NOTICE AND AGENDA

September 28, 2016

REGULAR MEETING OF THE MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY IN AND FOR THE
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS WILL BE HELD AT 1:30 P.M. AT 1001 WASHINGTON AVENUE NORTH,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

The Tenant Advisory Committee will meet at 12:00 Noon, same date and place

Commissioners: 
F. Clayton Tyler, Chair
Charles T. Lutz, Vice Chair
Tom DeAngelo, Commissioner
Mikkel Beckmen, Commissioner
Tawanna Black, Commissioner
Abdullahi Isse, Commissioner
Cara Letofsky, Commissioner
Tamir Mohamud, Commissioner
Hon. James Rosenbaum, Commissioner

GENERAL:

• Roll Call
• Approval of Agenda
• Minutes of Regular Meeting of August 24, 2016

TENANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE – TAC Chairperson Comments

DISCUSSION:

1. Medical Insurance Provider for 2017 (Robin Harris, Director of Human Resources)
2. Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) Services at 1001 Washington Avenue North
   (Tim Gaetz, Managing Director, Facilities and Development)

RESOLUTION:

3. MPHA 2017 Moving To Work (MTW) Plan and Changes to the MPHA Statement of
   Policies and Section 8 Administrative Plan (Bob Boyd, Director of Policy & Special
   Initiatives)
RECEIVE AND FILE:

- Monthly Performance Report for August 2016 (Cora McCorvey, Executive Director / CEO)
- Executive Search Process Update (Tom DeAngelo, Commissioner)
- Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources Report (Dean Carlson, Development Project Manager)
  - Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA
  - Sources of Rehab or Development Funds

Next Regular Meeting: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 - 1:30p.m.
1001 Washington Avenue North
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Notice: A portion of this meeting may be closed to the public pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 13D.03 or 13D.05.
The Minneapolis Public Housing Authority in and for the City of Minneapolis met in a regularly scheduled meeting at 1:30 P.M. on August 24, 2016, at 1001 Washington Avenue North, Minneapolis, Minnesota, the date, time, and place established for the holding of such meeting.

Roll Call:

The Chair called the meeting to order, the following members of the Board being present:

- F. Clayton Tyler  
  Chair
- Charles T. Lutz  
  Vice Chair
- Mikkel Beckmen  
  Commissioner
- Tawanna Black  
  Commissioner
- Cara Letofsky  
  Commissioner
- Tamir Mohamud  
  Commissioner

The following members of the Board were absent:

- Tom DeAngelo  
  Commissioner
- Abdullahi Isse  
  Commissioner
- Hon. James Rosenbaum  
  Commissioner

The following others were also present:

- Cora McCorvey  
  Executive Director / CEO

The Chair declared the presence of a quorum.

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Letofsky moved approval of the proposed agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Black. Upon a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Approval of Minutes:

The Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 22, 2016, were presented for approval. Commissioner Beckmen moved the minutes be accepted as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Letofsky. Upon a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.
Item No. 1: Security Guard Services

After a brief presentation by staff and discussion, Commissioner Mohamud moved approval of the recommendation set forth in the Report. Commissioner Letofsky seconded the motion. Upon a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried. [See Document No. 2016-24]

Item No. 2: Resolution Honoring MPHA Executive Director/CEO Cora McCorvey

After a presentation by staff and discussion, Chairman Tyler moved approval of the recommendation set forth in the Report along with the corresponding Resolution attached thereto. Commissioner Letofsky seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote, Six Commissioners voted “aye” (Commissioners Beckmen, Black, Letofsky, Lutz, Mohamud, and Chairman Tyler) and No Commissioner voted “nay”. The Chair declared the motion carried. [See Document No. 2016-25] [See Resolution No. 2016-166]

Item No. 3: Authorization to Execute Deferred Loan Repayment Agreement

After a presentation by staff and discussion, Commissioner Letofsky moved approval of the recommendation set forth in the Report along with the corresponding Resolution attached thereto. Commissioner Mohamud seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote, Six Commissioners voted “aye” (Commissioners Beckmen, Black, Letofsky, Lutz, Mohamud and Chairman Tyler) and no Commissioner voted “nay”. The Chair declared the motion carried. [See Document No. 2016-26] [See Resolution No. 2016-167]

Receive and File Items:

The following items were received and filed by the Board:

- Executive Search Process Update [See Document No. 2016-29]
- Contracting with Women and Minority-Owned Businesses Memorandum [See Document No. 2016-30]

Public Hearing:

- The meeting was open to public testimony, notice of which appeared in the Minneapolis Star Tribune on July 24, 2016. Interested residents and parties were invited to express their comments regarding the “MPHA’s 2017 Moving to Work (MTW) Plan and Proposed Policy Changes” [See Document No. 2016-31]

Adjournment:

There being no further business to come before the meeting, and upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 2:29 p.m.
Secretary of the Board of Commissioners

Date These Minutes Approved
REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Cora McCorvey, Executive Director / CEO

SUBJECT: Medical Insurance Provider for 2017

Previous Directives: In September 2014, the MPHA Board of Commissioners authorized the Executive Director or her designee to execute an agreement with HealthPartners to provide MPHA Staff and their dependents with Health insurance effective January 1, 2015. This agreement included a two-year rate guarantee through 2016.

