	126	No(163)	124	No(163)	107	No(150)
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)	126	No(163)	124	No(163)	107	No(150)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	126	No(163)	124	No(163)	107	No(150)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choices (Baseline=0)	126	No(163)	124	No(163)	72	No(110)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #11-03 developed a “PBV sub-program to award long-term housing assistance to Single Room Occupancy (SRO) and studio apartment developments” (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020, p. # or n.p.). Due to worsening market conditions, the OHA extended assistance to service-enriched housing programs (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The shrinking SRO

housing supply negatively affected hard-to-house populations, and the OHA sought to counteract this with the Building Bridges program in fiscal year 2018 (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The Building Bridges program allowed the OHA to provide subsidies for households with OHA Board approved partners, which allowed for service-enriched housing assistance with qualified owners or property managers (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).



Table 16: MTW Activity #11-05

Activity #11-05	Benchmark Achieved?	No(21)	No(21)	No(21)	No(\$13,000)	N/A	No(10)	Yes(3)
	2015	9	9	9	\$5,089	N/A	9	3
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	No(\$12,740)	Yes(10)	Yes(10)	Yes(3)
	2016	11	11	11	\$9,195	8	8	3
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	No(\$12,740)	Yes(10)	Yes(10)	No(3)
	2017	12	12	12	\$6,644	17	18	1
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	No(\$12,740)	Yes(10)	Yes(10)	Yes(3)
	2018	13	13	13	\$6,037	9	13	4
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	No(\$12,740)	Yes(10)	Yes(10)	Yes(3)	
2019	10	10	10	\$10,587	7	10	7	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	Yes(8)	No(\$12,740)	Yes(8)	Yes(10)	No(3)	
2020	13	13	13	\$9,489	6	13	2	

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #11-05 allowed the development of sub-programs to support transitional housing at developments providing services to low-income special needs households (Oakland Housing

Authority, 2020). Without these sub-programs, these low-income special needs households might not have qualified for housing assistance (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Activity #11-05 used existing relationships with the ACSO to develop sub-programs such as the MOMS and DADS programs (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The PACT program provided transitional service-enriched housing to recipients of both programs, as well as case management, group counseling, and employment development (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). These services were implemented to increase the housing choices of program recipients by allowing them to move to better neighborhoods (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 17: MTW Activity #12-01

Activity #12-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	0	No(0)	0	No(0)	0	No(0)	0	No(0)	0	No(0)	0	No(0)
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	18	No(169)	341	Yes(169)	168	Yes(77)	1,058	Yes(0)	292	Yes(0)	15	Yes(0)
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)	9	No(210)	173	No(210)	0	No(100)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Table 18: MTW Activity #12-01

Activity #12-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	9	No(50)	173	Yes(50)	143	Yes(77)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choices (Baseline=0)	134	Yes(25)	134	Yes(25)	25	Yes(0)	21	Yes(0)	107	Yes(0)	11	Yes(0)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2015; Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #12-01 allowed the OHA to eliminate caps on PBV allocations (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Without this activity, the OHA would have been limited to project-basing 20% of its budget authority and 25% of units in a single development (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Since its implementation, this activity has created an additional 4,051 units and 2,262 vouchers (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 19: MTW Activity #14-01

Activity #14-01										
	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars.(Triennial HCV Reexam Calculation) (Baseline=\$111,940)	\$54,507	Yes(\$57,985)	\$50,285	Yes(\$57,985)	\$50,483	Yes(\$57,985)	\$59,002	No(\$57,985)	\$56,545	Yes(\$57,985)
Total cost of task in dollars.(Triennial Public Housing Reexam Calculation) (Baseline=\$42,000)	\$7,936	Yes(\$21,000)	\$4,155	Yes(\$21,000)	\$9,825	Yes(\$21,000)	\$2,665	Yes(\$21,000)	\$11,430	Yes(\$21,000)
Total cost of task in dollars.(Biennial HCV Reexam Calculation) (Baseline=\$146,300)	\$124,849	No(\$73,150)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total cost of task in dollars. (Triennial HCV Reexam Calculation) (Baseline=\$153,940)	\$187,292	No(\$78,985)	\$54,440	Yes(\$78,985)	\$60,308	Yes(\$78,985)	\$61,667	Yes(\$78,985)	\$67,975	Yes(\$78,985)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours(Triennial HCV Reexam Calculation) (Baseline=2,678)	1,043	Yes(1,475)	1,203	Yes(1,475)	966	Yes(1,475)	1,129	Yes(1,475)	1,082	Yes(1,475)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours(Triennial Public Housing Reexam Calculation) (Baseline=1,680)	160	Yes(840)	101	Yes(840)	188	Yes(840)	51	Yes(840)	381	Yes(840)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours(Biennial HCV Reexam Calculation) (Baseline=1,750)	2,389	No(1,750)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Table 20: MTW Activity #14-01

Activity #14-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours(Public Housing and HCV) (Baseline=4,358)	3,592	No(2,315)	1,304	Yes(2,315)	1,154	Yes(2,315)	1,180	Yes(2,315)	1,463	Yes(2,315)
Rental revenue in dollars(Public Housing and HCV) (Baseline=\$3,863,650)	\$5,445,219	No(\$5,096,518)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$5,096,518	No(\$5,096,518)
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline: PH=\$10,926 HCV=\$14,444)	PH=\$16,365 HCV=\$18,900	Yes(PH=\$12,020 HCV=\$15,888)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=100)	1,542	No(1,500)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #14-01 expanded on changes made by Activity #07-01 to change the recertification schedule for wage-earning households to once every two years (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity did not affect households that reported no income or temporary income, as those households continued to certify annually (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity was used in the Section 8 program as well as public housing program, and was aimed at reducing staff time and associated costs (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Households affected by this policy benefited from income savings, as their rent portions were not recalculated (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Due to system limitations, the OHA chose to

continue to track the triennial families affected by Activity #07-01 (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 21: MTW Activity #15-01

Activity #15-01	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars(local port-out requests) (Baseline=\$49,287)	\$8,590	\$8,449	\$10,282	\$19,011	\$44,851	Yes(\$24,643)	No(\$24,643)
Cost of administering Local Port-outs. (Baseline=\$51,634)	\$8,120	\$6,572	\$6,572	\$2,581	\$10,984	Yes(\$18,776)	Yes(\$38,726)
Total cost of task in dollars. (Baseline=\$100,921)	\$16,710	\$16,854	\$16,854	\$21,592	\$55,835	Yes(\$43,410)	Yes(\$63,370)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours(local port-out requests) (Baseline=1,050)	551	219	219	83	955	No(525)	Yes(525)
Time spent administering Local Port-outs. (Baseline=1,100)	173	434	434	55	234	Yes(825)	Yes(825)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours. (Baseline=2,150)	724	653	653	138	1,189	Yes(1,350)	Yes(1,350)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #15-01 allowed the OHA to limit elective moves to jurisdictions within the 9 Bay Area counties (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity was implemented because an administrative burden was created when many households decided to move their vouchers to

neighboring housing authorities with higher payment standards and no MTW flexibility, called “port out”, meaning leaving with the portability process (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Activity #15-01 allowed the OHA to mitigate the concentration of port out requests and their negative effects (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The activity allowed families to move their vouchers if they require reasonable accommodation, needed to move for education, had long commutes to work, were in a situation covered by the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), were in physical danger, or if the receiving PHA absorbed the voucher (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity was implemented in fiscal year 2016 (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 22: MTW Activity #15-02

Activity #15-02									
Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$10,228,812)	No(\$110,484)	No(\$0)	No(\$10,449,780)	No(0)	N/A	No(\$5,191,848)		
2016	\$10,919,352	\$46,504	\$2,909	\$10,968,765	63	N/A	\$4,658,296		
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,228,812)	Yes(\$110,484)	No(\$0)	Yes(\$10,449,780)	No(0)	N/A	No(\$5,191,848)		
2017	\$9,693,924	\$1,528	\$14	\$9,695,466	0.5	N/A	\$4,846,418		
Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$10,228,812)	Yes(\$110,484)	Yes(\$0)	No(\$10,449,780)	Yes(0)	N/A	No(\$5,191,848)		
2018	\$11,413,332	\$0	\$0	\$11,413,332	0	N/A	\$4,934,562		
Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$10,228,812)	Yes(\$110,484)	Yes(\$0)	No(\$10,449,780)	Yes(0)	Yes(1%)	Yes(\$5,191,848)		
2019	\$12,028,704	\$264	\$2.31	\$12,028,968	0.05	<.0001%	\$5,542,200		
Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$10,228,812)	Yes(\$110,484)	Yes(\$0)	No(\$10,449,780)	Yes(0)	Yes(1%)	No(\$6,565,500)		
2020	\$12,234,576	\$0	\$0	\$12,234,576	0	<.0001%	\$5,445,219		
Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$10,228,812)	Yes(\$110,484)	Yes(\$0)	No(\$10,449,780)	Yes(0)	Yes(1%)	No(\$6,565,500)		
Total cost of task in dollars(Utility Allowance) (Baseline=\$11,188,104)									
Total cost of task in dollars(Utility Reimbursement Payment) (Baseline=\$220,968)									
Total cost of task in dollars(Staff) (Baseline=\$6,699)									
Total cost of task in dollars. (Baseline=\$11,415,771)									
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Utility Reimbursement Payment) (Baseline=145)									
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=5%)									
Total rental revenue/total tenant payment in dollars(HCV) (Baseline=\$4,343,040)									

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2016; Oakland Housing Authority, 2017; Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.



Activity #15-02 modified old policies to streamline utility allowances to be consistent with the household’s occupancy standard, and removed the utility allowance payment (UAP) (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity has allowed for a 100% decrease in the cost of utility allowances covered under Utility Reimbursement Payments (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

Table 23: MTW Activity #17-01

Activity #17-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new landlords where sign on payment was an incentive to enroll in HCV program (Baseline=0)	129	Yes(13)	103	Yes(13)	75	Yes(13)
Total cost of task in dollars. (Baseline=\$14,096)	\$2,233	Yes(\$3,691)	\$2,741	Yes(\$3,691)	\$3,562	Yes(\$3,691)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours. (Baseline=305)	48	Yes(80)	59	Yes(80)	77	Yes(80)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=20%)	15%	Yes(15%)	15%	Yes(15%)	15%	Yes(15%)

Source: Oakland Housing Authority, 2018; Oakland Housing Authority, 2019; Oakland Housing Authority, 2020.

Activity #17-01 implemented an owner incentives program that provided services to retain HCV owners by providing enhanced services to existing owners and high performers (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity was important to the success of the HCV program due to the extremely limited inventory and increasing competitiveness of the housing market (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). In 2015 the OHA identified that many owners chose not to re-lease units, resulting in the loss of 824 affordable housing units (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity aimed to retain these owners and preserve these units that would otherwise be lost

(Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). Activity #17-01 provided vacancy loss payments for up to two months, expedited lease-up processing, recognition programs, incentive payments, and capital improvement payments (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). This activity was implemented in fiscal year 2018 (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020).

## Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB)

Table 24: MTW Activity #4

Activity #4	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$231,482)	No(6,660)	Yes(\$281)	Yes(\$4,734)	N/A	N/A
	2015	\$315,339	9,029	\$312	\$6,984	N/A	N/A
Activity #4	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$231,482)	No(6,660)	Yes(\$281)	Yes(\$4,734)	N/A	N/A
	2016	\$298,065	8,628	\$341	\$6,394	N/A	N/A
Activity #4	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$231,482)	No(6,660)	Yes(\$281)	Yes(\$4,734)	Yes(184)	Yes(105)
	2017	\$481,311	14,089	\$340	\$7,088	1,122	564
Activity #4	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$231,482)	Yes(6,660)	Yes(\$281)	Yes(\$4,734)	No(184)	No(105)
	2018	\$217,971	6,262	\$403	\$7,208	1,189	709
Activity #4	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$231,482)	Yes(6,660)	Yes(\$281)	Yes(\$4,734)	Yes(175)	Yes(175)
	2019	\$153,025	4,316	\$419	\$7,292	1,214	636
Activity #4	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$231,482)	Yes(6,660)	Yes(\$281)	Yes(\$4,734)	Yes(175)	Yes(175)
	2020	\$172,496	4,912	\$428	\$6,694	953	487

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Table 25: MTW Activity #4

Activity #4	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=39)	206	268	328	247	N/A	N/A	N/A
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=9)	39	57	81	58	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unemployed (Baseline=200)	1,293	1,431	6,678	6,713	N/A	5,732	Yes(8,214)
Other (Baseline=22)	152	195	238	155	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=29.8%)	20%	21%	21%	23.5%	25.3%	26.7%	Yes(29.8%)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=57)	53	55	0	42	42	57	Yes(0)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #4 allowed the HACSB to conduct biennial and triennial recertifications instead of annual ones for its MTW and Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) households (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The only triennial inspections conducted were for elderly-only fixed-income families (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity only modified the recertification schedule, and families were

still subjected to interim reporting requirements as well as income and rent calculations (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The goal of this activity was to reduce costs and increase effectiveness in federal expenditures (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 26: MTW Activity #5

Activity #5	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$296,512)	\$38,351	Yes(\$160,117)	\$61,774	Yes(\$160,117)	\$118,235	Yes(\$160,117)	\$49,014	Yes(\$160,117)	\$40,833	Yes(\$160,117)	\$50,692	Yes(\$160,117)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=8,483.4)	1,097	Yes(4,580)	1,767	Yes(4,580)	3,382	Yes(4,580)	1,402	Yes(4,580)	1,168	Yes(4,580)	1,450	Yes(4,580)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=44%)	5%	Yes(44%)	17%	Yes(44%)	0%	Yes(44%)	0%	Yes(44%)	17%	Yes(44%)	41%	Yes(44%)
Average tenant rent share in dollars for households with the Earned Income Disallowance (EID) and/or local income inclusions (Baseline=\$473)	\$804	No(\$720)	\$723	No(\$720)	\$596	Yes(\$720)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #5 allowed the HACSB to simplify income determination for its public housing and HCV programs by modifying policies regarding local verification, elimination of assets, elimination of Earned Income Disallowance (EID), and inclusions or exclusions of certain income sources (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The HACSB modified its verification form to include Upfront Income Verification using HUD’s Enterprise

Income Verification (EIV) tool (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The HACSB also allowed households to submit documents to verify income and source as a weaker form of verification (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Third-party written verification was another even weaker form of verification, followed by third-party oral verification (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Assets were fully excluded from annual income calculations, and the EID was eliminated from the total tenant payment calculation (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The goal of this activity was to increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 27: MTW Activity #7

Activity #7	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$171,933)	\$62,683	No(\$56,217)	\$62,281	No(\$56,217)	\$68,327	No(\$56,217)	\$105,789	No(\$56,217)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=4,918)	1,793	No(1,608)	1,781	No(1,608)	1,954	No(1,608)	3,116	No(1,608)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018.

Activity #7 limited the number of voluntary moves for HCV program participants to 1 move every two years (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The activity required participants to be in good standing with their landlord, but exceptions were made for cases related to domestic violence, reasonable accommodation, and self-sufficiency (Housing

Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity was closed out in fiscal year 2019 (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 28: MTW Activity #8

Activity #8	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$70,060)	\$12,201	Yes(\$35,029)	\$9,183	Yes(\$35,029)	\$21,936	Yes(\$35,029)	\$15,503	Yes(\$35,029)	\$24,900	Yes(\$35,029)	\$22,287	Yes(\$35,029)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=2,004)	349	Yes(1,002)	262.68	Yes(1,002)	627.46	Yes(1,002)	443.45	Yes(1,002)	712.25	Yes(1,002)	637.5	Yes(1,002)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #8 allowed the HACSB to apply ongoing MTW activity requirements to inbound portability participants to increase staff time savings (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 29: MTW Activity #9

Activity #9	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Benchmark=\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Benchmark=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017.

Activity #9 allowed the HACSB to eliminate the EID calculation from the total tenant payment calculation in its Public Housing and HCV programs (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017). This activity was closed out in fiscal year 2018, as its modifications were combined with Activity #5 (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018).



Table 30: MTW Activity #10

Activity #10	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average tenant rent share in dollars for minimum rent households (Baseline=\$33)	\$168	Yes(\$73)	\$163	Yes(\$73)	\$155	Yes(\$73)	\$140	Yes(\$73)	\$159	Yes(\$73)	\$149	Yes(\$73)
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$718)	\$1,091	Yes(\$774)	\$996	Yes(\$774)	\$1,342	Yes(\$774)	\$775	No(\$5,000)	\$631	No(\$5,000)	\$915	No(\$5,000)
Percentage of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=10.5%)	22%	Yes(50%)	27.3%	Yes(50%)	31.4%	Yes(50%)	52.3%	No(50%)	54.4%	No(50%)	36.4%	Yes(50%)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #10 allowed the HACSB to increase the minimum rent from \$50 to \$125 per month for all households participating in its MTW programs (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). In addition, the benchmark for the average earned income of households was revised in fiscal year 2018 due to being unrealistic, as the maximum total household income for the affected households was \$5,000 (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 31: MTW Activity #11

Activity #11	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$3,438.60)	\$687.72	Yes(\$1,719.3)	\$687.72	Yes(\$1,719.3)	\$687.72	Yes(\$1,719.3)	\$687.72	Yes(\$1,719.3)	\$687.72	Yes(\$1,719.3)	\$687.72	Yes(\$1,719.3)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=60 hours per contract)	12	Yes(30 hours per contract)	12	Yes(30 hours per contract)	12	Yes(30 hours per contract)	12	Yes(30 hours per contract)	12	Yes(30 hours per contract)	12	Yes(30 hours per contract)
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	1,200	Yes(0)	1,161	Yes(0)	1,180	Yes(0)	1,059	Yes(0)	942	Yes(0)	N/A	N/A
Number of units added to the HACSB portfolio as a result of this activity (Baseline=349)	2,889	Yes(1,856)	2,975	Yes(1,856)	1,441	No(1,856)	1,458	No(1,856)	1,336	No(1,856)	1,115	No(1,856)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #11 allowed for flexibilities in the HACSB’s Local PBV program to increase the stock of housing units (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity implemented a local PBV HAP contract that modified the conditions of the HAP contract and removed limitations on the percentage of units that could be project-based by the HACSB (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The activity also allowed more flexibility in applying occupancy standards for PBV developments, which could be used at the HACSB’s discretion, based on the needs of certain developments (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 32: MTW Activity #12

Activity #12	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$15,754.70)	\$12,190	Yes(\$15,754.70)	\$12,793	Yes(\$15,754.70)	\$44,944	No(\$15,754.70)	\$8,105	Yes(\$15,754.70)	\$8,439	Yes(\$15,754.70)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=470.43)	364	Yes(470.43)	382	Yes(470.43)	1,342	No(470.43)	242	Yes(470.43)	252	Yes(470.43)
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=995)	2,267	Yes(308)	2,109	Yes(308)	1,445	Yes(308)	718	Yes(308)	845	Yes(308)
Average HAP cost for MTW units (Baseline=\$535.87)	\$835	No(\$535.87)	\$796	No(\$535.87)	\$707.19	No(\$535.87)	\$600.63	No(\$535.87)	\$583.22	No(\$535.87)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #12 allowed the HACSB to conduct market assessments to create Local Payment Standards for its submarkets, replacing HUD’s Fair Market Rents (FMR) (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity aimed to reflect the local rental market more accurately. The Local Payment Standards were reviewed annually, and maximum flat rent was reassessed when payment standards increased or decreased by more than 10% (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This policy was applied to VASH households effective January 1, 2021 (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 33: MTW Activity #13

Activity #13	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2020
Total cost of task in dollars (Benchmark=\$579,392)	Yes(\$579,392)	\$355,887	Yes(\$579,392)	\$427,405	Yes(\$579,392)	\$501,811	Yes(\$579,392)	\$515,402	Yes(\$579,392)	\$422,322	Yes(\$579,392)	\$388,066
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Benchmark=12,282)	Yes(12,282)	1,309	Yes(12,282)	1,542	Yes(12,282)	1,182	Yes(12,282)	1,674	Yes(12,282)	265	Yes(12,282)	27
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=19%)	N/A	N/A	Yes(19%)	3.7%	Yes(19%)	0%	Yes(19%)	1.3%	Yes(19%)	1.3%	Yes(19%)	2.4%

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #13 allowed the development and implementation of local inspection standards for the HCV program to increase efficiency (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity eliminated the previous property rating system and implemented biennial inspections for HCV units (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The HCV inspections were also outsourced in 2013 to achieve additional staff time and cost savings (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Most inspections for fiscal year 2020 were delayed by one year to comply with social distancing guidelines from state and local authorities due to COVID-19 (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 34: MTW Activity #15

Activity #15	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of Maplewood Homes Pilot Work Requirement households in dollars (Baseline=\$12,934)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$14,838	Yes(\$13,349)	\$15,414	Yes(\$13,349)
Average earned income of port-in households (Baseline=\$1,513)	\$20,777	Yes(\$1,589)	\$17,341	Yes(\$1,589)	\$14,428	Yes(\$1,589)	\$4,032	Yes(\$1,589)
Number of Maplewood Homes households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=66)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	126	No(59)	99	No(59)
Percentage of port-in households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=16.7%)	17%	Yes(25%)	13%	Yes(25%)	18%	Yes(25%)	17.9%	Yes(25%)
Percentage of Maplewood Homes households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=26 households)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	Yes(100%)	100%	Yes(100%)
Number of port-in households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018.

Table 35: MTW Activity #15

Activity #15	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed full-time (Baseline=17)	13	Yes(10)	15	Yes(10)	29	Yes(10)	27	Yes(10)
Employed part-time (Baseline=44)	7	No(10)	14	Yes(10)	76	Yes(10)	78	Yes(10)
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=2)	1	Yes(1)	2	Yes(1)	7	Yes(1)	8	Yes(1)
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	13	Yes(0)	11	Yes(0)
Unemployed (Baseline=198)	41	Yes(10)	3	Yes(10)	128	Yes(10)	196	Yes(10)
Other (Baseline=14)	1	Yes(1)	2	Yes(1)	9	No(1)	9	No(1)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018.

Table 36: MTW Activity #15

Activity #15	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$726.25)	\$816	No(\$617.13)	\$811	No(\$617.13)	\$816	No(\$617.13)	\$645.93	No(\$617.13)
PHA rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$194)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$237	Yes(\$206)	\$210	Yes(\$202)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	No(8)	5	No(8)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018.

Activity #15 implemented a work requirement for the Maplewood Homes Public Housing community and all inbound portability (port-in) participants (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Families interested in portability had to have been employed at least 15 hours per week, as this encouraged educated decisions regarding portability (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity was closed out in fiscal year 2019 to reduce administrative burdens, streamline processes, and increase housing choices for families interested in portability (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 37: MTW Activity #17

Activity #17	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Average tenant rent share in dollars for households with local income inclusions (Baseline=\$473)	\$530	Yes(less than \$720)	\$534	Yes(less than \$720)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017.

Activity #17 modified tenants' rent calculation to include foster care income, Sanctioned Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) income, and adoption assistance payment income (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017). Earned income of full-time , other than the head of household (HoH) or spouse, was fully excluded from rent calculations (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017). This activity was modified in 2015 and merged with Activity #5 in fiscal year 2019 (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).



Table 38: MTW Activity #18

Activity #18	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost for arbitration services (Baseline=\$6,550)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Average contract vacancy turnaround expenses per unit (Baseline=\$14)	\$35.35	Yes(\$45)	\$36.74	No(\$11)	\$25.35	No(\$11)	\$8.77	Yes(\$11)	\$7.69	Yes(\$11)	\$10.61	Yes(\$11)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours per hearing (Baseline=5.4)	0	Yes(2.7)	2	Yes(2.7)	2	Yes(2.7)	0	Yes(2.7)	2	Yes(2.7)	2	Yes(2.7)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #18 allowed the development of a property management innovation program that operated similarly to counterparts in the private sector (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity aimed to decrease management costs and increase housing unit quality. Some of the changes were increases in fees, holding deposit implementation, and streamlining the grievance process (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 39: MTW Activity #19

Activity #19	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$8,000)	Yes(\$702)	Yes(50%)	No(125)
	2015	\$11,552	\$1,677	37.8%	66
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$8,000)	Yes(\$702)	Yes(50%)	No(125)
	2016	\$13,942	\$1,812	25.8%	39
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$8,000)	Yes(\$702)	Yes(50%)	No(125)
	2017	\$16,157	\$4,012	21%	60
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$8,000)	Yes(\$702)	Yes(50%)	No(125)
	2018	\$14,365	\$5,440	25%	51
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$8,000)	Yes(\$702)	Yes(50%)	No(125)
	2019	\$19,189	\$6,516	18%	22
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$8,000)	Yes(\$702)	Yes(50%)	N/A
	2020	\$22,113	\$2,755	50%	N/A

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Table 40: MTW Activity #19

Activity #19	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$968	No(\$579)	\$855	No(\$579)	\$752	No(\$579)	\$424	Yes(\$579)	\$344	Yes(\$579)	\$365	Yes(\$579)
PHA rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$607	Yes(\$443)	\$465	Yes(\$443)	\$353	No(\$443)	\$283	No(\$443)	\$313	No(\$443)	\$291	No(\$443)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	0	No(1)	1	Yes(1)	2	Yes(1)	0	No(1)	0	No(1)	0	No(1)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #19 allowed program participants to receive the balance of their escrow savings account at the end of their contract in the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program if they voluntarily terminated assistance and exited to self-sufficiency (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity also allowed participants to withdraw a portion of their savings during participation in the program to promote self-sufficiency (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 41: MTW Activity #20

Activity #20																			
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$17,662)	Yes(271)	Yes(172)	Yes(100)	No(50)	Yes(270)	No(54)											
	2015	\$15,554	478	372	199	32	487	48											
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$17,662)	Yes(271)	Yes(172)	Yes(100)	No(50)	Yes(270)	Yes(54)											
	2016	\$16,017	531	220	130	38	291	454											
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$17,662)	Yes(271)	Yes(172)	Yes(100)	No(50)	Yes(270)	Yes(54)											
	2017	\$19,512	475	194	111	39	240	358											
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$21,317)	No(271)	No(172)	No(100)	No(50)	Yes(270)	Yes(54)											
	2018	\$20,395	205	97	60	29	111	168											
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$21,317)	Yes(271)	No(172)	No(100)	No(50)	Yes(270)	Yes(54)											
	2019	\$16,316	342	138	49	19	174	296											
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$21,317)	No(271)	No(172)	No(100)	No(50)	Yes(270)	No(54)											
	2020	\$12,975	206	60	46	12	162	28											
		Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$12,181)																	
			Employed full-time (Baseline=219)	Employed part-time (Baseline=164)	Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=43)	Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=30)	Unemployed (Baseline=329)	Other (Baseline=0)											

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Table 42: MTW Activity #20

Activity #20	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Percentage of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=N/A)	35%	Yes(50%)	29.9%	Yes(50%)	26.5%	Yes(50%)	30%	Yes(50%)	35.5%	Yes(50%)	36.6%	Yes(50%)
Percentage of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=N/A)	N/A	N/A	100%	Yes(100%)	100%	Yes(100%)	100%	Yes(100%)	100%	Yes(100%)	100%	Yes(100%)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	628	Yes(174)	499	Yes(174)	422	Yes(174)	205	Yes(174)	42	No(174)	6	No(174)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #20 provided housing assistance and supportive services to new HCV program participants, households porting in from another jurisdiction, and households moving from PBV sites through the Term-Limited Assistance program (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Services were provided for up to 7 years with an extension, and allowed participants to focus on self-sufficiency (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 43: MTW Activity #22

Activity #22	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$158,872)	No(4,449)	Yes(11%)	Yes(\$4,454)	Yes(2,377)	Yes(\$574)	Yes(\$270)	Yes(0)
	2015	\$315,339	9,029	6%	\$5,884	1,003	\$574	\$323	11
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$158,872)	No(4,449)	Yes(11%)	Yes(\$4,454)	Yes(2,377)	Yes(\$595)	Yes(\$270)	Yes(0)
	2016	\$298,065	8,628	7%	\$4,912	2,173	\$595	\$322	29
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$158,872)	No(4,449)	Yes(11%)	Yes(\$4,454)	Yes(2,377)	Yes(\$728)	Yes(\$270)	Yes(0)
	2017	\$253,393	7,418	8.7%	\$5,554	1,883	\$728	\$315	15
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$158,872)	No(4,449)	Yes(11%)	Yes(\$4,454)	Yes(2,377)	No(\$706)	Yes(\$270)	Yes(0)
	2018	\$210,765	6,055	3%	\$6,217	1,702	\$721	\$392	60
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$158,872)	Yes(4,449)	Yes(11%)	Yes(\$4,454)	Yes(2,377)	No(\$685)	Yes(\$270)	Yes(0)
	2019	\$140,064	3,949	3.59%	\$5,995	1,718	\$786	\$403	32
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$158,872)	Yes(4,449)	Yes(11%)	Yes(\$4,454)	Yes(2,377)	No(\$664)	Yes(\$270)	Yes(0)
	2020	\$145,831	4,151	3.45%	\$5,894	1,608	\$804	\$420	29
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$176,524)									
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=4,943)									
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=11%)									
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$4,454)									
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=2,377)									
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$575)									
PHA rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$270)									
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=37)									

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Table 44: MTW Activity #22

Activity #22	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed full-time (Baseline=76)	815	Yes(103)	791	Yes(103)	980	Yes(103)	714	Yes(103)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Employed part-time (Baseline=58)	430	Yes(58)	424	Yes(58)	615	Yes(58)	423	Yes(58)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=27)	177	Yes(27)	174	Yes(27)	269	Yes(27)	178	Yes(27)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=5)	30	Yes(5)	35	Yes(5)	64	Yes(5)	38	Yes(5)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unemployed (Baseline=7,103)	1,204	Yes(6,738)	1,073	Yes(6,738)	6,258	Yes(6,738)	5,833	Yes(6,738)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other (Baseline=13)	132	Yes(54)	136	Yes(54)	201	Yes(54)	109	Yes(54)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #22 implemented a streamlined lease assistance program for households participating in the public housing and HCV programs (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Activity #22 provided fixed assistance for the elderly or disabled and tiered assistance for career-able households (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino,

2020). The activity also implemented limitations on unit size, subsidy, and rent increase (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 45: MTW Activity #23

Activity #23	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$80,750	Yes(\$35,000)	\$80,750	Yes(\$35,000)	\$80,750	Yes(\$35,000)	\$77,430	Yes(\$35,000)	\$74,081	Yes(\$35,000)	\$35,483	Yes(\$35,000)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Average applicant time on waitlist in days (Baseline=58.85)	91.59	Yes(N/A)	90	Yes(N/A)	83	Yes(N/A)	54	Yes(N/A)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (Baseline=0)	35	Yes(5)	31	Yes(5)	31	Yes(5)	18	Yes(5)	21	Yes(5)	6	Yes(5)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #23 implemented the No Child Left Unsheltered program, which assisted unsheltered families with children in the county by providing HCV assistance to eligible families identified through partnerships (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The activity also provided families with services, such as school connections, job training, and emergency relief (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).



Table 46: MTW Activity #24

Activity #24	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	56	Yes(4)	128	Yes(4)	141	Yes(4)	33	Yes(4)	3	No(4)	39	Yes(4)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #24 implemented a policy to transition households with an annual income over the 80% income limit (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This policy applied to households in the public housing and HCV programs, and was implemented to create more housing opportunities for families on the waiting lists (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Families identified as having over-income were given a 6-month transition period before receiving no housing assistance (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity did not apply to the elderly, disabled, or families with a hardship exemption (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

Table 47: MTW Activity #25

Activity #25	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	49	Yes(49)	49	Yes(49)	49	Yes(49)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020.

Activity #25 amended the definition of elderly for PBV and allowed for PBV flexibility at the Horizons at Yucaipa Affordable Senior Housing development (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The flexibility was needed to meet the City of Yucaipa’s affordable senior housing requirements (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020).

## San Diego Housing Commission (SDHC)

Table 48: MTW Activity 2010-1

Activity 2010-1	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$544,779)	\$331,911	\$382,941	\$350,028	\$352,080	\$367,794	\$443,961
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=15,133)	9,220	10,637	9,723	9,780	10,217	12,332
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=11%)	0%	0.3%	0.9%	0.6%	1.3%	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2010-1 implemented a Biennial Inspection Cycle and allowed owners to self-certify Housing Quality Standards (HQS) for failed inspections in the minor category (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Self-certification aimed at staff time savings by reducing the number of secondary inspections (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 49: MTW Activity 2010-2

Activity 2010-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$128,716)	\$19,527	Yes(\$105,731)	\$24,794	Yes(\$105,731)	\$21,275	Yes(\$105,731)	\$17,325	Yes(\$105,731)	\$19,031	Yes(\$105,731)	\$32,293	Yes(\$105,731)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	N/A	N/A
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=14%)	1%	Yes(1%)	0%	Yes(1%)	1%	Yes(1%)	2%	Yes(1%)	2%	Yes(1%)	N/A	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2010-2 authorized the SDHC to inspect and determine rent reasonableness for properties owned by the SDHC (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The SDHC aimed to reduce costs and increase cost-effectiveness by performing these tasks in-house.

Table 50: MTW Activity 2010-3

Activity 2010-3	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$295,000)	\$158,090	Yes(\$213,660)	\$158,090	Yes(\$213,660)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=9,500)	5,072	Yes(6,850)	5,072	Yes(6,850)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016.

Activity 2010-3 implemented a Triennial Reexamination Cycle for elderly or disabled households (San Diego Housing Commission, 2015). The SDHC closed out this activity in fiscal year 2016 due to difficulties managing both a biennial and triennial reexamination schedule (San Diego Housing Commission, 2016).

Table 51: MTW Activity 2010-4

Activity 2010-4	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=33)	561	Yes(300)	507	Yes(300)	434	Yes(300)	338	Yes(300)	290	No(300)	264	No(500)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (Baseline=0)	1,047	Yes(750)	2,915	Yes(750)	2,213	Yes(750)	1,793	Yes(750)	1,430	Yes(750)	1,211	Yes(750)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2010-4 provided incentives and assistance to MTW program participants who aspired to move to areas of opportunity via the Choice Communities initiative (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Through this initiative, the SDHC implemented a security deposit

loan program, a robust mobility counseling program, and increased payment standards in opportunity zip codes (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 52: MTW Activity 2010-5

Activity 2010-5	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$31,710)	\$4,311	Yes(\$6,330)	\$4,138	Yes(\$6,330)	\$4,082	Yes(\$6,330)	\$4,193	Yes(\$6,330)	\$4,060	Yes(\$6,330)	\$2,808	Yes(\$6,330)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=1,057)	144	Yes(211)	138	Yes(211)	136	Yes(211)	140	Yes(211)	135	Yes(211)	94	Yes(211)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=11%)	3%	Yes(6%)	2%	Yes(6%)	1%	Yes(6%)	2%	Yes(6%)	2%	Yes(6%)	3%	Yes(6%)
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$62,464,332)	\$84,918,660	Yes(\$68,710,765)	\$79,691,076	Yes(\$68,710,765)	\$74,582,832	Yes(\$68,710,765)	\$27,517	Yes(\$10,000)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	N/A	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2010-5 authorized a simplified utility allowance structure to reduce the administrative costs related to applying for correct utility allowances during the rent calculation process (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Under this activity, the utility allowance amount was based on whether the family was responsible for water utilities (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 53: MTW Activity 2010-6

Activity 2010-6	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$17,040)	\$1,034	Yes(\$3,345)	\$1,058	Yes(\$3,345)	\$1,130	Yes(\$3,345)	\$1,048	Yes(\$3,345)	\$1,159	Yes(\$3,345)	\$1,248	Yes(\$3,345)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Benchmark=568)	34	Yes(112)	35	Yes(112)	38	Yes(112)	35	Yes(112)	39	Yes(112)	42	Yes(112)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=13%)	0%	Yes(7%)	0%	Yes(7%)	0%	Yes(7%)	N/A	N/A	0%	Yes(7%)	1%	Yes(7%)
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$62,464,332)	\$84,918,660	Yes(\$68,710,765)	\$79,691,076	Yes(\$68,710,765)	\$74,582,832	Yes(\$68,710,765)	\$15,992	Yes(\$5,000)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	N/A	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2010-6 simplified the income and asset verification systems by allowing program participants to self-certify the value of their assets and restructuring the verification hierarchy (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The SDHC was also not required to issue third-party verifications to verify household income and the goal was to save time and costs associated with verifying assets (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 54: MTW Activity 2010-7

Activity 2010-7	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$20,160)	No(672)	N/A	No(\$22,914)	N/A	N/A
	2015	\$20,233	674	N/A	\$20,958	N/A	N/A
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,160)	Yes(672)	N/A	No(\$22,914)	Yes(1700)	Yes(100)
	2016	\$19,907	664	N/A	\$22,193	1,438	378
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,160)	Yes(672)	N/A	Yes(\$22,914)	Yes(1700)	Yes(100)
	2017	\$16,803	560	N/A	\$23,425	1,258	482
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,160)	Yes(672)	Yes(\$68,710,765)	Yes(\$22,914)	Yes(1700)	Yes(100)
	2018	\$14,404	480	\$74,582,832	\$25,062	1,071	611
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,160)	Yes(672)	Yes(\$68,710,765)	Yes(\$22,914)	Yes(1700)	Yes(100)
	2019	\$14,244	475	\$79,691,076	\$23,269	1,014	622
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,160)	Yes(672)	Yes(\$68,710,765)	Yes(\$22,914)	Yes(1700)	Yes(100)
	2020	\$9,062	302	\$84,918,660	\$27,335	1,018	874

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.



Table 55: MTW Activity 2010-7

Activity 2010-7	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed Full-Time (Baseline=50)	105	Yes(63)	54	No(63)	42	No(63)	44	No(63)	112	Yes(63)	N/A	N/A
Employed Part-Time (Baseline=29)	53	Yes(36)	66	Yes(36)	50	Yes(36)	55	Yes(36)	102	Yes(36)	N/A	N/A
Enrolled in an Educational Program (Baseline=16)	19	No(20)	41	Yes(20)	2	No(20)	10	No(20)	4	No(20)	N/A	N/A
Enrolled in Job Training Program (Baseline=32)	15	No(40)	64	Yes(40)	6	No(40)	24	No(40)	20	No(40)	N/A	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2010-7 implemented a local interim certification policy that encouraged non-elderly and non-disabled households to maintain current sources of income to promote self-sufficiency (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The local policy aimed to decrease the number of interim income reexaminations and associated costs (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 56: MTW Activity 2010-9

Activity 2010-9	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$28,400)	\$12,883	Yes(\$23,570)	\$12,883	Yes(\$23,570)	\$12,883	Yes(\$23,570)	\$12,883	Yes(\$23,570)	\$12,883	Yes(\$23,570)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=947)	429	Yes(786)	429	Yes(786)	429	Yes(786)	429	Yes(786)	429	Yes(786)
Number of homeless households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	88	Yes(88)	88	Yes(88)	88	Yes(88)	88	Yes(88)	88	Yes(88)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2010-9 expanded the PBV program by creating long-term subsidies, increasing the range of options available to low-income households, increasing the permissible percentage of subsidized units in a single development, and creating project-specific waiting lists (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Expansion of the PBV program allowed SDHC to allocate more vouchers to provide housing to homeless and low-income households (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 57: MTW Activity 2011-1

Activity 2011-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$97,350 )	\$0	Yes(\$89,562)	\$0	Yes(\$89,562)	\$0	Yes(\$89,562)	\$0	Yes(\$89,562)	\$82,470	Yes(\$89,562)	N/A	N/A
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=3,245)	0	Yes(2,985)	0	Yes(2,985)	0	Yes(2,985)	0	Yes(2,985)	2,749	Yes(2,985)	N/A	N/A
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=1%)	0%	Yes(0.75%)	0%	Yes(0.75%)	0%	Yes(0.75%)	0%	Yes(0.75%)	1.5%	Yes(0.75%)	N/A	N/A
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	310	Yes(39)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2011-1 implemented a revised rent reasonableness protocol for assisted units in developments owned by the SDHC (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The flexibility was used to allow lower rents in unassisted units to ensure that tenants in affordable developments owned by the SDHC were given a transition period before increased rents (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 58: MTW Activity 2011-2

Activity 2011-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$2,272)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	N/A	N/A
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=56)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	N/A	N/A
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=19)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	247	Yes(69)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2011-2 authorized the SDHC to commit PBVs to properties it owned without a competitive process or HUD approval (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity also used waivers that allowed the SDHC to conduct HQS inspections and rent reasonableness determinations for properties owned by the SDHC (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 59: MTW Activity 2011-3

Activity 2011-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
	Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$24,960)	\$30,738	No(\$12,480)	\$24,852	No(\$12,480)	\$19,947	No(\$12,480)	\$21,582	No(\$12,480)	\$8,937	Yes(\$12,480)	\$12,207
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=832)	1,025	No(416)	828	No(416)	665	No(416)	719	No(416)	298	Yes(416)	407	Yes(416)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2011-3 increased the minimum occupancy requirement in project-based developments to 2 years before households could be eligible for tenant-based vouchers (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity aimed to maintain vacancy rates so that they did not exceed a level that would compromise the property’s sustainability (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 60: MTW Activity 2011-4

Activity 2011-4	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	284	Yes(200)	284	Yes(200)	284	Yes(200)	877	Yes(200)	192	No(200)	192	No(200)
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=131)	1,606	Yes(131)	1,618	Yes(131)	1,606	Yes(131)	192	No(131)	210	Yes(131)	131	Yes(131)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2011-4 allowed the use of MTW funds to create affordable housing in San Diego through the acquisition of land or existing developments, rehabilitation, gap financing, and funding pre-development activities (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity created or preserved 1,902 affordable housing units since implementation (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 61: MTW Activity 2011-5

Activity 2011-5	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$8,730)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=291)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016.