Resident Association Notification: This Report will be reviewed by the Tenant Advisory Committee (TAC) immediately prior to the Board’s September 28, 2016 meeting.

Budget Impact: The budget impact of this action based on a 9% increase, and the number/demographics of MPHA staff expected to utilize these services. Staff estimates the impact to be $2,900,000 per year.

Affirmative Action Compliance: HealthPartners has an Affirmative Action Policy that has been approved by the State of Minnesota.

Procurement Review: This Report has been reviewed and approved by the Agency’s Contracting Officer.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Board of Commissioners authorize the Executive Director or her designee to execute an extension to the agreement with HealthPartners (including additional future 1-year extension options in accordance with the MPHA Procurement Policy and HUD requirements) to provide MPHA staff and their dependents with Health insurance effective January 1, 2017.
BACKGROUND:

On May 6, 2014, the MPHA Board of Commissioners passed a Resolution regarding an action by the City of Minneapolis to exclude MPHA from its employee benefits plans and to withhold from the agency its payroll and HRIS administrative services.

In September 2014 an MPHA Review Committee was formed and selected HealthPartners, through the RFP process, to provide medical insurance coverage for MPHA employees.

HealthPartners proposed a contract with a two-year rate guarantee (2015 – 2016) with the second year cost increase not to exceed five percent (5%). HealthPartners offered a fully insured, open access plan with different rates for single and family coverage.

2017 Renewal

The MPHA Benefits Labor Management Committee (BLMC) began conversations about medical insurance renewal in the Spring of 2016, as our rate guarantee with HealthPartners was scheduled to expire on December 31, 2016. Based on the “renewal calculation” data (review PowerPoint), MPHA costs were trending close to 22.4% through May 2016. Based on these costs, our broker (Ahmann Martin) estimated that MPHA would see premium rates increase between 15-20% if we were to solicit proposals in the marketplace.

Working though Ahmann Martin, HealthPartners was willing to offer MPHA a 9% increase, even though our experience levels were trending higher, in an effort to maintain MPHA as a customer. There was much discussion with the BLMC, the Executive Director, and the Director of Procurement regarding whether or not to issue an RFP to see if a better rate might be available. It was determined that we would continue our relationship with HealthPartners and accept the 9% increase, which will include two plan offerings, for the following reasons:

- MPHA renewal calculation was trending at 22.4%
- Loss ratio (Premium vs. Expenses) equal 112.7%
- 22 high claimants; 20 of which are still active on the MPHA plan and 10 of which exceeded the $70,000 pooling point
- An increase of 9% is lower than what is trending in the market
- Based on our renewal calculation levels, a new provider would most likely come in at a higher rate
Keeping medical costs low and competitive is a retention and recruitment tool.
Consistency in the delivery of health care services to employees.
Changes to health care providers can be disruptive and costly.

Given the nine percent (9%) increase when compared to both the public and private market, MPHA rates will stay very competitive and is within the average cost of other agencies. MPHA will cover (based on chosen plan) 85.9% (employee only) and 82.9% of the cost for the medical premium in 2017 (see chart below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Plans</th>
<th>Costs Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTHPARTNERS</strong></td>
<td>Employee Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A ($2000/ $4000 deductible)</td>
<td>$90.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B ($2500/ $5000 deductible)</td>
<td>$85.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to make a direct comparison to the City of Minneapolis plan offerings for the following reasons based on the City’s 2016 plan documents:

- At this time 2017 rates are not available
- Well established Wellness plan premium discount options
- Same employer contribution amount (Single = $512 and Family $1383) no matter what plan is selected by employee
- Three plan choices for employees
- Greater employee population

Due to variations in our benefit agreements, at this time there will be no other changes to the MPHA employee benefit plan offerings.