Activity 2011-5 authorized the SDHC to disregard retirement accounts when calculating a participant’s income from assets (San Diego Housing Commission, 2016). This activity was closed out in fiscal year 2017 because Activity 2010-5 rendered it unnecessary (San Diego Housing Commission, 2017).

Table 62: MTW Activity 2011-6

Activity 2011-6	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,750)	Yes(1,025)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2015	\$545	18	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,750)	Yes(1,025)	Yes(1.5%)	N/A	Yes(\$0)
	2016	\$693	23	1.1%	N/A	\$0
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,750)	Yes(1,025)	Yes(1.5%)	N/A	Yes(\$10,000)
	2017	\$574	19	0.6%	N/A	\$60,926
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,750)	Yes(1,025)	Yes(1.5%)	Yes(\$68,710,765)	N/A
	2018	\$495	17	2.1%	\$74,582,832	N/A
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,750)	Yes(1,025)	No(1.5%)	Yes(\$68,710,765)	N/A
	2019	\$337	11	3%	\$79,691,076	N/A
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,750)	Yes(1,025)	No(1.5%)	Yes(\$68,710,765)	N/A
	2020	\$436	15	4.8%	\$84,918,660	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2011-6 made the EIV income report a required component in the certification process (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The EIV income report was used when



processing reexaminations of income or household composition for biennial and triennial cycles, with an exemption for interim certification (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 63: MTW Activity 2011-7

Activity 2011-7	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$7,520,525	Yes(\$250,000)	\$7,520,525	Yes(\$250,000)	\$7,520,525	Yes(\$250,000)	\$422,267	Yes(\$250,000)	\$2,995,267	Yes(\$250,000)	N/A	N/A
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	75	Yes(75)	75	Yes(75)	75	Yes(75)	75	Yes(75)	75	Yes(75)	152	Yes(75)
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)	112	Yes(112)	112	Yes(112)	112	Yes(112)	112	Yes(112)	77	No(112)	N/A	N/A
Average applicant time on waitlist in months (Baseline=108)	72	Yes(96)	72	Yes(96)	72	Yes(96)	72	Yes(96)	108	No(96)	N/A	N/A
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=112)	0	Yes(10)	0	Yes(10)	0	Yes(10)	0	Yes(10)	0	Yes(10)	N/A	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2011-7 allowed the SDHC to increase affordable availability by developing additional public housing units without the use of a competitive process (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). In addition, this activity allowed the SDHC to use rehabilitation and acquisition to manage its housing portfolio (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 64: MTW Activity 2011-8

Activity 2011-8	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$4,249,055	Yes(\$2,000,000)	\$5,946,694	Yes(\$2,000,000)	\$4,136,268	Yes(\$2,000,000)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$13,329)	\$18,793	Yes(\$13,995)	\$14,753	Yes(\$13,995)	\$17,063	Yes(\$13,995)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=7)	15	No(5)	11	No(5)	12	No(5)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	596	Yes(500)	552	Yes(500)	445	No(500)	495	No(1,000)	411	No(1,000)	230	No(1,000)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Table 65: MTW Activity 2011-8

Activity 2011-8	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$633)	\$881	No(\$627)	\$793	No(\$627)	\$714	No(\$627)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$1,100,700)	\$1,794,024	Yes(\$1,210,770)	\$1,487,388	Yes(\$1,210,770)	\$1,480,368	Yes(\$1,210,770)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	7	Yes(5)	10	Yes(5)	1	No(5)	14	Yes(5)	0	No(5)	0	No(5)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	326	Yes(2)	268	Yes(2)	279	Yes(2)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$140,100)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$11,138	Yes(\$22,500)	\$9,248	Yes(\$22,500)	\$5,175	Yes(\$22,500)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=4,670)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	371	Yes(750)	308	Yes(750)	173	Yes(750)
Number of new housing units made available for homeless households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	860	No(1,000)	460	No(1,000)	401	No(1,000)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Table 66: MTW Activity 2011-8

Activity 2011-8	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed full-time (Baseline=3)	3	No(4)	8	Yes(4)	5	Yes(4)
Employed part-time (Baseline=12)	15	Yes(15)	20	Yes(15)	10	No(15)
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=0)	22	Yes(2)	3	Yes(2)	1	No(2)
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=0)	0	No(2)	1	No(2)	7	Yes(2)
Unemployed (Baseline=301)	561	No(293)	462	No(293)	468	No(293)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2011-8 used MTW flexibility to combine supportive services with permanent housing by partnering with sponsor agencies through the Sponsor-Based Subsidy Program (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Through this activity, the SDHC provided subsidies to house the homeless and sponsor organizations provided supportive services (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 67: MTW Activity 2012-1

Activity 2012-1	Benchmark Achieved?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes(\$20,445)	Yes(\$938)
	2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$20,958	\$934
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$370,740)	Yes(12,136)	Yes(15%)	N/A	Yes(\$20,445)	Yes(\$938)
	2016	\$257,783	8,593	3%	N/A	\$22,193	\$865
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$370,740)	Yes(12,136)	Yes(15%)	N/A	Yes(\$20,445)	Yes(\$938)
	2017	\$283,014	9,434	4%	\$197,595	\$23,425	\$855
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$370,740)	Yes(12,136)	Yes(15%)	No(\$52,097,047)	Yes(\$20,445)	Yes(\$938)
2018	\$275,522	9,184	4%	\$44,629,104	\$25,062	\$860	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$370,740)	Yes(12,136)	Yes(15%)	No(\$52,097,047)	Yes(\$20,445)	Yes(\$938)	
2019	\$279,288	9,310	6%	\$46,812,444	\$23,269	\$899	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$370,740)	Yes(12,136)	Yes(15%)	No(\$52,097,047)	Yes(\$20,445)	Yes(\$938)	
2020	\$265,235	8,841	5%	\$49,809,504	\$25,264	\$860	

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Table 68: MTW Activity 2012-1

Activity 2012-1	Benchmark Achieved?	No(120)	N/A	Yes(\$2,000,000)	Yes(10)
	2015	4	N/A	\$2,688,444	31
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	Benchmark Achieved?	No(120)	Yes(\$0)	N/A	N/A
	2016	24	\$0	N/A	N/A
Rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	Benchmark Achieved?	No(120)	Yes(\$6,134)	N/A	N/A
	2017	25	\$197,595	N/A	N/A
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(120)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2018	33	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	Benchmark Achieved?	No(120)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2019	42	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(120)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2020	46	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Table 69: MTW Activity 2012-1

Activity 2012-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed full-time (Baseline=50)	105	Yes(63)	54	No(63)	42	No(63)	44	No(63)	112	Yes(63)
Employed part-time (Baseline=29)	53	Yes(36)	66	Yes(36)	50	Yes(36)	55	Yes(36)	102	Yes(36)
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=16)	19	No(20)	41	Yes(20)	2	No(20)	10	No(20)	4	No(20)
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=32)	15	No(40)	64	Yes(40)	6	No(40)	24	No(40)	20	No(40)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2012-1 implemented a tiered rent structure for work-able families via the Path to Success program (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This program also limited the portability of HCV program participants who can work (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 70: MTW Activity 2012-2

Activity 2012-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$961,218)	\$656,210	No(\$637,773)	\$690,979	No(\$637,773)	\$681,661	No(\$479,176)	\$700,198	No(\$479,176)	\$637,773	Yes(\$479,176)	\$330,860	Yes(\$479,176)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=31,465)	21,481	No(20,877)	22,619	No(20,877)	22,314	No(20,877)	22,921	No(20,877)	20,877	Yes(20,877)	10,831	Yes(20,877)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	N/A	N/A

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2012-2 implemented a biennial reexamination schedule for work-able households, PBVs, and sponsor-based subsidies (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the SDHC modified this activity in fiscal year 2020 to give families the ability to self-certify that they had no changes in income or household composition, which was used in place of the biennial reexamination (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The SDHC also modified the threshold for unreported income reconciliation and extended the validity of a household’s recertification by up to one year (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).



Table 71: MTW Activity 2012-3

Activity 2012-3												
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,613)	Yes(354)	Yes(\$20,804)								
	2015	\$9,045	302	\$22,084								
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,613)	Yes(354)	Yes(\$20,804)								
	2016	\$9,435	315	\$20,834								
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,613)	Yes(354)	Yes(\$20,804)								
	2017	\$2,385	80	\$21,955								
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,613)	Yes(354)	Yes(\$20,804)								
	2018	\$8,798	293	\$25,324								
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,613)	Yes(354)	Yes(\$20,804)								
	2019	\$8,228	274	\$31,961								
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,613)	Yes(354)	Yes(\$20,804)								
	2020	\$8,603	287	\$28,240								
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$10,613)	Yes(354)	Yes(\$20,804)								
	Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$11,325)											
	Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=378)											
	Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$18,913)											

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2012-3 modified the definition of a full-time student to encourage self-sufficiency for program participants. The new definition included adult family members ages 18 to 23 (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity also excluded financial aid from income calculations for any student (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity aimed to incentivize households to complete post-secondary education to enter the workforce with more skills (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 72: MTW Activity 2013-1

Activity 2013-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$16,693)	\$19,682	Yes(\$18,362)	\$19,241	Yes(\$18,362)	\$19,170	Yes(\$18,362)	\$17,839	No(\$18,362)	\$15,995	No(\$18,362)	\$15,836	No(\$18,362)
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$707)	\$935	No(\$642)	\$906	No(\$642)	\$883	No(\$642)	\$817	No(\$642)	\$728	No(\$642)	\$731	No(\$642)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2013-1 implemented the VASH voucher program that reduced criminal history requirements, reduced minimum rent, excluded garnishments from income calculations, and included participants in the biennial inspection cycle (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 73: MTW Activity 2013-2

Activity 2013-2	Benchmark Achieved?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes(\$8,714)	Yes(\$400)	No(0)
	2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$12,090	\$1,981	10
Activity 2013-2	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$5,220)	Yes(200)	Yes(5%)	N/A	Yes(\$8,714)	Yes(\$400)	No(0)
	2016	\$3,245	125	2.5%	N/A	\$26,028	\$2,703	8
Activity 2013-2	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$5,220)	Yes(200)	Yes(5%)	N/A	Yes(\$8,714)	Yes(\$400)	No(0)
	2017	\$3,471	134	4.6%	N/A	\$22,862	\$1,337	95
Activity 2013-2	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$5,220)	Yes(200)	Yes(5%)	Yes(\$2,274,708)	Yes(\$8,714)	Yes(\$400)	No(0)
	2018	\$3,742	144	2.3%	\$74,582,832	\$16,172	\$1,168	76
Activity 2013-2	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$5,220)	Yes(200)	Yes(5%)	Yes(\$2,274,708)	Yes(\$8,714)	Yes(\$400)	No(0)
	2019	\$4,212	162	0%	\$3,853,395	\$23,108	\$3,478	129
Activity 2013-2	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$5,220)	Yes(200)	Yes(5%)	No(\$2,274,708)	Yes(\$8,714)	Yes(\$400)	No(0)
	2020	\$4,402	169	1.9%	\$2,140,140	\$25,941	\$3,747	51

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Table 74: MTW Activity 2013-2

Activity 2013-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
	380	Yes(216)	328	Yes(216)	246	Yes(216)	315	Yes(216)	314	Yes(216)	208	No(216)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=96)												
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$956)	\$1,022	No(\$813)	\$687	Yes(\$813)	\$749	Yes(\$813)	\$824	No(\$813)	\$854	No(\$813)	\$928	No(\$813)
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$1,420,485)	\$2,140,140	Yes(\$1,562,534)	\$5,273,880	Yes(\$1,562,534)	\$2,274,708	Yes(\$1,562,534)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	13	No(20)	21	Yes(20)	14	No(20)	20	Yes(20)	22	Yes(20)	3	No(20)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Table 75: MTW Activity 2013-2

Activity 2013-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Employed full-time (Baseline=50)	105	Yes(63)	54	No(63)	42	No(63)	44	No(63)	112	Yes(63)	44	No(63)
Employed part-time (Baseline=29)	53	Yes(36)	66	Yes(36)	50	Yes(36)	55	Yes(36)	102	Yes(36)	50	Yes(36)
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=16)	19	No(20)	41	Yes(20)	2	No(20)	10	No(20)	4	No(20)	15	No(20)
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=32)	15	No(40)	64	Yes(40)	6	No(40)	24	No(40)	20	No(40)	21	No(40)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2013-2 modified the FSS program to align with the Path to Success initiative by changing the contract term and escrow calculation (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

These changes were done to increase accessibility to the program and participant engagement (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 76: MTW Activity 2013-3

Activity 2013-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$17,010)	\$0	Yes(\$11,907)	\$0	Yes(\$11,907)	\$0	Yes(\$11,907)	\$1,280	Yes(\$11,907)	\$1,782	Yes(\$11,907)	\$4,123	Yes(\$11,907)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=567)	0	Yes(397)	0	Yes(397)	0	Yes(397)	43	Yes(397)	59	Yes(397)	137	Yes(397)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=17%)	4%	Yes(15%)	6%	Yes(15%)	4%	Yes(15%)	4%	Yes(15%)	3%	Yes(15%)	3%	Yes(15%)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2013-3 aimed to increase cost-effectiveness by discontinuing the calculation of earnings for full-time students and income identified as excluded by HUD, such as earnings from minors (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 77: MTW Activity 2013-4

Activity 2013-4	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$5,460)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=182)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2013-4 eliminated the flat rent option from the public housing program and required all tenants to pay a portion of their rent based on adjusted income (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity equalized the contributions towards housing from lower and higher-income tenants and did not hurt either group, as the rent portion was affordable regardless of income level (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 78: MTW Activity 2013-6

Activity 2013-6	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$16,920)	\$7,878	\$7,722	\$9,282	\$9,282	\$5,499	\$9,516	No(\$9,450)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=564)	263	257	309	309	183	317	No(315)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	101	99	119	119	152	122	Yes(96)
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$675	\$691	\$711	\$679	\$679	\$667	No(\$600)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	41	60	61	21	60	78	Yes(20)
Number of new housing units made available for homeless households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	47	47	47	47	47	47	Yes(16)
							Benchmark Achieved?
							Yes(\$9,450)
							Yes(315)
							Yes(96)
							No(\$600)
							Yes(20)
							Yes(16)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.



Activity 2013-6 allowed the SDHC to partner with local agencies to operate a transitional housing program with flat subsidies and supportive services (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The service-providing agency was responsible for creating and maintaining a waiting list, and the SDHC was responsible for auditing the list for compliance (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 79: MTW Activity 2014-2

Activity 2014-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$1,086)	\$970	No(\$756)	\$822	No(\$756)	\$791	No(\$756)	\$754	No(\$756)	\$831	No(\$756)	\$920	No(\$756)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2014-2 authorized the SDHC to include Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payments (Kin-GAP), adoption assistance, and foster care payments when calculating the household rent share (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Before the implementation of this activity, households were receiving money for the provision of housing and these funds were excluded from calculations (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Kin-GAP, adoption assistance, and foster care payments were omitted when determining initial program eligibility (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 80: MTW Activity 2015-1

Activity 2015-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	72	Yes(50)	122	Yes(50)	57	Yes(50)	36	No(50)	12	No(50)	3	No(50)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2015; San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2015-1 authorized the SDHC to increase the 40% affordability cap to 50% to reduce the barriers HCV participants faced during the initial leasing process (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Prior to implementation, the HCV program limited the rent burden to 40%, prohibiting families from choosing units that fit their needs (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 81: MTW Activity 2016-1

Activity 2016-1																			
	2020	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?	2014	Benchmark Achieved?	2013	Benchmark Achieved?	2012	Benchmark Achieved?	2011	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$69,492	\$85,284	Yes(\$10,000)	\$51,405	Yes(\$10,000)	\$57,559	Yes(\$10,000)	\$30,118	Yes(\$10,000)										
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$7,290)	\$16,631	\$20,903	Yes(\$10,400)	\$14,144	Yes(\$10,400)	\$14,729	Yes(\$10,400)	\$8,842	Yes(\$10,400)										
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$247	\$0	Yes(\$150)	\$0	No(\$150)	\$0	No(\$150)	\$0	No(\$150)										
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=3)	14	11	No(0)	15	No(0)	18	No(0)	6	No(0)										
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	23	20	No(25)	21	No(25)	23	No(25)	7	No(25)										
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$0)	\$62,202	\$88,320	No(\$90,000)	\$94,692	No(\$90,000)	N/A	Yes(\$90,000)	N/A	N/A										
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	0	1	No(25)	0	No(25)	0	No(25)	0	No(25)										

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Table 82: MTW Activity 2016-1

Activity 2016-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	1	No(25)	2	No(25)	1	No(25)	23	No(25)	0	No(25)
PHA rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$444)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$370	No(\$466)	\$495	Yes(\$466)
Employed full-time (Baseline=0)	1	No(12)	2	No(12)	2	No(12)	4	No(12)	2	No(12)
Employed part-time (Baseline=2)	1	No(6)	7	Yes(6)	1	No(6)	3	No(6)	2	No(6)
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=0)	1	No(3)	1	No(3)	2	No(3)	4	Yes(3)	2	No(3)
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=0)	19	Yes(4)	22	Yes(4)	3	No(4)	4	Yes(4)	1	No(4)
Unemployed (Baseline=1)	21	No(0)	9	No(0)	18	No(0)	16	No(0)	3	No(0)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2016; San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2016-1 authorized the SDHC to provide rental subsidies to homeless families with children at the Monarch School via the Monarch School Housing Program (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). Families were required to maintain acceptable levels of attendance,

and parents were required to attend work-readiness services, as well as engage in supportive services, to receive subsidies (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 83: MTW Activity 2016-2

Activity 2016-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$1,379,594	Yes(\$400,000)	\$1,653,070	Yes(\$400,000)	\$1,399,497	Yes(\$400,000)	\$600,000	Yes(\$400,000)
Number of participants enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=0)	93	Yes(63)	90	Yes(63)	74	Yes(63)	63	Yes(63)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	93	Yes(63)	90	Yes(63)	74	Yes(63)	63	Yes(63)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	23	Yes(17)	24	Yes(17)	15	No(17)	22	No(17)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2017; San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2016-2 authorized the SDHC to provide resources to students under legal guardianship, exiting foster care, designated as wards of the court, or who were homeless youth at the San Diego State University (SDSU) via the Guardian Scholars Program (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This program provided supportive services and encouraged students to reside on campus (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This program provided scholarships and tutoring, academic advising, and mentoring services (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 84: MTW Activity 2016-3

Activity 2016-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	0	No(300)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (Baseline=0)	3,118	Yes(300)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2016-3 was implemented in fiscal year 2020 and authorized the SDHC to use the funding to subsidize permanent indoor emergency shelter beds for the homeless population (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The SDHC used the temporary beds to mitigate the dangers faced by the homeless population, as they were a vulnerable population (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 85: MTW Activity 2017-1

Activity 2017-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$46,000	No(\$50,000)	\$22,000	No(\$50,000)	\$8,000	No(\$50,000)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	22	No(25)	14	No(25)	4	No(25)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	0	No(5)	2	No(5)	0	No(5)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	9	Yes(2)	3	Yes(2)	2	Yes(2)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2017-1 authorized the SDHC to provide rental assistance to the formerly homeless who are transitioning from permanent supportive housing via the Moving On Program (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). The program was voluntary and provided community-based resources for this population with a decreased need for intensive case management, which freed up resources for those in more need (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 86: MTW Activity 2018-1

Activity 2018-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$312,000)	\$104,000	Yes(\$249,600)	\$67,200	Yes(\$249,600)	\$153,600	Yes(\$249,600)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=7,800)	2,600	Yes(6,240)	1,680	Yes(6,240)	3,840	Yes(6,240)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=17%)	6%	No(4%)	4%	Yes(4%)	2%	Yes(4%)
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$0)	\$0	No(\$62,400)	\$244,800	Yes(\$62,400)	\$247,056	Yes(\$62,400)
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$677	No(\$10,000)	\$19,701	Yes(\$10,000)	\$19,701	Yes(\$10,000)
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=18)	9	No(5)	11	No(5)	7	No(5)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	43	No(50)	42	No(50)	257	Yes(50)
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$772)	\$1,249	No(\$695)	\$836	No(\$695)	\$785	No(\$695)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.



Table 87: MTW Activity 2018-1

Activity 2018-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$0)	\$319,032	Yes(\$88,934)	\$503,736	Yes(\$88,934)	\$372,072	Yes(\$88,934)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	21	No(96)	1	No(96)	171	Yes(96)
Employed full-time (Baseline=22)	1	No(38)	11	No(38)	22	No(38)
Employed part-time (Baseline=7)	10	No(56)	3	No(56)	7	No(56)
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=8)	0	No(6)	1	No(6)	8	Yes(6)
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=4)	3	No(18)	3	No(18)	4	No(18)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2018; San Diego Housing Commission, 2019; San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2018-1 implemented the Moving Home rapid rehousing program that provided housing subsidies and supportive services to the homeless (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity also ensured housing stability by providing short term-transitional subsidies for participants transitioning from federally funded rapid re-housing programs (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

Table 88: MTW Activity 2020-1

Activity 2020-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	188	Yes(50)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (Baseline=0)	1,541	Yes(300)
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$277,340)	\$280,836	No(\$216,540)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=6,315)	5,851	Yes(6,015)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=0%)	0%	Yes(0%)

Source: San Diego Housing Commission, 2020.

Activity 2020-1 implemented the Landlord Retention and Incentive Program to increase and retain quality housing units in the HCV program (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity provided lump-sum incentive payments, payments for damages caused by tenants, simplified inspections, and specialized customer service for landlords and program recipients (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020).

**Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo (HACSM)**

Table 89: MTW Activity 2000-3

Activity 2000-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	54	Yes(20)	68	Yes(20)	39	Yes(20)	47	Yes(20)	82	Yes(20)	32	Yes(20)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2000-3 authorized the Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo to eliminate the 40% affordability cap placed on HCV recipients to increase their housing choices (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). In addition, this activity implemented rent affordability discussions with program participants, property owner outreach, calculation tools, and a review process for households with a rent burden of over 50% (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 90: MTW Activity 2009-2

Activity 2009-2	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$20,500)	Yes(\$100)	Yes(10)	Yes(40)	Yes(\$1,200)	Yes(10)
	2015	\$16,364	\$496	7	53	\$754	17
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$20,500)	Yes(\$100)	No(10)	Yes(40)	No(\$1,200)	Yes(10)
	2016	\$16,293	\$881	12	99	\$1,384	13
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$20,500)	Yes(\$100)	No(10)	Yes(40)	No(\$1,200)	Yes(10)
	2017	\$18,985	\$490	15	91	\$1,378	1
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,500)	Yes(\$100)	No(10)	Yes(40)	No(\$1,200)	Yes(10)
	2018	\$29,220	\$2,094	19	132	\$1,229	24
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,500)	N/A	No(10)	Yes(40)	No(\$1,200)	Yes(10)	
2019	\$27,506	N/A	18	82	\$1,794	9	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$20,500)	Yes(\$100)	No(10)	Yes(40)	No(\$1,200)	Yes(10)	
2020	\$34,074	\$2,102	22	85	\$2,110	14	
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$19,339)							
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$249)							
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=13)							
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)							
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$908)							
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)							

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Table 91: MTW Activity 2009-2

Activity 2009-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved? 2019	Benchmark Achieved? 2018	Benchmark Achieved? 2017	Benchmark Achieved? 2016	Benchmark Achieved? 2015
Employed full-time (Baseline=11)	22	45 Yes(11)	41 Yes(11)	42 Yes(11)	6 Yes(11)	16 No(11)
Employed part-time (Baseline=12)	19	38 Yes(10)	38 Yes(10)	30 Yes(10)	10 Yes(10)	17 Yes(10)
Enrolled in an educational program (Baseline=0)	12	12 Yes(10)	13 Yes(10)	28 Yes(10)	0 Yes(10)	13 Yes(10)
Enrolled in a job training program (Baseline=0)	75	75 Yes(10)	27 Yes(10)	16 Yes(10)	1 Yes(10)	2 Yes(10)
Unemployed (Baseline=11)	44	18 No(10)	34 Yes(10)	22 Yes(10)	15 Yes(10)	16 No(10)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2009-2 implemented the Housing Readiness Program (HRP) to provide the homeless with rental subsidies and supportive services for up to 5 years (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). Homeless households were referred to this program through partnerships with San Mateo’s Center on Homelessness, as well as other homeless service providers (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). Families participating in this program were encouraged to join the FSS program (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 92: MTW Activity 2010-6

Activity 2010-6	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$154,085)	\$56,931	Yes(\$118,645)	N/A	N/A	\$43,048	Yes(\$118,645)	\$50,323	Yes(\$118,645)	\$48,855	Yes(\$118,645)	\$32,185	Yes(\$118,645)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=2,949)	1,094	Yes(1,800)	N/A	N/A	581	Yes(1,800)	796	Yes(1,800)	688	Yes(1,800)	618	Yes(1,800)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2010-6 implemented a triennial recertification schedule for elderly or disabled families (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). However, interim adjustments for decreases in household income or composition were still processed (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 93: MTW Activity 2010-7

Activity 2010-7	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$59,774)	\$90,894	No(\$59,774)	\$71,746	No(\$59,774)	\$53,810	Yes(\$59,774)	\$62,904	No(\$59,774)	\$61,068	No(\$59,774)	\$59,579	Yes(\$59,774)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=1,295)	1,969	Yes(993)	896	Yes(993)	756	Yes(993)	911	Yes(993)	762	Yes(993)	950	Yes(993)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	3%	Yes(0%)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2010-7 simplified the rent calculation process and established a minimum threshold of \$50,000 before assets would be included in income calculations (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). The activity also eliminated the EID because program participants benefited more from alternate recertification schedules (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 94: MTW Activity 2010-8

Activity 2010-8	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$29,285)	\$1,771	Yes(\$15,000)	\$1,716	Yes(\$15,000)	\$1,061	Yes(\$15,000)	\$1,716	Yes(\$15,000)	\$1,666	Yes(\$15,000)	\$7,150	Yes(\$15,000)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=738)	108	Yes(369)	117	Yes(369)	98	Yes(369)	119	Yes(369)	99	Yes(369)	119	Yes(369)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=10%)	1%	Yes(10%)	1%	Yes(10%)	1%	Yes(10%)	0%	Yes(10%)	1%	Yes(10%)	15%	No(10%)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2010-8 simplified the third-party verification process for income to reduce administrative burdens (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). This activity changed the threshold for third-party verification from \$5,000 to \$50,000 and allowed self-certification of assets under \$50,000 (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). Families were also allowed to self-certify certain verifications, such as childcare expenses (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).



Table 95: MTW Activity 2010-9

Activity 2010-9								
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$81,000)	Yes(1,550)	Yes(10%)	Yes(\$1,638,019)	No(\$25,566)	Yes(400)	Yes(2)	
2015	\$74,474	1,430	4%	\$1,777,306	\$20,773	307	19	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$81,000)	Yes(1,550)	Yes(10%)	Yes(\$1,638,019)	No(\$25,566)	Yes(400)	Yes(2)	
2016	\$65,474	1,190	2%	\$1,707,628	\$21,897	267	38	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$81,000)	Yes(1,550)	Yes(10%)	Yes(\$1,638,019)	No(\$25,566)	Yes(400)	Yes(2)	
2017	\$78,251	1,423	4%	\$2,207,040	\$23,068	249	46	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$81,000)	Yes(1,550)	Yes(10%)	Yes(\$1,638,019)	No(\$25,566)	Yes(400)	Yes(2)	
2018	\$67,867	1,181	10%	\$1,937,368	\$24,406	300	42	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$81,000)	Yes(1,550)	Yes(10%)	Yes(\$1,638,019)	Yes(\$25,566)	Yes(400)	Yes(2)	
2019	\$91,452	1,338	3%	\$2,130,007	\$33,812	143	52	
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$81,000)	Yes(1,550)	Yes(10%)	Yes(\$1,638,019)	No(\$25,566)	Yes(400)	Yes(2)	
2020	\$87,125	1,283	4.75%	\$5,449,728	\$17,426	182	75	

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2010-9 created a tiered subsidy table that informed program participants of the maximum amount that the HACSM would contribute to housing costs during voucher issuance (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). This activity allowed participants to search for housing, knowing exactly how much subsidy they would receive, which allowed them to make more informed choices (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 96: MTW Activity 2010-10

Activity 2010-10	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$1,500)	\$4,300	Yes(\$6,000)	\$2,370	Yes(\$6,000)	\$5,961	Yes(\$6,000)	\$4,749	Yes(\$6,000)	\$1,875	Yes(\$6,000)	\$1,612	Yes(\$6,000)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=60)	154	Yes(112)	52	Yes(112)	113	Yes(112)	91	Yes(112)	75	Yes(112)	58	Yes(112)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=28%)	0%	Yes(10%)	0%	Yes(10%)	0%	Yes(10%)	0%	Yes(10%)	0%	Yes(10%)	0%	Yes(10%)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2010-10 simplified the HQS inspection process to allow the HACSM to inspect and determine compliance for properties it owned (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). These inspections did not require the HACSM to submit reports to the HUD field office. Still, they were maintained in an electronic filing system for retrieval at HUD’s request (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 97: MTW Activity 2011-15

Activity 2011-15	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$195,046)	\$130,230	No(\$100,000)	\$137,703	No(\$100,000)	\$64,841	Yes(\$100,000)	\$138,960	Yes(\$100,000)	\$111,471	No(\$100,000)	\$55,976	Yes(\$100,000)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=4,157)	2,715	Yes(2,161)	2,399	Yes(2,161)	2,490	Yes(2,161)	2,527	Yes(2,161)	2,026	Yes(2,161)	1,952	Yes(2,161)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=44%)	0%	Yes(25%)	0%	Yes(25%)	0%	Yes(25%)	0%	Yes(25%)	0%	Yes(25%)	4%	Yes(25%)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2011-15 implemented a biennial inspection schedule for all HCV units and required that the units meet HQS while under contract (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 98: MTW Activity 2011-16

Activity 2011-16	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2011-16 expanded the Section 8 PBV program and increased the voucher budget authority of the HACSM to 40% (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). The PBV program expansion was a major component of developing affordable housing units to end homelessness in the county (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 99: MTW Activity 2011-17

Activity 2011-17	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (Baseline=36)	2-3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2011-17 revised eligibility standards and implemented a limit on the value of assets for program participants (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). If an applicant or participant had assets exceeding \$100,000 or ownership in a suitable home, they were deemed not eligible for assistance (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 100: MTW Activity 2011-18

Activity 2011-18	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$7,400)	\$2,016	Yes(\$1,825)	\$1,061	Yes(\$1,825)	\$1,031	Yes(\$1,825)	\$1,001	Yes(\$1,825)	\$1,610	Yes(\$1,825)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=60)	35	Yes(30)	25	Yes(30)	30	Yes(30)	25	Yes(30)	30	Yes(30)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=N/A)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019.

Activity 2011-18 modified the income calculation process to no longer verify or count income that HUD defined as 100% excluded (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019). Some examples of 100% excluded income were earned income from minors and CalFresh payments. This modification did not affect the amount of rental assistance received by participants (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019).

Table 101: MTW Activity 2011-19

Activity 2011-19	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$1,339)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$203	Yes(\$275)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=34)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.25	Yes(6)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019.

Activity 2011-19 eliminated the requirement to complete a new HAP contract when utility responsibility changed (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019). Under this activity, when lease requirements relating to utility responsibilities change, the owner or tenant must notify the HACSM (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019). As a result, the HACSM reviewed the new contract for rent reasonableness and changed the tenant portion of rent when necessary (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019). This activity has not been used since fiscal year 2015.

Table 102: MTW Activity 2011-27

Activity 2011-27	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (Baseline=0)	51	Yes(30)	69	Yes(30)	84	Yes(30)	71	Yes(30)	76	Yes(30)	55	Yes(30)
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=0)	\$1,278	Yes(\$900)	\$1,278	Yes(\$900)	\$1,030	Yes(\$900)	\$897,97	Yes(\$900)	\$1,172	Yes(\$900)	\$1,032	Yes(\$900)
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=0)	3	Yes(20)	5	Yes(20)	5	Yes(20)	9	Yes(20)	7	Yes(20)	7	Yes(20)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	24	Yes(5)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2011-27 implemented a provider-based assistance program that aimed to provide services to under-served populations (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

This activity aided survivors of domestic violence, non-violent parolees, single parents with minor children, and the elderly who could live independently with supportive services (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).



Table 103: MTW Activity 2012-21

Activity 2012-21								
	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$0)	\$1,511,892	\$12,515	\$33,347	\$15,213	\$9,245	No(\$453,738)	No(\$453,738)	No(\$453,738)
		Yes(\$453,738)	No(\$453,738)	No(\$453,738)				

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2012-21 changed the qualifications for full-time student status to include family members under 24 years old who attended an accredited university and provided their transcript (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). The qualification changes allowed families to receive a dependent deduction and earned income exclusion (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 104: MTW Activity 2012-23

Activity 2012-23								
	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (Baseline=36)	2-3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	Yes(36)	Yes(36)	Yes(36)
		Yes(36)	Yes(36)	Yes(36)				

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2012-23 modified the HoH change policy and required the new HoH to be in the family for the last 12 months at a minimum (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 105: MTW Activity 2012-24

Activity 2012-24	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (Baseline=36)	2-3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)	2.3	Yes(36)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2012-24 reduced the number of days that participants could remain in the program with a \$0 HAP from 180 days to 90 days (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 106: MTW Activity 2012-26

Activity 2012-26	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
	2015	115	15	\$56,200,000
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
2016	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
	2016	126	0	\$201,200,000
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	No(3:1 leverage)
2017	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
	2017	60	0	\$300,000
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	No(3:1 leverage)
2018	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
	2018	40	0	\$585,000
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	No(3:1 leverage)
2019	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	No(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
	2019	0	0	\$0
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	Yes(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
2020	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	Yes(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)
	2020	\$897	140	\$230,000,000
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(20 units per \$1,000,00 invested)	Yes(60)	Yes(3:1 leverage)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2012-26 allowed the HACSM to use MTW funds to leverage investment funds that were larger than its commitments (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Some of the spending was used on site acquisition, rehabilitation, and development of new housing units (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 107: MTW Activity 2013-28

Activity 2013-28	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$2,401)	\$1,207	Yes(\$2,161)	\$1,400	Yes(\$2,161)	\$1,354	Yes(\$2,161)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=42)	22	Yes(38)	22	Yes(38)	24	Yes(38)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=10%)	0%	Yes(10%)	0%	Yes(10%)	N/A	N/A
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$26,062)	\$38,175	Yes(\$26,000)	\$38,640	Yes(\$26,000)	\$31,179	Yes(\$26,000)
Average savings of households (Baseline=\$172)	\$2,391	Yes(\$500)	\$1,624	Yes(\$500)	\$1,811	Yes(\$500)
Actual number of HOH employed after implementation (Baseline=22)	15	Yes(22)	12	Yes(22)	16	Yes(22)
Actual percentage of total work-able households employed (Baseline=81%)	71%	Yes(80%)	80%	Yes(80%)	94%	Yes(80%)
Actual number of HOH unemployed (Baseline=2)	3	Yes(2)	18	Yes(2)	14	Yes(2)
Actual percentage of total work-able households who are unemployed full time (Baseline=8%)	12%	Yes(5%)	20%	Yes(5%)	1%	Yes(5%)
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=5)	3	Yes(5)	3	Yes(5)	4	Yes(5)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017.

Table 108: MTW Activity 2013-28

Activity 2013-28	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$1,123)	\$31.21	Yes(\$1,123)	\$44.54	Yes(\$1,123)	\$1,123	Yes(\$1,123)
PHA rental revenue (Baseline=\$239,052)	\$282,309	Yes(\$239,052)	\$258,286	Yes(\$239,052)	\$233,528	Yes(\$239,052)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017.

Activity 2013-28 authorized the HACSM to apply MTW flexibilities to its public housing units (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017). This activity implemented biennial recertifications/inspections, eliminated the EID, revised eligibility standards, excluded assets under \$50,000, and simplified the verification process, and change of household policies (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017).

Table 109: MTW Activity 2014-29

Activity 2014-29	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental Revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$1,653,740)	\$756,024	No(\$1,650,000)	\$2,130,007	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$1,937,368	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$2,207,040	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$1,707,628	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$1,777,306	Yes(\$1,650,000)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2014-29 revised the expense deduction, and allowed childcare deductions for dependent children under 12 years old when the parent was looking for work or attending school full time (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). However, the activity required

payments to the custodial parents, and the maximum allowable deduction was the lesser amount of actual expense or 50% of gross earnings (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 110: MTW Activity 2015-30

Activity 2015-30	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$8,674)	\$8,666	Yes(\$12,000)	\$7,536	Yes(\$12,000)	\$9,230	Yes(\$12,000)	\$8,161	Yes(\$12,000)	\$10,273	Yes(\$12,000)	\$4,000	Yes(\$4,400)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=166)	109	Yes(160)	109	Yes(160)	135	Yes(160)	142	Yes(160)	159	Yes(160)	77	Yes(83)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=0%)	0%	Yes(5%)	0%	Yes(5%)	0%	Yes(5%)	0%	Yes(5%)	0%	Yes(5%)	0%	Yes(5%)
Total household contributions towards housing assistance (Baseline=\$1,653,740)	\$2,042,112	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$2,130,007	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$1,937,368	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$2,207,040	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$1,707,628	Yes(\$1,650,000)	\$1,777,306	Yes(\$1,650,000)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2015-30 standardized the proration for ineligible household members to \$150 per member to support HUD subsidy regulations (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). This activity allowed families with both eligible and ineligible members to receive some relief when searching for housing and leasing housing (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 111: MTW Activity 2015-32

Activity 2015-32	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$12,749 )	\$2,248	Yes(\$2,560)	\$1,955	Yes(\$2,560)	\$1,956	Yes(\$2,560)	\$2,405	Yes(\$2,560)	\$0	Yes(\$2,560)	\$1,380	Yes(\$2,560)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=244)	34	Yes(49)	34	Yes(49)	34	Yes(49)	42	Yes(49)	0	Yes(49)	26.5	Yes(49)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2015-32 modified the EIV review schedule and did not generate EIV income reports for interim reexaminations (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). Instead, the EIV income report was only generated during annual or triennial reexaminations (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). This activity also allowed the HACSM to recalculate tenant and HAP portions, without meeting households in person, for decreases in income supported with documentation (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

Table 112: MTW Activity 2015-34

Activity 2015-34	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$21,000)	\$28,831	Yes(\$42,000)	\$36,000	Yes(\$42,000)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016.