This Report was prepared by Robin G. Harris, MPHA’s Director Human Resources. For additional information, please contact Ms. Harris at (612) 342-1484 or rharris@mplspha.org.
REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Cora McCorvey, Executive Director / CEO

SUBJECT: Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) Services at 1001 Washington Avenue North

Previous Directives: The Board previously approved Capital Fund Program (CFP) Plans for FY 2015 and 2016 as part of the Agency’s 2015 and 2016 Moving to Work (MTW) Plans.

Resident Council Review/Recommendation: This Report will be discussed with the Tenant Advisory Committee (TAC) immediately prior to the Board’s September 28, 2016 meeting.

Budget Impact: Expenditures will be charged to the Capital Fund Program and the 1001 Washington Operating Budget.

Affirmative Action Compliance: The Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery method provides favorable opportunities for the participation of minority, women, and Section 3 owned businesses in major improvement projects. Watson-Forsberg is aware of MPHA’s affirmative action and Section 3 contracting goals, and has a successful track record of meeting or exceeding owner-established goals on other projects. Watson-Forsberg is also partnering with Tri-Construction – a certified minority and Section 3 firm – on this project.

Procurement Review: This Report has been reviewed and approved by the Agency’s Contracting Officer.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Board of Commissioners authorize the Executive Director or her designee to execute a CMAR agreement with Watson-Forsberg for building improvements at 1001 Washington Avenue North.
Background

In 2012, the MPHA Board of Commissioners adopted MPHA’s 2012-16 strategic plan which called for a “comprehensive assessment of security needs and practices with the goal of contributing to a safe and secure environment in a cost effective manner.” The current renovation plans for MPHA’s Central Office at 1001 Washington Avenue North are designed to enhance safety and security and to support a secure and safe work environment for its employees and visitors. After extensive review of reconfiguration options, MPHA staff believes it has an optimal design that will both enhance building security and customer service in an economical manner.

Scope & Budget

The scope of renovation work includes creation of new entry vestibule with exterior canopy and reconfiguration of existing vestibule to exit only, which will greatly improve traffic control and flow; a reconfigured lobby with guided access to front desk reception; a centrally located guard desk; the addition of HCV administration presence on the first floor; a dedicated first floor meeting room for “high-risk” meetings; a more centrally located rent collections window; secure access points at either side of first floor corridor and at the elevator lobby; additional card readers on department suites; new finishes & furnishings; and new visitor management policies & procedures. The overall budget for the project is $1.14 million, which includes design, construction, and furniture/equipment costs.

The project will consist of two phases including a preconstruction and construction phase.

Pre-Construction Phase

- CMAR and MPHA’s design team further refine design details and conduct investigative work to determine constructability and, as necessary, engage in the value engineering process to meet the project design intent while maximizing budget, schedule, and phasing.
- Bid documents are prepared for all project disciplines.
- Project is bid in accordance to MPHA and HUD procurement guidelines.
- Project schedule is established.

Construction Phase

- Upon completion of the pre-construction phase, MPHA will negotiate a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) at Risk agreement with the CMAR.
- CMAR will be at risk to deliver project on time and within agreed upon GMP agreement.
- MPHA will inform the Board of the final GMP agreement amount once executed.
Procurement

On August 16, 2016, MPHA issued an RFP to its pre-qualified CMAR pool members for the building modernization project at 1001 Washington Avenue North. MPHA received proposals from the following firms:

    Frerichs Construction Company
    Shaw-Lundquist Associates (MBE)
    Watson-Forsberg (partnering with Tri-Construction, MBE/S3)

An evaluation committee was formed to evaluate and rank proposals. Evaluation criteria included proposed fees, proposed project team, past experience, and their approach to project implementation including proposed phasing to ensure continued operations during construction, customer relations, meeting or exceeding affirmative action goals, safety, meeting budget and time constraints, etc. The highest ranking firm, Watson-Forsberg, has successfully completed several similar projects and MPHA staff is confident they will perform well on this project.

This Report was prepared by Timothy Gaetz, Managing Director of Facilities & Development. For further information, please contact Mr. Gaetz at (612) 342-1226 or tgaetz@mplspha.org.
REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Cora McCorvey, Executive Director / CEO

SUBJECT: MPHA 2017 Moving to Work (MTW) Plan and Changes to the MPHA Statement of Policies and Section 8 Administrative Plan

Previous Directives: On January 6, 2008 MPHA signed an MTW Agreement with HUD making the Agency a full status MTW. This status requires MPHA to create an Annual MTW Plan. On July 6, 2008, the Board approved MPHA’s first MTW Plan and has subsequently approved a new MTW Plan each year following.

Resident Notification: The MPHA Board of Commissioners appointed the MTW Resident Advisory Board (RAB) consisting of representatives from the Tenant Advisory Committee, and other members representing MPHA populations groups, including Highrise, Family, Scattered Site and Section 8 for the purpose of ensuring resident and participant involvement in the MTW planning process.