Activity 2015-34 modified the local collections process. It allowed the HACSM to retain 100% of funds received from a judgment, litigation, or repayment agreement instead of the 50% permitted by HUD (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016). This activity was closed out in fiscal year 2017 due to a lack of MTW authority (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017).



Table 113: MTW Activity 2015-35

Activity 2015-35	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	83	Yes(10)	58	Yes(10)	45	Yes(10)	86	Yes(10)	13	Yes(10)	N/A	N/A
Average applicant time on waitlist in months (Baseline=36)	2-3	Yes(24)	2.3	Yes(24)	2.3	Yes(24)	2.3	Yes(24)	2	Yes(24)	1.2	Yes(24)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	83	Yes(10)	68	Yes(10)	39	Yes(10)	47	Yes(10)	58	Yes(10)	N/A	N/A
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choices (Baseline=0)	83	Yes(30)	62	Yes(30)	53	Yes(30)	322	Yes(30)	65	Yes(30)	N/A	N/A

Source: Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020.

Activity 2015-35 implemented the Leasing Success Program to increase program participation (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). The Leasing Success Program contracted with organizations that had rental market expertise and organizations with shared housing expertise (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). In addition, the

program created a landlord incentive program and a security deposit program to encourage landlord participation (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

**Santa Clara County Housing Authority (SCCHA)**

Table 114: MTW Activity 2009-1

Activity 2009-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$1,934,982)	\$763,900	Yes(\$967,491)	\$879,774	Yes(\$943,776)	\$712,985	Yes(\$920,898)	\$641,204	Yes(\$839,907)	\$741,308	Yes(\$820,254)	\$634,545	Yes(\$820,254)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=61,930)	24,449	Yes(24,449)	28,865	Yes(30,965)	23,974	Yes(30,965)	23,639	Yes(30,965)	28,495	Yes(30,965)	24,315	Yes(30,965)
Tenant rent share in dollars (Baseline=\$8,065,166)	\$6,971,568	No(\$8,065,166)	\$5,760,801	No(\$8,065,166)	\$5,505,877	No(\$8,065,166)	\$6,070,688	No(\$8,065,166)	\$5,602,832	No(\$8,065,166)	\$6,876,191	No(\$8,065,166)
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$23,021)	\$24,472	Yes(\$23,021)	23,846	Yes(\$23,021)	\$20,373	No(\$23,021)	\$20,401	No(\$23,021)	\$17,527	No(\$23,021)	\$24,769	No(\$23,021)
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=1,955)	676	Yes(1,955)	708	Yes(1,955)	783	Yes(1,955)	1,007	Yes(1,955)	603	Yes(1,955)	1,312	Yes(1,955)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=322)	198	No(322)	181	No(322)	156	No(322)	142	No(322)	237	No(322)	263	No(322)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-1 modified the requirement of annual reexaminations, and changed the frequency to once every three years for fixed-income families, and once every two years for all other households (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 115: MTW Activity 2009-2

Activity 2009-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$81,222)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=30)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-2 expedited the initial eligibility income verification process by extending the validity of application documents from 60 to 120 days (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The extended validity of documents reduced the need for updated documents that staff needed to review (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 116: MTW Activity 2009-5

Activity 2009-5	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (Baseline=87)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	1,344	Yes(800)	758	No(800)	536	No(800)	362	No(800)	277	No(300)	262	No(300)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choices (Baseline=0)	1,344	Yes(800)	758	No(800)	536	No(800)	362	No(800)	277	No(300)	262	No(300)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-5 implemented the Chronically Homeless Direct Referral (CHDR) program to refer homeless households, not on the voucher waiting list, to tenant-based housing assistance (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity also provided case management and services to promote housing stability (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 117: MTW Activity 2009-8

Activity 2009-8	2015	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$23 per transaction)	Yes(30 minutes per transaction)
	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$2,300)	Yes(50)
	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$25/transaction)	Yes(30 minutes/transaction)
	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$1,530)	Yes(25.5)
	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$1,403)	Yes(23)
	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$3,476)	Yes(55.5)
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$5,214)				
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=83.25)				

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-8 implemented a 30-day referral process for project-based vacancies (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This process allowed owners to refer applicants after 30 days of unsuccessful attempts by the SCCHA (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The SCCHA used this activity to reduce the monetary loss experienced by owners during unit vacancies (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 118: MTW Activity 2009-9

Activity 2009-9	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$27,493)	\$21,512	Yes(\$21,512)	\$20,233	Yes(\$20,233)	\$8,484	Yes(\$8,484)	\$73.71 per transaction	Yes(\$73.71 per transaction)	\$7,995	Yes(\$7,995)	\$68.33 per transaction	Yes(\$68.33 per transaction)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=855)	669	Yes(669)	645	Yes(645)	306	Yes(306)	3	Yes(3)	351	Yes(351)	3	Yes(3)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-9 allowed the SCCHA to use the Tenant Income Certification (TIC) form required by the LIHTC program to verify household income and streamline the asset verification process for PBV units at tax credit properties (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). Prior to implementing this activity, the verification process caused staff to duplicate verification efforts when the information had already been verified (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 119: MTW Activity 2009-11

Activity 2009-11	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=506)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-11 allowed the SCCHA to project-base more than 25% of the units in existing multi-family complexes, and did not require participation in supportive services (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). As a result, the housing units became more attractive to families that did not want to participate in supportive services (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 120: MTW Activity 2009-13

Activity 2009-13	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$8,325)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=380)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-13 combined the wait lists for the County of Santa Clara and the City of San Jose to increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 121: MTW Activity 2009-14

Activity 2009-14	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$246,302,481)	\$328,296,876	No(\$246,059,768)	\$298,577,604	No(\$246,059,768)	\$282,312,497	No(\$246,059,768)	\$246,249,578	No(\$246,059,768)	\$207,764,049	Yes(\$246,059,768)	\$200,500,269	Yes(\$246,059,768)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2009-14 implemented voucher size changes immediately when they occurred between regular reexaminations to avoid households being over-housed (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This was intended to reduce the portion of rent that SCCHA paid as soon as possible (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).



Table 122: MTW Activity 2010-2

Activity 2010-2										
	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2019
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$551,801)	Yes(\$74.92 per transaction)	\$74.92 per transaction	Yes(\$386,288)	\$386,288	Yes(\$74.92 per transaction)	\$74.92 per transaction	Yes(\$351,450)	\$351,450	Yes(\$612,684)	\$612,684
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=17,158)	Yes(3 hours 40 minutes)	3 hours 40 minutes	Yes(18,905)	18,905	Yes(3 hours 40 minutes)	3 hours 40 minutes	Yes(17,200)	17,200	Yes(19,543)	19,543
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=0%)	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%
	Benchmark Achieved?	2020	Benchmark Achieved?		Benchmark Achieved?		Benchmark Achieved?		Benchmark Achieved?	
	Yes(\$527,810)	\$527,810	Yes(16,412)	16,412	Yes(0%)	0%				

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2010-2 excluded family assets from income calculations when the total amount of family assets was under \$50,000 (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The objective was to reduce administrative costs and promote family savings (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 123: MTW Activity 2010-3

Activity 2010-3										
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,368)	Yes(1,114)		Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,368)	Yes(1,114)		Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,368)
	2015	\$3,084	110		2016	\$822	29		2017	\$316
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$83,548)	Yes(2,665)		Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,368)	Yes(1,114)		Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$30,368)
	2019	\$276	9		2018	\$190	7		2020	\$212
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$83,548)	Yes(2,665)		Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$104,427)				Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=3,331)	
	2020	\$212	7							

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2010-3 authorized the SCCHA to apply the current payment standard to the rental assistance calculation at interim reexaminations if the payment standard had increased (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This decreased the rent burden on participating households, and reduced administrative costs associated with processing family moves to cheaper units (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 124: MTW Activity 2010-4

Activity 2010-4	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$12,164 )	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=158)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2010-4 authorized the SCCHA to select housing sites it owned for project-based assistance without a competitive process (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity was implemented to streamline the process and reduce administrative costs (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 125: MTW Activity 2011-1

Activity 2011-1	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=3)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	10	10	8	7	8	6

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2011-1 allowed the SCCHA to approve requests for exception payment standards above 100% of the FMR as a reasonable accommodation for households with disabilities (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). Prior to implementation, households with disabilities faced hardships in securing housing due to the length of time it took HUD to review and approve exception payment standard requests (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 126: MTW Activity 2011-2

Activity 2011-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$1,621)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=45)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2011-2 simplified the requirements regarding independent inspection agencies and waived the requirement that HUD must approve of the agency (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity also waived the requirement for an independent agency to send HUD copies of HQS inspection reports (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 127: MTW Activity 2012-2

Activity 2012-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$5,598)	\$3,656	No(\$2,799)	\$3,787	No(\$2,731)	\$1,547	Yes(\$2,664)	\$1,736	Yes(\$2,340)	\$939	Yes(\$2,127)	\$1,921	Yes(\$2,127)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=110)	72	No(55)	76	No(55)	32	Yes(55)	41	Yes(55)	25	Yes(42.5)	39	Yes(42.5)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2012-2 required PBV households to remain in the program for 2 years before being eligible for tenant-based voucher assistance (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity helped stabilize the PBV program and reduced vacancies and turnover costs (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 128: MTW Activity 2012-3

Activity 2012-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$93.6 Million	Yes(\$55 Million)	0	No(\$55 Million)	0	No(\$55 Million)	\$133.5 Million	Yes(\$75 Million)	\$78.3 Million	Yes(\$75 Million)	\$26.3 Million	No(\$75 Million)
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	182	No(250)	0	No(250)	0	No(250)	74	No(250)	74	No(250)	74	No(250)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2012-3 authorized the SCCHA to acquire land and rehabilitate or build new rental housing units (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The goal of this activity was to increase development activities to increase the supply of affordable housing (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 129: MTW Activity 2012-4

Activity 2012-4	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
	Yes(\$36 Million)	\$59.6 Million	\$59.74 Million	\$60.24 Million	\$29 Million	\$29 Million	No(\$36 Million)
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
	Yes(\$36 Million)	\$59.6 Million	\$59.74 Million	\$60.24 Million	\$29 Million	\$29 Million	No(\$36 Million)
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
	No(500)	178	178	294	448	448	No(500)
Rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$29,514,440)	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
	Yes(\$30,347,824)	\$30,620,870	\$32,313,022	\$32,313,022	\$5,820,493	\$19,923,961	No(\$30,347,824)
							2020
							\$29 million
							448
							Yes(\$30,347,824)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2012-4 created the affordable housing preservation fund that allowed the SCCHA to help when faced with an unforeseen event that could impact its housing portfolio (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 130: MTW Activity 2013-1

Activity 2013-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$482)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=15)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=100%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)
Tenant rent share in dollars (Baseline=\$8,065,166)	\$6,971,568	No(\$8,065,166)	\$5,760,801	No(\$8,065,166)	\$5,505,877	No(\$8,065,166)	\$6,070,688	No(\$8,065,166)	\$5,602,832	No(\$8,065,166)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2013-1 eliminated the EID calculation mandated by HUD when a disabled family member gained an increase in wages (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

The SCCHA policy to not calculate income increases between regular reexaminations made the EID calculation unnecessary (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity allowed families to benefit from the income increases for up to 3 years before they were reassessed (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).



Table 131: MTW Activity 2014-4

Activity 2014-4									
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$210,174,768)	Yes(0)	No(5%)	No(\$8,065,166)				
	2015	\$200,500,269	0	9%	\$6,876,191				
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(\$210,174,768)	Yes(0)	No(5%)	No(\$8,065,166)				
	2016	\$207,764,049	0	10%	\$5,602,832				
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$210,174,768)	Yes(0)	No(5%)	No(\$8,065,166)				
	2017	\$246,249,578	0	9%	\$6,070,688				
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$210,174,768)	Yes(0)	No(5%)	No(\$8,065,166)				
	2018	\$282,312,497	0	8%	\$5,505,877				
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$210,174,768)	Yes(0)	Yes(5%)	No(\$8,065,166)				
	2019	\$298,577,604	0	4%	\$6,896,657				
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$210,174,768)	Yes(0)	Yes(5%)	No(\$8,065,166)				
	2020	\$328,296,876	0	0.95%	\$6,254,848				
	Benchmark Achieved?	No(\$210,174,768)	Yes(0)	Yes(5%)	No(\$8,065,166)				
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$246,302,481)									
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=796)									
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=12%)									
Tenant rent share in dollars (Baseline=\$8,065,166)									

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2014-4 simplified the calculation of Total Tenant Payment (TTP) by removing standard deductions and allowances (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The new calculation allowed the SCCHA to charge a rate between 30% and 35% of the gross monthly income, or \$50, whichever was higher (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This flexibility was needed to reduce program costs as funding was reduced (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 132: MTW Activity 2015-2

Activity 2015-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$22,400)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=691)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=19%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)	0%	Yes(0%)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2015-2 allowed PBV owners and tenants to self-certify the correction of minor HQS deficiencies within the 30-day deadline (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This avoided the need for re-check inspections to reduce costs (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). However, life-threatening deficiencies were still re-checked within 24 hours (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 133: MTW Activity 2015-3

Activity 2015-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=45)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	813	Yes(774)	819	Yes(774)	921	Yes(774)	878	Yes(774)	774	Yes(774)	774	Yes(774)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2015; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2015-3 modified the age to be considered elderly in the PBV program from 62 to 55 to align with local affordable housing developments and increase the number of units available to participating households (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 134: MTW Activity 2016-2

Activity 2016-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$25,400)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=600)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2016; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2016-2 streamlined the PBV competitive selection requirements, and modified HUD’s requirement that forced housing authorities to select proposals within three years to 15 years (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 135: MTW Activity 2017-1

Activity 2017-1	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=1,742)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2017-1 allowed households to keep their current subsidy level when their voucher size changed (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). Under this activity, the new voucher size was not applied until the family moved or the rental market vacancy rate was higher than 5% for six months (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 136: MTW Activity 2017-2

Activity 2017-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=100)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (Baseline=0)	73	No(100)	45	No(100)
Average applicant time on waitlist in months (Baseline=87)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2017-2 implemented the Special Needs Direct Referral (SNDR) program that followed the housing-first model, and served at-risk disabled individuals as well as transition-aged youth (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). These special needs populations were referred directly from the county’s Office of Supportive Housing, and received case management services (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The activity was implemented in fiscal year 2019 (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 137: MTW Activity 2017-3

Activity 2017-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)	633	Yes(276)	462	Yes(276)	299	Yes(276)	62	No(276)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2017; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2018; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2017-3 allowed the SCCHA to provide incentive payments to landlords in the HCV program, with the goal to increase the number of HCV units (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). In addition, this activity allowed for a simplified and expedited process that encouraged landlords to re-rent their units to HCV participants (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 138: MTW Activity 2019-2

Activity 2019-2	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$22,222)	\$25,619	No(\$26,060)	\$30,241	Yes(\$26,060)
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$7,327	Yes(\$5,056)	\$6,015	Yes(\$5,056)
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=232)	356	Yes(268)	322	Yes(268)
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)	4	Yes(4)	4	Yes(4)
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$8,089)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=66)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2019-2 was implemented in fiscal year 2019 and waived the need for a reexamination within 120 days of the Contract of Participation (CoP) effective date for participating households (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity also loosened the employment requirements pertaining to self-sufficiency program completion (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 139: MTW Activity 2019-3

Activity 2019-3	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$750)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=42 minutes per unit)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2019-3 removed the annual redetermination requirement for manufactured homes required by HUD (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). Rent reasonableness reviews were conducted at the time of the new contract, when the owner requested rent changes, and when the tenant made the request (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The goal was to reduce the costs associated with additional reviews (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 140: MTW Activity 2019-4

Activity 2019-4	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$750)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=42 minutes per unit)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2019; Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2019-4 improved customer service and communication by streamlining the lease process (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The SCCHA simplified redundant and



confusing forms to reduce the delays experienced during the completion of the RFTA packet (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 141: MTW Activity 2020-01

Activity 2020-01	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	287	No(300)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2020-01 allowed the SCCCHA to increase the PBV program cap of units under the Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract (CACC) from 20% to 40% (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity aimed to increase the permanently affordable housing inventory by encouraging new development (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 142: MTW Activity 2020-03

Activity 2020-03	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=75)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2020-03 allowed families under-housed or over-housed in the PBV program to remain in their units until a correct sized unit became available, or the rental market vacancy rate dropped below 5% (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 143: MTW Activity 2020-04

Activity 2020-04	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=33)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2020-04 waived the HUD requirement to reduce approved contract rent to the current reasonable rent and instead reviewed rent adjustments based on the trend of FMR (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity was aimed at retaining owners and preserving the affordable housing inventory (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 144: MTW Activity 2020-05

Activity 2020-05	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	31	No(45)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2020-05 modified the regulation prohibiting families from spending over 40% of their monthly income on rent to allow up to 50% (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity was proposed as a technical one-year amendment due to the COVID-19 pandemic and aimed to give families more housing options (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

Table 145: MTW Activity 2020-06

Activity 2020-06	2020	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$376,334)	\$234,882	Yes(\$282,258)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=28,384)	0	Yes(0)
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=19%)	0%	Yes(10%)

Source: Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a.

Activity 2020-06 modified the frequency of periodic unit inspections from biennial to triennial for all MTW participants (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This was done under a technical amendment and allowed the SCCHA to reschedule periodic inspections that were due during the COVID-19 pandemic (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The SCCHA stated that an annual review of this activity would be required to retain its use (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

## Housing Authority of the County of Tulare (HATC)

Table 146: MTW Activity One

Activity One	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(0)	Yes(0)	Yes(0)	Yes(0)	Yes(0)	Yes(0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=1,019)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$45,323)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (Baseline=9%)	21%	19%	18%	20%	11%	9%
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$15,055)	\$31,318	\$30,046	\$28,383	\$28,110	\$26,343	\$25,256
Employed full-time (Baseline=33%)	54%	52%	50%	50%	43%	43%
Employed part-time (Baseline=13%)	31%	30%	32%	33%	39%	14%
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (Baseline=632)	676	629	684	617	705	820

Source: Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020.

Table 147: MTW Activity One

Activity One	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(0)	No(\$416)	Yes(\$190)	Yes(50)	No(25)
	2015	0	\$470	\$424	232	51
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(0)	No(\$416)	Yes(\$190)	Yes(50)	No(25)
	2016	0	\$464	\$432	324	51
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(0)	No(\$416)	Yes(\$190)	Yes(50)	No(25)
	2017	0	\$461	\$425	242	42
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(0)	No(\$416)	Yes(\$190)	Yes(50)	No(25)
	2018	0	\$452	\$427	207	44
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(0)	No(\$416)	Yes(\$190)	Yes(50)	No(25)
	2019	0	\$446	\$428	157	42
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(0)	No(\$416)	Yes(\$190)	Yes(50)	No(25)
	2020	0	\$493	\$457	201	47
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)						
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (Baseline=\$490)						
PHA rental revenue in dollars (Baseline=\$165)						
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (Baseline=0)						
Average applicant time on waitlist in months (Baseline=25)						

Source: Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020.

Activity One attempted to increase administrative cost savings and self-sufficiency by implementing fixed-proration amounts for mixed-family households with ineligible-alien-status family members, requiring Section 8 landlords to use the HUD-model lease, changing the definition of income to include all income in MTW households, and eliminating the UAP by establishing \$0 minimum rent (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). Under this

activity the HATC also implemented a flat medical deduction option, fixed rents for the public-housing program, fixed subsidies for the Section 8 program, and placed a five-year time limit on assistance. In addition, it converted all able-bodied families that received service before May 1999 to programs with fixed rents (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020).

Table 148: MTW Activity Two

Activity Two	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)	15	No(20)	13	No(20)	31	No(20)	20	Yes(20)	32	Yes(20)	39	No(40)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020.

Activity Two aimed to increase the housing choices of program participants by eliminating the 40% rule for families in its income-based program (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020).

Table 149: MTW Activity Four

Activity Four	2020	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(20)	0	Yes(20)	0	Yes(20)	0	Yes(20)	0	Yes(30)
Total cost of task in dollars (Baseline=\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)	\$0	Yes(\$0)
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (Baseline=0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)

Source: Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020.

Activity Four waived the need for a competitive process when the HATC changed residents to project-based Section 8 vouchers at properties it owned (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). This activity also eliminated the 25% limit, and allowed the HATC to project-base units over the previous limit (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020).

Table 150: MTW Activity Five

Activity Five												
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(13)	No(58)	Yes(0)	Yes(\$500,000)							
	2015	62	48	0	\$1,245,400							
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(25)	No(5)	No(0)	Yes(\$500,000)							
	2016	156	0	5	\$18,807,577							
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(25)	No(5)	No(0)	Yes(\$500,000)							
	2017	114	0	5	\$9,858,156							
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(25)	Yes(5)	Yes(0)	Yes(\$500,000)							
	2018	26	10	0	\$2,531,500							
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(25)	Yes(5)	Yes(0)	Yes(\$500,000)							
	2019	51	60	0	\$5,903,000							
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(25)	Yes(5)	Yes(0)	Yes(\$500,000)							
	2020	216	0	0	\$12,007,300							
	Benchmark Achieved?	Yes(25)	Yes(5)	Yes(0)	Yes(\$500,000)							
	Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (Baseline=0)											
	Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (Baseline=0)											
	Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (Baseline=0)											
	Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (Baseline=\$0)											

Source: Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020.

Activity Five authorized the HATC to leverage MTW funds and partner with non-profit agencies to develop additional affordable housing units (Housing Authority of the County of



Tulare, 2020). The funds were used for gap financing, purchasing property, and bridge loans (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020).

Table 151: MTW Activity Six

Activity Six	Benchmark Achieved?	2015	Benchmark Achieved?	2016	Benchmark Achieved?	2017	Benchmark Achieved?	2018	Benchmark Achieved?	2019	Benchmark Achieved?	2020
Average amount in dollars of annual rental revenue from participants affected by Activity Six (Benchmark=\$89,760)	Yes(\$89,760)	\$112,152	No(\$89,760)	\$56,784	No(\$89,760)	\$46,272	No(\$89,760)	\$72,384	No(\$89,760)	\$82,836	Yes(\$89,760)	\$90,420
Average amount in dollars of annual earned income per MTW participant affected by Activity Six (Benchmark=\$3,000)	No(\$3,000)	\$2,173	Yes(\$3,000)	\$3,624	No(\$3,000)	\$1,794	No(\$3,000)	\$2,565	No(\$3,000)	\$2,990	Yes(\$3,000)	\$4,595
Number of households with able bodied member that are employed full-time affected by Activity Six (Benchmark=27)	No(27)	16	No(27)	0	No(27)	0	No(27)	1	No(27)	1	No(27)	2
Number of households with able bodied member that are employed part-time affected by Activity Six (Benchmark=52)	No(52)	39	No(52)	11	No(52)	14	No(52)	16	No(52)	16	No(52)	14
Increase in number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency as a result of this activity (Benchmark=0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0	Yes(0)	0
Number of Public Housing households that have been evicted for non-payment of rent(Benchmark=3)	No(3)	9	Yes(3)	2	Yes(3)	0	Yes(3)	0	Yes(3)	0	Yes(3)	0

Source: Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2015; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2016; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2017; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2018; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2019; Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020.

Activity Six implemented an imputed income of \$10,000 per work-able adult in an elderly or disabled household. This amount was used to calculate the household’s rent portion

(Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). In addition, the HATC identified families using disabled or elderly family members as the head of household to avoid time limits and fixed subsidies (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). Therefore, this activity was implemented to reduce those vulnerabilities, and used the work-able individual's income if it was higher than the imputed income (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020).

## ANALYSIS

### **Oakland Housing Authority**

MTW Activity #06-01: The impact on waitlist times was inconclusive as there were mixed results when analyzing this activity's effect on decreasing waitlist times. OHA successfully minimized processing errors and achieved its benchmark in error rates, which positively contributed to cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #06-02: OHA has met the benchmarks in staff time hours spent on the activity and the total cost of the activity. This activity has shown positive outcomes for cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #06-03: OHA has met the benchmarks in staff time hours spent on the activity and the total cost of the activity. This activity has shown positive outcomes for cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #08-01: In its early years, this activity struggled to meet its three benchmarks measuring housing choice. OHA has improved its completion of benchmark metrics over the years and, in its latest report, has shown success in completing all three measurements of success. This activity was successful in increasing housing choices.

MTW Activity #10-01: MTW Activity #10-01 effectively increased the resources leveraged from 2015 to 2020. By meeting the HUD-defined benchmarks, the OHA achieved its MTW goal of increasing cost-effectiveness and efficiency.

MTW Activity #10-02: MTW Activity #10-02 effectively increased the self-sufficiency of program recipients from fiscal years 2015 to 2020. The activity did this by increasing the

average earned income of program recipients and the agency's rental revenue. The activity also decreased the number of households receiving TANF assistance and the per-unit subsidy costs for program recipients. The OHA met benchmarks in all the reported years for these categories besides reducing per unit subsidy costs, where it showed a general uptrend of success within recent years. The OHA failed to meet the benchmarks for the number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency.

MTW Activity #10-03: Although MTW Activity #10-03 could not meet the benchmarks in agency cost savings and staff time savings, it showed a large reduction from the baseline numbers before implementation. There was insufficient data to analyze success, as the activity was not used for most of the observed period.

MTW Activity #10-05: When analyzing the preservation of housing to increase housing choice, the benchmarks were not met in any of the observed years. This was due to an unusually high benchmark set during the 2010 disposition, and the OHA stated it would be correcting the benchmark the following year (Oakland Housing Authority, 2020). The activity showed mixed results toward self-sufficiency, with success in its earlier years when measuring reductions in the per-unit subsidy costs. Activity #10-05 met the benchmarks in displacement prevention for every year it was implemented, increasing the housing choices of program recipients.

MTW Activity #10-09: MTW Activity #10-09 supported the housing choices of program recipients by meeting the HUD-defined benchmarks relating to waitlist times. The activity also prevented displacement in the observed years, which supported the housing choices of program recipients. The activity did not increase resident mobility, as it did not meet benchmarks in any of the observed years, but it is important to note that the outcome was close to the benchmark. Therefore, this activity may show success regarding resident mobility in future years.

MTW Activity #11-01: MTW Activity #11-01 met the HUD defined benchmarks in displacement prevention annually, with a general downtrend in the number of families that would lose assistance or need to move. This activity also successfully achieved annual benchmarks related to increasing resident mobility. Through displacement prevention and increasing resident mobility, the OHA increased the housing choices of program participants.

MTW Activity #11-02: Activity #11-02 achieved benchmarks in reducing the number of households that would need to move every year since implementation, resulting in an increase in housing choice through displacement prevention, and increasing the number of households able to move to a better unit, so this activity increased resident mobility, which is a component of housing choice. The benchmark for this metric was missed in the most recent year, and the yearly downtrend could be attributed to an increasingly competitive rental market. Although the number of households receiving these services has declined yearly, the HUD-defined benchmarks have been met since implementation, showing that this activity had a positive change. However, the effect is weakening due to market conditions. The activity has also met annual benchmarks for rental revenue since implementation, showing an increase in agency revenue, resulting in increased cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #11-03: MTW Activity #11-03 successfully prevented displacement by meeting benchmarks in recent years. The activity failed to meet HUD-defined benchmarks when creating or preserving housing units, but outcomes have trended positively. The activity also was unable to meet benchmarks in resident mobility, as the number of households able to move to a better unit fluctuated in the observed years. Nevertheless, the number of assisted households has increased over the years despite not meeting the HUD-defined benchmarks. Recently implemented activities that missed benchmarks may meet them soon if positive trends continue.

MTW Activity #11-05: MTW Activity #11-05 only missed benchmarks for its metrics in fiscal year 2015. The following year the benchmarks were revised, and the OHA has exceeded benchmarks since then. The OHA has shown positive outcomes in increasing resident mobility by meeting the HUD-defined benchmarks in the number of households able to move to a better neighborhood due to this activity. The OHA also increased the housing choices of program recipients by increasing the number of recipients affected by this activity in recent years. Activity #11-05 successfully increased the number of households receiving services that support housing choice and self-sufficiency in the last five years, resulting in the completion of two MTW program goals. While the number of TANF recipients decreased over the years, the number of households that transitioned to full self-sufficiency fluctuated due to competitive market conditions. In addition, the average earned income of program recipients trended up in recent years but has not been able to meet the defined benchmarks.

MTW Activity #12-01: This activity did not positively affect displacement prevention and failed to meet HUD benchmarks in preserving housing units. However, this activity successfully created new housing units, as it met its benchmarks up until the COVID-19 pandemic. Resident mobility was also achieved until fiscal year 2020, when the number fell exponentially, likely due to the ongoing pandemic. This was logical ,as residents were less likely to move during shelter in place orders. When analyzing households and their housing choices, this activity met benchmarks in the number of households receiving services, and the number has trended upwards in recent years.

MTW Activity #14-01: There was insufficient data to analyze the effect of biennial reexaminations, but triennial reexaminations increased cost-effectiveness by reducing staff labor hours, resulting in reduced costs. The OHA has consistently met HUD-defined benchmarks in

staff time and cost savings, but this activity has not been effective in increasing rental revenue for the agency. This activity improved recipients' self-sufficiency by increasing average household earned income in the year data was reported, but needed to be researched further to confirm consistency. When it came to decreasing TANF households, this activity did not achieve the HUD defined benchmark, but was very close, as it missed by 3%. This activity showed that alternative recertification schedules could positively impact cost-effectiveness, while its impact on self-sufficiency must be researched further.

MTW Activity #15-01: Activity #15-01 successfully achieved the HUD defined benchmarks in total staff hours used, and total cost of the task every year after the initial implementation year. It is not uncommon for newly implemented activities to miss benchmarks, and the cost of the task has trended downwards, showing significant cost savings. This activity was very successful when measured for cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #15-02: MTW Activity #15-02 showed a trend of utility allowance increasing over the observed years, which correlated with the increased utility costs. The department realized a decrease in cost-effectiveness each year due to the increase in utility costs. The OHA successfully achieved its benchmarks in reducing Utility Reimbursement Payments, showing positive effects of this activity on cost-effectiveness. The activity was very successful in reducing the number of staff hours used, as it reported 0 staff hours used in fiscal year 2020. The activity produced very few errors, which also contributed to cost-effectiveness. Activity #15-02 has shown little success in increasing the amount of rental revenue the agency received. It only showed success in achieving its benchmark for one year and was not consistent in its results.

MTW Activity #17-01: MTW Activity #17-01 was successful in recruiting an increasing number of new landlords every year since it was implemented, and the outcomes achieved their



respective benchmarks annually. The activity also met benchmarks for reducing errors, staff time used, and associated costs in all the observed years. These achievements allowed the OHA to increase its cost-effectiveness, which would not have been possible without MTW Activity #17-01.

### **Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino**

MTW Activity #4: MTW Activity #4 successfully achieved cost and staff time savings in recent years, which improved cost-effectiveness. The missed benchmarks in the early years of implementation could be attributed to increased staff hours used to explain new MTW activities to participants (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). Time savings have trended positively in recent years, and the HACSB expects it to continue to do so in the coming years. This activity also supported self-sufficiency by meeting the benchmarks for increasing the average earned income of households in all observed years. The employment outcomes were inconclusive, and they were affected by other MTW activities.

MTW Activity #5: The HACSB achieved benchmarks regarding staff hours used, activity cost, and errors made in completing the activity every year since 2015. These have all contributed to increased cost-effectiveness. The metric regarding increasing tenant rent share has not been met in the two most recent years, but the outcomes have been quite close to the benchmark.

MTW Activity #7: MTW Activity #7 reduced the number of staff hours used and costs associated with processing voluntary moves for HCV recipients compared to the baseline. The benchmarks were not met because the total number of moves did not meet expectations.

Although the HACSB did not meet the HUD defined benchmarks, this activity positively impacted cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #8: The HACSB achieved the HUD defined benchmarks regarding staff time spent on inbound portability, as well as for the costs associated with inbound portability, in all the observed years. This activity showed consistent success in increasing cost-effectiveness through agency cost savings and staff time savings.

MTW Activity #9: Due to eliminating the EID calculation, no staff time was spent processing EID. There were no associated costs or errors, and the HUD-defined benchmarks were achieved for all metrics in all the observed years. This activity successfully increased cost-effectiveness through staff time savings, agency cost savings, and maintenance of a low error rate.

MTW Activity #10: MTW Activity #10 met the benchmarks for increasing tenant rent share in all the observed years, which increased cost-effectiveness. The average earned income of households affected by this policy met the HUD benchmarks once revised in fiscal year 2018, which showed success in increasing the self-sufficiency of program participants.

MTW Activity #11: MTW Activity #11 met its HUD-defined benchmarks for costs and staff hours used. This activity effectively increased cost-effectiveness, as shown by these two metrics. The HACSB has added an increasing number of housing units year over year and met its benchmarks in recent years, which increased the housing choices of PBV program recipients. This activity was also successful in increasing housing choices by preventing displacement and achieving benchmarks in all the reported years.

MTW Activity #12: MTW Activity #12 only missed its benchmarks for staff hours and cost in fiscal year 2018 due to an increasing number of HCV actions, and was successful in increasing cost-effectiveness for the HACSB (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2018). The activity successfully met benchmarks for resident mobility, as the number of households that would have lost assistance without the activity increased year over year, resulting in an increase in housing choices for program participants. The activity missed its benchmark and showed a negative trend for average HAP cost for MTW units in all observed years. This could be attributed to an increasingly competitive rental housing market.

MTW Activity #13: MTW Activity #13 achieved HUD defined benchmarks in reducing the total cost of inspections, and staff time required to complete those inspections, in all reported years. The activity successfully met the benchmark for reducing and maintaining a low error rate in processing inspections. These achievements all contributed to an increase in cost-effectiveness for the HACSB.

MTW Activity #15: MTW Activity #15 promoted households' self-sufficiency by achieving the HUD-defined benchmarks for average earned income for the Maplewood Homes Public Housing community and inbound portability (port-in) participants. This activity improved residents' self-sufficiency by reducing the percentage of households using inbound portability and receiving TANF. The activity was unsuccessful in achieving the benchmarks for reducing the number of Maplewood Homes households receiving TANF. The HACSB promoted self-sufficiency for port-in households and the Maplewood Homes community by achieving the HUD-defined benchmarks regarding the number of households receiving services provided by this activity. Activity #15 was unsuccessful in achieving HUD's benchmarks regarding the average subsidy amount affected by the policy, and the metrics have shown a negative trend in

the observed years. Self-sufficiency was increased by achieving the benchmark in PHA rental revenue, which showed an increase in tenant rent share. This activity did not meet the benchmark for the number of households transitioning to self-sufficiency in the observed years due to competitive rental housing market conditions. This activity achieved most of the benchmarks regarding employment outcomes, which positively contributed to recipients' self-sufficiency.

MTW Activity #17: MTW Activity #17 successfully achieved the HUD benchmarks for increasing the average tenant rent share for the reported years. This activity resulted in achieving increased cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #18: MTW Activity #18 successfully achieved the benchmark for total costs associated with arbitration in all the observed years. This activity missed benchmarks in fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019 for expenses related to vacancies. The benchmark for this metric was revised in fiscal year 2020, as the HACSB identified increases in vacancies caused by households exercising mobility with tenant-based vouchers (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). This activity successfully minimized the total time to complete the task in all the reported years. By reducing costs and time spent completing this activity, the HACSB could increase cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity #19: MTW Activity #19 increased the earned income of households participating in the FSS program and met the benchmarks for the metric in all the observed years, which promoted the self-sufficiency of program participants. This activity completed the annual benchmarks related to increases in escrow funds, which also promoted the self-sufficiency of program participants. The percentage of households receiving TANF assistance has fluctuated, but met the HUD-defined benchmarks for supporting self-sufficiency. The activity was unable to provide self-sufficiency services to the number of households set by HUD,

and the trend was that the number decreased over the last few years. The amount of subsidy affected by this activity has increased in recent years, which caused benchmarks to be missed in fiscal year 2018 and onwards. This increase could be related to increases in market rents, and failure to meet this benchmark cannot be blamed solely on this activity. This activity successfully increased the tenant rent share and showed a positive trend, achieving benchmarks in fiscal year 2019. Activity #19 struggled to fully transition households to self-sufficiency, as it did not meet the HUD benchmark of one family in most of the observed years. The benchmark was incredibly low, and was barely satisfied in the years it was met. Most benchmarks set for employment status were missed due to a decreasing number of households enrolled in the FSS program.

MTW Activity #20: MTW Activity #20 failed to increase household income to meet benchmarks in most of the observed years. Failure in recent years could be related to an influx of new program participants. This activity had shown success in increasing positive outcomes in employment status for program participants until a large influx happened in fiscal year 2019 (Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino, 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic also resulted in job and income loss, leading to missed benchmarks. The activity showed success in improving the self-sufficiency of program participants by reducing the number of households receiving TANF assistance. The program reached the HUD benchmarks for the number of households receiving services and from the lease assistance program. This activity also successfully transitioned households to self-sufficiency, and showed a strong positive trend in recent years.

MTW Activity #22: MTW Activity #22 failed to meet the benchmarks for money and staff time spent on the task until fiscal year 2019. Both metrics showed a strong positive trend of

decreasing costs and time spent, resulting in improved cost-effectiveness. The low average error rate also contributed to increased cost-effectiveness. This activity achieved all the benchmarks for average earned income of participating households, which promoted the self-sufficiency of households in the program. Activity #22 successfully removed households from the TANF assistance program, which contributed to households' self-sufficiency. This activity was unsuccessful in reducing the amount of HAP subsidy for households in this program, as reductions were expected in fiscal year 2018, but the metrics showed a trend of increasing HAP subsidies, while missing the HUD benchmarks. The activity successfully increased the tenant rent share, and the number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency, as it achieved the benchmarks and promoted self-sufficiency in all observed years.

MTW Activity #23: MTW Activity #23 improved cost-effectiveness by increasing the amount of funds leveraged, and achieved HUD's benchmarks in all reported years. The activity was not expected to transition any households to self-sufficiency. The activity was not expected to decrease waitlist times, and showed a trend of increasing over the past few years due to other conditions. This activity met the benchmarks for the number of households it provided service to, and increased the housing choices of program participants in the reported years.

MTW Activity #24: MTW Activity #24 successfully increased the number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency. The benchmark was missed in fiscal year 2018 but greatly exceeded in all other years.

MTW Activity #25: MTW Activity #25 did not displace any families and met the benchmarks regarding this metric in all reported years. The activity also met the benchmarks for the number of households able to move to a better unit. Success in both metrics showed that this activity increased the housing choices of program participants.

## **San Diego Housing Commission**

MTW Activity 2010-1: MTW Activity 2010-1 achieved the benchmarks set by HUD for cost savings, staff time savings, and reduction in error rate in all reported years. All these metrics contributed to increased cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity 2010-2: MTW Activity 2010-2 achieved the benchmarks set by HUD for cost savings, staff time savings, and reduction in error rate in all reported years. All these metrics contributed to increased cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity 2010-3: MTW Activity 2010-3 successfully achieved HUD benchmarks for cost savings and staff time savings in both reported years. This activity increased cost-effectiveness in income recertification for the elderly and disabled.

MTW Activity 2010-4: MTW Activity 2010-4 increased the number of households able to move to a better neighborhood, and achieved the benchmark in fiscal year 2017 onwards, which increased resident mobility and their housing choices. The activity was also successful in increasing the number of households receiving services that increase housing choice, and the benchmarks were met in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2010-5: MTW Activity 2010-5 achieved benchmarks in cost savings, time savings, reduction in error rate, and increased rental revenue in all reported years. Completion of these benchmarks contributed to an increase in agency cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity 2010-6: MTW Activity 2010-6 achieved benchmarks in cost savings, time savings, reduction in error rate, and increased rental revenue in all reported years. Completion of these benchmarks contributed to an increase in agency cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity 2010-7: MTW Activity 2010-7 achieved the cost-effectiveness benchmarks for money saved, staff time saved, and increase in household contributions from fiscal year 2017 onwards. The metrics showed a positive trend, and only missed benchmarks in the early years, which was expected. Activity 2010-7 showed a positive trend in increasing the average earned income of households, and achieved the benchmarks from fiscal year 2017 onwards, which resulted in increased self-sufficiency. The activity also increased the self-sufficiency of households by achieving benchmarks in all reported years for households removed from the TANF program, and households transitioned to self-sufficiency. This activity showed mixed results in the outcomes of employment status, as the only category that showed constant success was those employed part-time.