Impact on Budget: The MTW Plan identifies how MPHA resources will be spent but does not, itself, have a budgetary impact.

Procurement Review: Not applicable.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Board of Commissioners adopt a resolution approving the MPHA FY 2017 MTW Plan and forward it to HUD pursuant to the requirements in the MTW Agreement. It is further recommended that the Board of Commissioners approve the proposed changes to MPHA’s Statement of Policies and Section 8 Administrative Plan.
The development of an Annual MTW Plan is a requirement of the Revised Standard Moving to Work (MTW) Agreement between HUD and MPHA. The 2017 MTW Plan includes: an Introduction with the Agency’s Short and Long Term MTW Goals and Objectives, General Housing Authority Information, information on MPHA’s on-going MTW activities, MPHA’s 2017 MTW Budget and various other administrative information, including the comments and responses regarding the 2017 MTW Plan. MPHA utilizes the MTW planning process to identify proposed changes to the MPHA Statement of Policies (SOPs) and Section 8 Administrative Plan.

As is its tradition, MPHA undertook extraordinary efforts to solicit input in the development of proposed changes to the 2017 MTW Plan, and its administrative policies for both Low Income Public Housing and Section 8. Following the appointment of the MTW RAB by the MPHA Board of Commissioners, the MTW RAB met on a regular basis working with Agency staff to consider proposals for the Draft MTW Plan. RAB also developed a statement of guiding principles and adopted priorities which are included in the “Administrative” section of the MPHA MTW Plan.

In addition, RAB was asked for and encouraged to provide additional ideas and/or guidance to MPHA prior to the development of the draft plan. Once the draft plan was presented to RAB, it was also noticed in the Star Tribune, published on the MPHA Website, copied and sent to all building Resident Council presidents, to the MHRC Executive Committee, and the Scattered Site Resident Council. As Glendale does not currently have a resident council, notice of the draft MTW Plan, SOPs and Section 8 Administrative Plan, internet access and the Advance Meeting and public hearing were sent to all Glendale residents. All Glendale residents also received correspondence from MPHA informing them of an evening meeting on August 23, 2016 and the public hearing scheduled on August 24, 2016. This notice was translated into Somali and informed residents how to access the Agency draft documents. Every Public Housing resident received notice of the Advance Meeting and Public Hearing in their rent statements and were invited to share their comments on the Draft MTW plan by e-mail to MPHA’s Policy and Special Initiatives Department.

MHRC published notice of the Advance Meeting and the Public Hearing in the Highrise Lowdown, a publication that goes to 5000 highrise residents. MHPA provided a lunch and a $10 transportation stipend to all residents and participants who attended the Advance Meeting, solicited and responded to any and all questions from residents and participants at the Advance Meeting. MPHA also provided comment sheets in the Advance Meeting packets for residents and participants who did not have enough time to comment on all their concerns or who were more comfortable in addressing their concerns and offering their ideas in written form. MPHA specifically invited Legal Aid to meet with Agency staff to discuss any concerns and/or suggestions related to the 2017 MTW Plan. Though they did not take advantage of this offer, Legal Aid submitted numerous comments which are included in the “Comments and Responses” document which is an attachment to the 2017 MTW Plan. MPHA e-mailed a specific notice of the Public Hearing and comment period with links to all the draft MTW Plan and policy documents to over 250 organization and individuals.
While MPHA is not proposing any new MTW initiatives in its 2017 MTW Plan, it is proposing a Local Asset Management Plan (LAMP). The LAMP would permit the Central Office Cost Center to receive a management fee, equivalent to what is received from the Capital Fund, when Housing Choice Voucher resources are used for public housing capital improvements. The fee is intended to cover the additional costs associated with processing and reporting of capital expenditure reimbursements, preparation of reports, budgeting, accounting, and procurement and oversight of construction and other miscellaneous contracts.

MPHA has received numerous comments related to the 2017 MTW Plan as well as to the Agency’s current and proposed changes to the SOPs and Section 8 Administrative Plan. The “Comments and Responses” Section of the 2017 MTW Plan lists the comments by the MTW Resident Advisory Board, attendees at the public hearing, as well as comments received from various resident organizations, key constituencies, and individual residents and Section 8 HCV participants during the comment period (August 1, 2016 through September 2, 2016). Also included are MPHA’s responses the comments and changes to the Draft MTW Plan and administrative policies based upon the comments received. Legal Aid and the “Defend Glendale” group also provided formal responses to the Draft MTW Plan. MPHA has included these documents in full with its responses in the “Comments and Responses” section of the MTW Plan.