MTW Activity 2010-9: MTW Activity 2010-9 achieved the cost-effectiveness benchmarks related to agency cost savings and staff time savings in all reported years. The activity also successfully increased the housing choices of the affected households by achieving the benchmarks for displacement prevention in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2011-1: MTW Activity 2011-1 achieved benchmarks in cost savings, time savings, and reduction in error rate in all reported years. The activity was only used in fiscal years 2015 and 2016. The activity increased the housing choices of households by creating additional housing units.

MTW Activity 2011-2: MTW Activity 2011-2 did not have any associated staff time or monetary costs in all reported years, which resulted in the achievement of benchmarks for cost-effectiveness. The SDHC reported that 247 new housing units were created in fiscal year 2015, which met the benchmark and increased the housing choices of households affected by this policy.



MTW Activity 2011-3: MTW Activity 2011-3 was only successful in achieving the cost-effectiveness benchmarks for staff time savings and cost savings until fiscal year 2016. From fiscal year 2017 onwards, there was a significant increase in PBVs, and moves with a tenant-based voucher after the waiting period (San Diego Housing Commission, 2020). This activity did not increase cost-effectiveness when faced with a large increase in households served, as the benchmarks were not revised.

MTW Activity 2011-4: MTW Activity 2011-4 achieved the benchmark for number of new housing units made available in fiscal year 2017 onwards, which increased the housing choices of program participants. The activity was also successful in achieving the benchmark for the number of housing units preserved in most of the reported years, which also increased the housing choices of program participants.

MTW Activity 2011-5: MTW Activity 2011-5 achieved the benchmarks for staff time savings and cost savings in both reported years. These achievements contributed to increased cost-effectiveness in providing services by the SDHC.

MTW Activity 2011-6: MTW Activity 2011-6 achieved the benchmarks for staff time savings and cost savings in all reported years, which increased cost-effectiveness. The average error rate increased in recent years, and the benchmarks were missed in the last two years. Total household contributions towards housing have increased in recent years, and increased cost-effectiveness occurred by achieving the benchmark in all reported years. This activity also increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for increased agency rental revenue in the reported years.

MTW Activity 2011-7: MTW Activity 2011-7 increased cost-effectiveness by exceeding the benchmark for increasing the amount of funds leveraged in all reported years. The activity also achieved the benchmark for the number of new housing units made available in all reported years, which increased the housing choices of program participants. The benchmarks for number of new housing units preserved and average waitlist time were met in fiscal year 2017 onwards and contributed to an increase in housing choices for program participants. The benchmark for displacement prevention was met in all reported years and increased the housing choices of program participants.

MTW Activity 2011-8: MTW Activity 2011-8 increased cost-effectiveness by meeting the benchmarks for funds leveraged in all reported years. The activity also promoted self-sufficiency by achieving the benchmarks for the increase in household income and the increase in household savings in all reported years. Activity 2011-8 was unable to meet the benchmark for reducing the number of households receiving TANF assistance in all reported years. The number of households receiving services aimed at increasing self-sufficiency has increased in recent years to meet the benchmark in fiscal year 2019. This activity was unable to reduce the per-unit subsidy costs, and the outcomes have been increasing year over year. Total household contributions have increased yearly, and promoted self-sufficiency by achieving the benchmark since fiscal year 2018. In recent years, the number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency increased to meet the benchmark. Activity 2011-8 also increased resident mobility and housing choices, as it met the benchmark for number of households able to move to a better neighborhood in all reported years. The employment outcomes show an uptrend in those employed part-time and in an educational program, but the results overall were mixed and inconclusive.

MTW Activity 2012-1: MTW Activity 2012-1 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving benchmarks in cost savings, time savings, and error rate reduction in all reported years. The agency rental revenue has increased in recent years but has not yet met the HUD benchmark. This activity successfully promoted self-sufficiency by meeting the benchmark for increasing household income in all reported years. Activity 2012-1 promoted self-sufficiency by meeting the benchmark for the average amount of subsidy affected by this program in all reported years. Although the number of families that transitioned to self-sufficiency has increased in recent years, the benchmark was missed in most observed years. This activity successfully increased rental revenue, the amount of funds leveraged, and the number of new housing units made, but the data was not reported in enough years to identify whether the trend continued. The data was not available due to measurement metrics being changed. This activity achieved the benchmark for part-time employment in all reported years, but missed most benchmarks for all other employment outcomes.

MTW Activity 2012-2: MTW Activity 2012-2 failed to meet cost savings and staff time savings benchmarks after fiscal year 2016. The activity satisfied the benchmark for error rate in all reported years, but the error rate had less of an impact on cost-effectiveness than staff time or total cost savings.

MTW Activity 2012-3: MTW Activity 2012-3 increased cost-effectiveness by meeting agency cost savings and staff time savings benchmarks in all reported years. The activity also promoted the self-sufficiency of program participants by achieving the benchmark for increasing household income in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2013-1: MTW Activity 2013-1 promoted self-sufficiency by increasing the average earned income of households and meeting the benchmark in recent years. The

activity was unsuccessful in achieving the benchmark for the reduction in per-unit subsidy cost in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2013-2: MTW Activity 2013-2 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for agency cost savings, staff time savings, error rate reduction, and household contributions for most of the reported years. The activity promoted self-sufficiency by increasing the average household income and savings, and the benchmark was met in all reported years. Activity 2013-2 was unable to reduce the number of households receiving TANF, and the number has trended higher in recent years. This activity successfully increased the number of households receiving self-sufficiency services, and met the benchmark in all reported years. The activity did not successfully reduce the per-unit subsidy costs, as it missed benchmarks in most of the reported years. The total household contribution benchmark was also met in all reported years, which increased rental revenue and promoted the self-sufficiency of program participants. The activity did not show consistent results in transitioning families to complete self-sufficiency. Activity 2013-2 achieved the benchmark for part-time employment in all reported years, but missed most benchmarks for all other employment outcomes.

MTW Activity 2013-3: MTW Activity 2013-3 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost savings, staff time savings, and reduction in error rate for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2013-4: MTW Activity 2013-4 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years. This activity provided savings by eliminating the research and recordkeeping needed before implementation.

MTW Activity 2013-6: MTW Activity 2013-6 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings from fiscal year 2016 onwards. The activity promoted self-sufficiency by meeting the benchmark for the number of households receiving services in all reported years. The benchmark for the reduction in the average amount of subsidy affected by this policy was not met in any of the observed years. The number of households that transitioned to full self-sufficiency achieved the benchmark in all reported years. This activity was also successful in increasing the housing choices of program participants by exceeding the benchmark for number of new housing units made available in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2014-2: MTW Activity 2014-2 failed to meet the benchmark for reduction in the average amount of subsidy affected by this policy in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2015-1: MTW Activity 2015-1 increased the housing choices of HCV recipients by increasing the number of households able to move to a better neighborhood year over year, and met the benchmark in recent years.

MTW Activity 2016-1: MTW Activity 2016-1 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmark for the amount of funds leveraged in all reported years. The activity promoted the self-sufficiency of program participants by increasing the household income year over year, and meeting the benchmark in most of the observed years. This activity did not show consistent success when measuring the amount of household savings, and more data is needed, as the first benchmark success was in fiscal year 2020. The benchmarks for families receiving TANF assistance and self-sufficiency services were not met in any of the reported years. Total household contribution has been declining and barely met the benchmark in fiscal year 2018. The activity failed to show positive trends in the number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency or were able to move to a better neighborhood. There was not enough PHA rental

revenue data to show a trend or impact. The employment outcomes from this activity were mixed, and most benchmarks were missed.

MTW Activity 2016-2: MTW Activity 2016-2 successfully achieved the benchmark for amount of funds leveraged in all the reported years, which increased the agency's cost-effectiveness. The activity promoted self-sufficiency by achieving the benchmarks for the number of participants enrolled, and the number of households receiving services, in all the reported years. The number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency has grown year over year and met the benchmarks in recent years.

MTW Activity 2016-3: MTW Activity 2016-3 failed to meet the benchmark for number of beds created in its first year of implementation. This activity was implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic, which the SDHC responded to by creating many temporary beds, and increasing housing choice by greatly exceeding the benchmark for the number of households receiving services.

MTW Activity 2017-1: MTW Activity 2017-1 could not achieve the benchmark for amount of funds leveraged in any of the reported years, but the amount had been increasing. This activity did not meet the benchmarks for number of households receiving services or transitioning to self-sufficiency. The housing choices of program participants were increased as the number of households able to move to a better neighborhood met the benchmark in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2018-1: MTW Activity increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for staff time savings and agency cost savings for all reported years. The SDHC achieved most of the benchmarks for error rate and household contributions, which further

increased the agency's cost-effectiveness. The average earned income achieved the benchmark in most of the reported years, and the missed benchmark in 2020 may be due to factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic, as the amount dropped significantly. The activity did not achieve most of the benchmarks for households receiving TANF assistance, or for services aimed at increasing self-sufficiency. The average subsidy was not reduced to meet the benchmark in any of the observed years. This activity increased the total household contributions and met the benchmarks in all reported years, which promoted self-sufficiency. The number of households that fully transitioned to self-sufficiency has dropped in recent years and missed the benchmarks. This activity failed to meet the benchmarks for almost all the employment outcomes.

MTW Activity 2020-1: MTW Activity 2020-1 successfully increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmarks for the number of households receiving services and number of households able to move to a better neighborhood. The activity did not reduce the total cost to meet the benchmark in its first year of implementation. The SDHC achieved the benchmark for staff time savings and maintaining a low error rate, which increased the agency's cost-effectiveness.

### **Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo**

MTW Activity 2000-3: MTW Activity 2000-3 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmarks for number of households able to move to a better neighborhood in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2009-2: MTW Activity 2009-2 increased the average earned income of participating households year over year and achieved the benchmarks in recent years. The average amount of household savings satisfied benchmarks in all the reported years. The number

of households receiving TANF assistance increased every year, and did not meet the benchmark after fiscal year 2015. This activity met the benchmark for the number of households receiving services in all reported years. The average subsidy per household increased as rents increased, and the benchmark was missed in most reported years. This activity successfully achieved the benchmark for the number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency in all reported years. All these completed benchmarks contributed to an increase in the self-sufficiency of participating households.

MTW Activity 2010-6: MTW Activity 2010-6 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving staff time savings and cost savings benchmarks in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2010-7: MTW Activity 2010-7 did not meet the benchmark for the total cost of income calculation after fiscal year 2015. Failure to decrease the cost of the task was likely due to increases in personnel costs and the number of vouchers awarded (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). This activity successfully increased cost-effectiveness, as staff time used and the reduction in error rate met the benchmarks in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2010-8: MTW Activity 2010-8 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks in total costs and staff time used for all reported years. The activity also increased cost-effectiveness by meeting the benchmark for reducing error rate in all years after fiscal year 2015.

MTW Activity 2010-9: MTW Activity 2010-9 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years. This activity also increased cost-effectiveness by meeting the benchmarks for error rate and household contributions in all



reported years. The average earned income of households did not increase to meet the benchmark in most observed years. The number of households receiving TANF assistance decreased each year and achieved benchmarks in all reported years, promoting program participants' self-sufficiency. The number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency increased each year and met the benchmark in all reported years, which promoted the self-sufficiency of program participants.

MTW Activity 2010-10: MTW Activity 2010-10 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks in cost savings, staff time savings, and reduction in error rate for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2011-15: The total cost of this task would have achieved the benchmarks for cost-effectiveness if employee salary and benefits costs did not increase (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). This activity increased cost-effectiveness by meeting the benchmarks for staff time savings and reduction in error rate for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2011-16: The HACSM did not collect cost and staff time savings data when implementing Activity 2011-16 because it did not expect any savings (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020). The activity has not achieved cost or staff time savings. However, this activity successfully prevented displacement, as no households lost assistance due to this activity in any of the reported years, increasing housing choices of program participants.

MTW Activity 2011-17: MTW Activity 2011-17 achieved the benchmark for average applicant wait time in all reported years, resulting in an increase of housing choices for program participants.

MTW Activity 2011-18: MTW Activity 2011-18 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks in cost savings, staff time savings, and reduction in error rate for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2011-19: MTW activity 2011-19 increased cost-effectiveness and achieved the benchmarks in cost savings and staff time savings in fiscal year 2015 when it was used.

MTW Activity 2011-27: MTW Activity 2011-27 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of households receiving services in all reported years. In addition, this activity promoted self-sufficiency by meeting the benchmarks for average earned income and the number of households receiving TANF assistance in all observed years. The number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency was only reported in fiscal year 2020 and satisfied the benchmark.

MTW Activity 2012-21: Although MTW Activity 2012-21 missed the benchmark for total household contributions towards housing in most of the reported years, the amount increased to meet the benchmark in fiscal year 2020. The data showed an exponential increase in household contributions, which helped increase the agency's cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity 2012-23: MTW Activity 2012-23 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmarks for average wait times in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2012-24: MTW Activity 2012-24 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmarks for average wait times in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2012-26: MTW Activity 2012-26 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of new housing units built in

all reported years. The activity failed to meet most of the benchmarks for number of housing units preserved by this activity. Cost-effectiveness increased as the HACSM successfully leveraged large amounts of funds, and only missed benchmarks in the years it was working with little funding.

MTW Activity 2013-28: MTW Activity 2013-28 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for staff time savings, cost savings, and error rate in all reported years. This activity promoted self-sufficiency by meeting the earned income and savings benchmarks in all reported years. The activity increased the positive outcomes in employment status and met the benchmarks for all employment metrics in all reported years. The benchmark for reducing the number of households receiving TANF assistance was met in all reported years, which promoted the self-sufficiency of households. No households transitioned to complete self-sufficiency. None were expected to, as the households paid a flat rent instead of exiting the program (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2017). Activity 2013-28 promoted self-sufficiency by reducing the per-unit subsidy costs for participants, and met the benchmark in all reported years. The HACSM also promoted self-sufficiency by increasing the rental revenue and meeting the benchmark in all observed years.

MTW Activity 2014-29: MTW Activity 2014-29 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmark for rental revenue in all reported years, except for fiscal year 2020, where the decrease was due to a reduction in number of households claiming deductions (Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo, 2020).

MTW Activity 2015-30: MTW Activity 2015-30 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost savings, staff time savings, and error rate in all reported years.

The total household contributions towards housing increased every year and achieved the benchmark in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2015-32: MTW Activity 2015-32 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2015-34: MTW Activity 2015-34 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmark for cost savings in both reported years.

MTW Activity 2015-35: The benchmark of the number of new housing units built was met in all reported years, and increased the housing choices of program participants. The average applicant wait time met the benchmark in all reported years and increased the housing choices of participating households. The number of households able to move to a better neighborhood met all benchmarks, and increased the housing choices of program participants. The number of households receiving services also satisfied all benchmarks, and increased the housing choices of participating households.

### **Santa Clara County Housing Authority**

MTW Activity 2009-1: MTW Activity 2009-1 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years. The activity failed to meet the benchmark for increasing tenant rent share in all observed years. The average earned income of households failed to meet most benchmarks, but the amount has shown a positive trend, with some benchmark achievements in the two most recent years. This activity promoted self-sufficiency by meeting all the benchmarks for reducing the number of households receiving TANF assistance. However, the number of households that transitioned to full self-sufficiency

did not meet the benchmark in any reported year, which is likely due to the very high cost of rental housing in the county, which is home to San Jose.

MTW Activity 2009-2: MTW Activity 2009-2 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years. Without this activity, the cost to process these documents would be at least \$1,222 every year.

MTW Activity 2009-5: MTW Activity 2009-5 increased the housing choices of participating households by removing the need to wait, and achieved the benchmark in all reported years. This activity increased housing choices by increasing the number of households able to move to a better neighborhood each year, and achieved the benchmark in fiscal year 2020. The number of households receiving housing choice services followed the same trend and increased the housing choices of participating households.

MTW Activity 2009-8: MTW Activity 2009-8 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2009-9: MTW Activity 2009-9 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2009-11: MTW Activity 2009-11 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of households that would lose assistance in all reported years. This activity has allowed the SCCHA to prevent the displacement of families and the loss of 506 project-based units since implementation.

MTW Activity 2009-13: MTW Activity 2009-13 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in all reported years. If this activity

were not implemented, the costs associated with managing two waiting lists would have been at least \$8,325.

MTW Activity 2009-14: MTW Activity 2009-14 failed to achieve most of the cost savings benchmarks, likely due to the costly rental market and low inventory. The outcome of this activity relied on the rental market, and the positive effects felt may never outweigh the adverse effects of the competitive local rental housing market.

MTW Activity 2010-2: MTW Activity 2010-2 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost savings, staff time savings, and error rate for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2010-3: MTW Activity 2010-3 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the cost savings and time savings benchmarks for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2010-4: MTW Activity 2010-4 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the cost savings and time savings benchmarks for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2011-1: MTW Activity 2011-1 increased the housing choices of participants by preventing displacement and achieving the benchmark in all reported years. The activity was also successful in increasing the housing choices of households by moving them to better neighborhoods.

MTW Activity 2011-2: MTW Activity 2011-2 did not cost the SCCHA any money and achieved cost-effectiveness by eliminating the unnecessary need to send documents to HUD. There was a savings of \$1,621 from the implementation of this activity.

MTW Activity 2012-2: MTW Activity 2012-2 increased cost-effectiveness by meeting the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings in most of the reported years. The number of PBV

move-out caseloads increased in recent years, and the significant increase caused this activity to miss the recent benchmarks.

MTW Activity 2012-3: MTW Activity 2012-3 did not show consistent success in leveraging funds. The activity also failed to meet the benchmark for the number of new housing units built. However, the SCCHA projected that they would achieve both 5-year benchmarks after completion of all development projects currently in its pipeline (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

MTW Activity 2012-4: MTW Activity 2012-4 did not achieve most benchmarks for all reported metrics. The SCCHA anticipated achieving these benchmarks once the work was completed on its planned housing projects (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

MTW Activity 2013-1: MTW Activity 2013-1 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost savings, staff time savings, and reduction in error rate for all reported years. The tenant rent share showed a positive uptrend but failed to meet the HUD benchmark in any reported years.

MTW Activity 2014-4: MTW Activity 2014-4 was unable to meet most benchmarks for total cost savings due to increased HAP payments stemming from the competitive rental market and larger number of rent adjustments (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The activity increased cost-effectiveness by meeting the benchmark for staff time savings in all reported years. This activity also increased cost-effectiveness by reducing the average error rate and achieving the benchmark in recent years, with a significant reduction from the baseline. The tenant rent share did not increase to meet the HUD defined benchmark in any reported year.

MTW Activity 2015-2: MTW Activity 2015-2 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost savings, staff time savings, and reduction in error rate for all reported years.

MTW Activity 2015-3: MTW Activity 2015-3 achieved the benchmarks for number of households that would lose assistance and increased the housing choices of households by preventing displacement. In addition, the activity increased the housing choices of households by achieving the benchmark for number of households able to move to a better neighborhood in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2016-2: MTW Activity 2016-2 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost savings and staff time savings in all reported years.

MTW Activity 2017-1: MTW Activity 2017-1 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of households prevented from losing assistance or being displaced.

MTW Activity 2017-2: MTW Activity 2017-2 increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of households that would need to move and prevented displacement. The activity also increased the housing choices of households by removing the need to wait on a waitlist. This activity has increased the number of households receiving services that increase housing choice every year since implementation, but the benchmark has not been met yet.

MTW Activity 2017-3: MTW Activity 2017-3 increased the housing choices of HCV recipients by achieving the benchmark for the number of housing units preserved in most of the



reported years. The number has increased each year and only missed the benchmark in its first year of implementation.

MTW Activity 2019-2: MTW Activity 2019-2 showed mixed results on the average earned income of households affected by this policy, which could be blamed on losses in income from the COVID-19 pandemic (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). This activity promoted self-sufficiency by achieving the benchmarks for the number of households that received services, and for the number of households that transitioned to full self-sufficiency. The activity increased households' savings and met the benchmarks, which also promoted self-sufficiency. Activity 2019-2 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the cost and staff time savings benchmarks in both reported years.

MTW Activity 2019-3: MTW Activity 2019-3 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings every year since implementation.

MTW Activity 2019-4: MTW Activity 2019-4 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the benchmarks for cost and staff time savings every year since implementation.

MTW Activity 2020-01: MTW Activity 2020-01 failed to meet the benchmark for increasing the number of households able to move to a better neighborhood in its first year of implementation. Failure to meet the benchmark was not concerning as it was missed by under 5%, and the activity was implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic when changing homes was difficult.

MTW Activity 2020-03: MTW Activity 2020-03 increased the housing choices of PBV program participants, as it achieved the benchmark in its initial year of implementation during the COVID-19 pandemic.

MTW Activity 2020-04: MTW Activity 2020-04 increased the housing choices of households by achieving the benchmark for displacement prevention in its initial year of implementation.

MTW Activity 2020-05: MTW Activity 2020-05 was implemented in the last three months of fiscal year 2020 and did not reflect a full year of activity (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a). The SCCHA projected that it would exceed the benchmark with a full year of data (Santa Clara County Housing Authority, 2020a).

MTW Activity 2020-06: MTW Activity 2020-06 increased cost-effectiveness by achieving all the benchmarks for cost savings, staff time savings, and error rate of unit inspections.

### **Housing Authority of the County of Tulare**

MTW Activity One: MTW Activity One increased cost-effectiveness by achieving the staff time savings and cost savings benchmarks in all reported years. The average error rate increased likely due to staff adjusting to the implementation of new software, and did not meet the benchmark in any of the reported years. Activity One met the benchmark for increased earned income of households in all reported years, which promoted the self-sufficiency of households. The activity achieved the benchmarks for positive outcomes in employment status for full-time and part-time employment in all reported years. The benchmark for the number of families receiving TANF services was not met due to the inadequate methodology used (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). A percentage calculation showed a 25% decrease in households receiving TANF services, which positively influenced household self-sufficiency. The HATC did not expect to report any statistically significant data for the number of

households receiving services aimed at increasing self-sufficiency (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). This activity was not designed to significantly impact the reduction of Section 8 subsidy, and missed the benchmarks due to payment standards increasing yearly with the rental market at a higher rate (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). Activity One promoted self-sufficiency by achieving all the benchmarks for increasing rental revenue. This activity promoted self-sufficiency by exceeding the benchmark for the number of families that transitioned to complete self-sufficiency in all reported years. The average applicant wait time missed the benchmark every year due to a large influx of applicants (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020).

MTW Activity Two: MTW Activity Two failed to meet most benchmarks for the number of households able to move to a better neighborhood. The activity did have a positive effect from the baseline and likely missed the benchmark due to FMR increasing and utilization of this activity dropping (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020).

MTW Activity Four: MTW Activity Four increased housing choices for program participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of households that lost assistance. This activity displaced no families. This activity was not used to project-base any Section 8 HCV since 2011 and therefore had no staff time or monetary costs anticipated.

MTW Activity Five: MTW Activity Five increased the housing choices of program participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of additional housing units built in all reported years. The activity increased the housing choices of participating households by achieving most of the HUD benchmarks for the number of housing units preserved. The metric of 0 in fiscal year 2020 achieved the benchmark because there were no opportunities to preserve existing affordable housing units (Housing Authority of the County of Tulare, 2020). The

benchmark for the number of households that would lose assistance was achieved in most years and increased the housing choices of program participants. The amount of funds leveraged has greatly increased each year, and exceeded the HUD benchmark and increased agency cost-effectiveness.

MTW Activity Six: MTW Activity Six failed to achieve the benchmarks for annual revenue in most of the reported years. The activity increased the earned income of program participants each year and achieved the benchmark in fiscal year 2020, which showed a positive impact on the self-sufficiency of households. The employment outcomes did not achieve HUD's benchmarks in any reported years. This activity was not designed to transition families to complete self-sufficiency and met the anticipated benchmarks. Activity Six increased the housing choices of participants by achieving the benchmark for the number of households that were evicted in most of the reported years, and reducing it to 0 in recent years.

## **Conclusion**

Analysis of individual PHAs in California that participated in the MTW program showed great success in meeting the goals of increasing administrative cost-effectiveness, promoting tenant self-sufficiency, and expanding participants' housing choices from 2015 to 2020. Each PHA used a mixture of MTW activities to achieve the three goals shown in Table 3, as some activities were specifically tailored to achieve some but not all of the MTW objectives. Each of the six California PHAs continues to participate in the MTW program.

The analysis of the various strategies used by the six PHAs shows that while the goals were set with bounded rationality, constraints and unexpected externalities impacted the ability of the PHAs to manage outcomes. The primary constraint in California is the very high cost of rental housing in the metropolitan areas of the state. As discussed in the Background, low income residents do not have enough income to afford market rate rental units, thus making their exit from supported housing unlikely. Although self-sufficiency is a worthy goal, and the FSS program is well designed, the cost constraints in the California housing market make exiting the HCV program unlikely for most metropolitan area residents. Tulare's greater success with exiting tenants validates this analysis.

The greatest externality during this period was the international COVID-19 pandemic. Stay at home orders were issued, so people could not go to work. MTW programs that intended to enhance self-sufficiency were thwarted by the shutdown of most of the US economy for weeks in early 2020 (Hansen, 2020), followed by a slow recovery, as disease variations caused waves of illness, even after vaccines were widely administered (Katella, 2022). The pandemic

was an unexpected policy impact that made some MTW goals impossible for more than two years, as the disease variants continued to arrive.

Even with the constraints and externality, the MTW program had significant successes, as cataloged in the Analysis section. All PHAs that face difficulty administering programs under HUD's tight regulations in competitive rental markets should consider adopting the MTW program to gain greater efficiency for the PHA and better outcomes for tenants.

## References

- Aurand, A., Emmanuel, D., Threet, D., Rafi, I., & Yentel, D. (2021). *A Shortage of Affordable Homes*. National Low Income Home Coalition.  
[https://reports.nlihc.org/sites/default/files/gap/Gap-Report\\_2021.pdf](https://reports.nlihc.org/sites/default/files/gap/Gap-Report_2021.pdf)
- Bellisario, J., Covert, A., Sciaruto, A., & Lopez, E. (2021). *Bay Area Homelessness New Urgency, New Solutions*. Bay Area Council Economic Institute.  
<http://www.bayareaeconomy.org/files/pdf/HomelessnessReportJune2021.pdf>
- Buron, L., Vandawalker, M., & Morrill, T. (2017, July 25). *Testing Performance Measures for the MTW Program*. Housing Center. [https://www.housingcenter.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/testing\\_performance\\_measures\\_for\\_the\\_mtw\\_program.pdf](https://www.housingcenter.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/testing_performance_measures_for_the_mtw_program.pdf)
- California Department of Fair Employment and Housing. (2020). *Source of Income FAQ*.  
[https://www.dfeh.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2020/02/SourceofIncomeFAQ\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.dfeh.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2020/02/SourceofIncomeFAQ_ENG.pdf)
- City of Alameda. (2022). *Family Self-Sufficiency Program*. Housing Authority.  
[http://www.alamedahsg.org/housing\\_services/voucher\\_program/family\\_self-sufficiency\\_program\\_fss#:~:text=The%20Family%20Self%20Sufficiency%20\(FSS,year%20personal%20commitment%20by%20participants](http://www.alamedahsg.org/housing_services/voucher_program/family_self-sufficiency_program_fss#:~:text=The%20Family%20Self%20Sufficiency%20(FSS,year%20personal%20commitment%20by%20participants)
- Cohen, O. (2020, April 7). *The Role of HCVs in Addressing America's Rental Housing Crisis*. Housing Matters. <https://housingmatters.urban.org/articles/role-housing-choice-vouchers-addressing-americas-rental-housing-crisis>
- Collyer, S., Wimer, C., Curran, M., Friedman, K., Hartley, R., Harris, D., & Hinton, A. (2020, October 7). *Housing Vouchers and Tax Credits*. Center on Poverty and Social Policy.

<https://www.povertycenter.columbia.edu/publication/2020/policy-proposal-housing-vouchers>

Congressional Research Service. (2014, February 7). *An Overview of the Section 8 Housing Programs: HCVs and Project-Based Rental Assistance*. Every CRS Report.

<https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RL32284.html>

Dastrup, S., Finkel, M., Burnett, K., & Sousa, T. D. (2018). Small Area Fair Market Rent Demonstration Evaluation: Final Report. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3615783>

Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2020). *HCV (HCV) Success Rate*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/IMPROVSUCCESSRATES.PDF>

Esajian, J. (2020, November 27). *Highest Rent In The US By City 2020*. FortuneBuilders.

<https://www.fortunebuilders.com/top-10-u-s-cities-with-the-highest-rents/>

Finkel, M., Khadduri, J., Main, V., Pistilli, L., Solari, C., Winkel, K., & Wood, M. (2003). *Costs and Utilization in the HCV Program*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban

Development. <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/Publications/PDF/utilization.pdf>

Fischer, W. (2017, October 30). *New Report Reinforces Concerns About HUD's Moving to Work Demonstration*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

<https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/new-report-reinforces-concerns-about-huds-moving-to-work-demonstration>

Fischer, W. (2021, May 28). *Rental Markets Can Absorb Many Additional Housing Vouchers*.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. <https://www.cbpp.org/blog/rental-markets-can-absorb-many-additional-housing-vouchers>



Fischer, W., Acosta, S., & Gartland, E. (2021, May 13). *More Housing Vouchers: Most Important Step to Help More People Afford Stable Homes*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. <https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/more-housing-vouchers-most-important-step-to-help-more-people-afford-stable-homes>

Freeman, L. (2011). *The Impact of Source of Income Laws on Voucher Utilization and Locational Outcomes Assisted Housing Research Cadre Report*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. [https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/freeman\\_impactlaws\\_assistedhousingrcr06.pdf](https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/freeman_impactlaws_assistedhousingrcr06.pdf)

Ghaffary, S. (2019, March 19). *Even tech workers can't afford to buy homes in San Francisco*. Vox. <https://www.vox.com/2019/3/19/18256378/tech-worker-afford-buy-homes-san-francisco-facebook-google-uber-lyft-housing-crisis-programmers>

Glynn, C., Byrne, T. H., & Culhane, D. P. (2021). Inflection points in community-level homeless rates. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-aos1414>

Hansen, L. (2020, March 15). Coronavirus: Newsom asks Californians 65 and older to stay home, bars and nightclubs to close. *Mercury News*. <https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/03/15/coronavirus-newsom-calls-for-bars-nightclub-to-close-across-california/>

Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles. (2021). *About Section 8*. <http://home.hacla.org/abouts8>Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino. (2015). *2015 Moving to Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/SANBERNARDINOFY2015.PDF>

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino. (2016). *2016 Moving to Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanbernardinoFY16Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino. (2017). *2017 Moving to Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanBernardinoFY17Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino. (2018). *2018 Moving to Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanBernardinoFY18Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino. (2019). *2019 Moving to Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanBernardinoFY19Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino. (2020). *2020 Moving to Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanBernardinoFY20Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo. (2015). *FY 2015 Moving To Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/SANMATEO2015REPORT.PDF>

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo. (2016). *FY 2016 Moving To Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SANMATEOFY16Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo. (2017). *FY 2017 Moving To Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SANMATEOFY17Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo. (2018). *FY 2018 Moving To Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanMateoFY18Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo. (2019). *FY 2019 Moving To Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanMateoFY19Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo. (2020). *FY 2020 Moving To Work Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanMateoFY20Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare. (2015). *Fiscal Year 2015 Moving to Work Report*. HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/TULARE2015REPORT.PDF>

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare. (2016). *Fiscal Year 2016 Moving to Work Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/TULAREFY16REPORT.PDF>

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare. (2017). *Fiscal Year 2017 Moving to Work Report*. HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/TulareFY17Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare. (2018). *Fiscal Year 2018 Moving to Work Report*. HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/TulareFY18Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare. (2019). *Fiscal Year 2019 Moving to Work Report*. HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/TulareFY19Report.pdf>

Housing Authority of the County of Tulare. (2020). *Fiscal Year 2020 Moving to Work Report*.

HUD.gov. Housing Authority of the County of Tulare

Katella, K. (2022). Omicron, Delta, Alpha, and More: What To Know About the Coronavirus

Variants. *Yale Medicine*. April 20. <https://www.yalemedicine.org/news/covid-19-variants-of-concern-omicron>

Mazzara, A. (2021, May 11). *Expanding Housing Vouchers Would Cut Poverty and Reduce*

*Racial Disparities*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

<https://www.cbpp.org/blog/expanding-housing-vouchers-would-cut-poverty-and-reduce-racial-disparities>

Mazzara, A., & Knudsen, B. (2019, January 3). *Where Families with Children Use Housing*

*Vouchers*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

<https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/where-families-with-children-use-housing-vouchers>

Mcbain, R., Ward, J., & Hunter, S. (2021). *Transforming the HCV System in California a Path to*

*Universal Housing? Perspective Expert Insights on a Timely Policy Issue*. RAND Corporation.

[https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PEA1300/PEA1387-1/RAND\\_PEA1387-1.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PEA1300/PEA1387-1/RAND_PEA1387-1.pdf)

Metzger, M. W. (2014). The reconcentration of poverty: Patterns of housing voucher use, 2000

to 2008. *Housing Policy Debate*, 24(3), 544–567.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2013.876437>

Novogradac. (2016, January 6). *About the LIHTC*. [https://www.novoco.com/resource-](https://www.novoco.com/resource-centers/affordable-housing-tax-credits/lihtc-basics/about-lihtc)

[centers/affordable-housing-tax-credits/lihtc-basics/about-lihtc](https://www.novoco.com/resource-centers/affordable-housing-tax-credits/lihtc-basics/about-lihtc)Oakland Housing

- Authority. (2015). *Fiscal Year 2015 MTW Annual Report*. HUD.gov.  
<https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/OAKLAND2015REPORT.PDF>
- Oakland Housing Authority. (2016). *Fiscal Year 2016 MTW Annual Report*. HUD.gov.  
<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/OAKLANDFY16REPORT.pdf>
- Oakland Housing Authority. (2017). *Fiscal Year 2017 MTW Annual Report*. HUD.gov.  
<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/OaklandFY17Report.pdf>
- Oakland Housing Authority. (2018). *Fiscal Year 2018 MTW Annual Report*. HUD.gov.  
<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/OaklandFY18Report.pdf>
- Oakland Housing Authority. (2019). *Fiscal Year 2019 MTW Annual Report*. HUD.gov.  
<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/OaklandFY19Report.pdf>
- Oakland Housing Authority. (2020). *Fiscal Year 2020 MTW Annual Report*. HUD.gov.  
<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/OaklandFY20Report.pdf>
- Oliva, A. (2021, June 9). *Why Expanding HCVs Is Essential to Ending Homelessness*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. <https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/why-expanding-housing-choice-vouchers-is-essential-to-ending-homelessness>
- Pendall, R. (2000). Why voucher and certificate users live in distressed neighborhoods. *Housing Policy Debate*, 11(4), 881–910. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2000.9521391>
- Rent Café. (2022a). San Francisco Rental Market Trends. <https://www.rentcafe.com/average-rent-market-trends/us/ca/san-francisco/>
- Rent Café. (2022b). San Jose Rental Market Trends. <https://www.rentcafe.com/average-rent-market-trends/us/ca/san-jose/>
- Rice, D. (2019, March 4). *Agencies Generally Use All Available Voucher Funding to Help Families Afford Housing*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

<https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/agencies-generally-use-all-available-voucher-funding-to-help-families-afford>

San Diego Housing Commission. (2015). *Moving To Work Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2015*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/SANDIEGO2015REPORT.PDF>

San Diego Housing Commission. (2016). *Moving To Work Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2016*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanDiegoFY16REPORT.pdf>

San Diego Housing Commission. (2017). *Moving To Work Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2017*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SANDIEGOFY17report.pdf>

San Diego Housing Commission. (2018). *Moving To Work Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2018*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanDiegoFY18Report.pdf>

San Diego Housing Commission. (2019). *Moving To Work Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2019*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanDiegoFY19Report.pdf>

San Diego Housing Commission. (2020). *Moving To Work Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2020*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SanDiegoFY20Report.pdf>

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2015). *Moving to Work (MTW) FY 2015 Annual Report*.

HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/SANTACLARA2015REPORT.PDF>

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2016). *Moving to Work (MTW) FY 2016 Annual Report*.

HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SantaClaraFY16Report.pdf>

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2017). *Moving to Work (MTW) FY 2017 Annual Report*.

HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SantaClaraFY17Report.pdf>

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2018). *Moving to Work (MTW) FY 2018 Annual Report*.

HUD.gov. <https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SantaClaraFY18Report.pdf>

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2019). *Moving to Work (MTW) FY 2019 Annual Report*. In *HUD.gov*.

[https://www.scchousingauthority.org/assets/1/6/Moving\\_to\\_Work\\_FY2019\\_Annual\\_Report.final.HUD\\_Response.Blackline.pdf](https://www.scchousingauthority.org/assets/1/6/Moving_to_Work_FY2019_Annual_Report.final.HUD_Response.Blackline.pdf)

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2020a). *Moving to Work (MTW) FY 2020 Annual Report*. HUD.gov.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SantaClaraFY20Report.pdf>

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2020b, April 8). *FY2021 Moving to Work Annual Plan*.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

<https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/PIH/documents/SantaClaraFY21PlanAmendment.pdf>

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2021a). *Section 8 Program Temporary Policy Changes*

*During COVID-19 Crisis*. [https://www.scchousingauthority.org/assets/1/6/COVID-19\\_Temporary\\_Policy\\_Changes.pdf](https://www.scchousingauthority.org/assets/1/6/COVID-19_Temporary_Policy_Changes.pdf)

Santa Clara County Housing Authority. (2021b, June 3). *Agenda Board of Commissioners Regular Meeting*. SCCHA Board Agendas and Meeting Minutes.

[http://hacsc.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=hacsc\\_5d7a3689e917aec093c01dcedbae55ec.pdf&view=1](http://hacsc.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=hacsc_5d7a3689e917aec093c01dcedbae55ec.pdf&view=1)

- Scally, C., Gold, A., & Dubois, N. (2018). *The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit How It Works and Who It Serves*. Urban Institute.  
[https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/98758/lithc\\_how\\_it\\_works\\_and\\_who\\_it\\_serves\\_final\\_2.pdf](https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/98758/lithc_how_it_works_and_who_it_serves_final_2.pdf)
- Sylvia, R. D., & Sylvia, K. M. (2012). *Program planning and evaluation for the public manager*. Waveland Press.
- Taylor, M. (2015, March 17). *California's High Housing Costs*. Legislative Analyst's Office.  
<https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.pdf>
- Terplan, E. (2019, February 21). *How Much Housing Should the Bay Area Have Built to Avoid the Current Housing Crisis?* SPUR. <https://www.spur.org/news/2019-02-21/how-much-housing-should-bay-area-have-built-avoid-current-housing-crisis>
- The President's Economic Recovery Advisory Board. (2010). *The Report on Tax Reform Options: Simplification, Compliance, and Corporate Taxation*.  
[https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/PERAB\\_Tax\\_Reform\\_Report.pdf](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/PERAB_Tax_Reform_Report.pdf)
- Tighe, J. R., Hatch, M. E., & Mead, J. (2016). Source of income discrimination and fair housing policy. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 32(1), 3–15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412216670603>
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2018). *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)*. <https://www.hud.gov/about/qaintro>
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021, September 20). *Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration Program*. <https://www.hud.gov/mtw>



- United States Census Bureau. (2021). *U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Santa Clara County, California*. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/santaclaracountycalifornia>
- Varady, D. (2010). What should housing vouchers do? A review of the recent literature. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 25(4), 391–407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-010-9199-0>
- Watson, N., Steffen, B., Martin, M., & Vandembroucke, D. (2020, June). *Worst Case Housing Needs*. Office of Policy Development and Research. <https://www.huduser.gov/PORTAL/sites/default/files/pdf/worst-case-housing-needs-2020.pdf>
- Williamson, A. R., Smith, M. T., & Strambi-Kramer, M. (2009). HCVs, the low-income housing tax credit, and the federal poverty deconcentration goal. *Urban Affairs Review*, 45(1), 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087409336529>