A copy of the proposed Board Resolution is attached to this Report for the Board’s consideration. The MTW Plan must be submitted to HUD prior to October 15, 2016.

This Report was prepared by Bob Boyd, MPHA Director of Policy and Special Initiatives. For further information, please contact Mr. Boyd at (612) 342-1437 or bboyd@mpslpha.org.
RESOLUTION No. 16-168

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority in and for the City of Minneapolis (MPHA) signed a Moving to Work (MTW) Agreement with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on January 6, 2008, making MPHA a full status Moving to Work Agency; and

WHEREAS, the full status Moving to Work Agreement requires MPHA to create an annual Moving to Work Plan;

WHEREAS, MPHA also identified and made changes to its Statement of Policies (SOPs) and Section 8 Administrative Plan; and

WHEREAS, MPHA is required to submit the Moving to Work Plan to HUD prior to October 15, 2016;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Commissioners of MPHA that the 2016 Moving to Work Plan and the changes to the Agency’s Statement of Policies and Section 8 Administrative Plan are approved and that the Executive Director is authorized to submit them to HUD for approval as required.
REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Cora McCorvey, Executive Director / CEO

SUBJECT: Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources Report

Previous Directives: In June 2015, the Board of Commissioners requested that MPHA engage a consultant to examine creative ways to finance public housing development. The Report: Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA was presented to the Board at its May 2016 meeting.

Resident Association Notification: This Report will be reviewed by the Tenant Advisory Committee (TAC) immediately prior to the Board’s September 28, 2016 meeting.

Budget Impact: None.

Affirmative Action Compliance: Not applicable.

Procurement Review: Not Applicable.

RECOMMENDATION: This is a “Receive and File” item only. No Board Action is required.

BACKGROUND:
At the request of the Board in the summer of 2015, MPHA hired a consultant to analyze, discuss, and make recommendations regarding potential development and funding resources available to MPHA to address Congressional underfunding of public housing; legal constraints on the MPHA in doing so; and to determine whether there are opportunities to better address the housing needs of Minneapolis’ extremely low income households who are currently poorly housed. MPHA hired The Housing Justice Center/Aeon and their report, Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA was presented at the May 2016 Board Meeting. These Receive and File items are a staff update on the issues and recommendations found in that report.

This Report was prepared by Dean Carlson, MPHA’s Development Project Manager. For additional information, please contact Mr. Carlson at (612) 342-1213 or dcarlson@mplspha.org.
September 28, 2016

To: MPHA Board of Commissioners

From: Cora McCorvey, Executive Director/CEO

Subject: Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA

In June of 2015, the Board of Commissioners requested that MPHA engage a consultant to examine creative ways to finance public housing development. MPHA issued a RFP for a consultant related to the Board’s request and retained Jack Cann of the Housing Justice Center and James Lehnhoff of Aeon to oversee this assignment. In May 2016, the consultants presented their findings to the MPHA Board of Commissioners in a Report titled Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA. In the report, a number of development strategies were identified, along with potential funding resources for new construction and the rehabilitation of existing MPHA properties.

These recommendations were given in light of the fact that the report also commented that “there are no magic bullets, no cure-alls to address these (financial) problems. MPHA has not missed any obvious way to eliminate the $120 million capital needs accumulation or to provide a lot more housing for the lowest income households that need it.” The recommendations listed would be over and above the activities MPHA currently pursues to provide safe, well managed housing for low income individuals. In some cases, these strategies may mean additional staff or a change in how MPHA operates.

This memo is intended to summarize the recommendations presented in that report and to describe current and future staff activities MPHA is taking, considering or pursuing to help implement strategies and recommendations identified in the report. Strategies arising from previous directives from the Board of Commissioners are discussed as well. This memo is divided into three sections: (a) MPHA Development Strategies; (b) Regional Strategies; and (c) City of Minneapolis Strategies.
MPHA Development Strategies

1. Developing MPHA-Owned Public Housing
The report describes MPHA’s current efforts to develop 16 units of public housing (Minnehaha Townhomes) under its available Faircloth Authority as a way to implement its Families-out-of-Shelter initiative. The available Faircloth Authority is the number of additional public housing units eligible to receive operating and capital improvements subsidies from HUD. HUD will not provide operating and capital subsidies for any units above the “Faircloth Limit.” Most of the capital funding for the $4.3 million Minnehaha Townhomes project will come from public sources such as the MHFA, City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and the Federal Home Loan Bank. The report notes that these funding sources are limited and highly competitive and it may take two years for MPHA to secure all the funding. However, for smaller scale, 8-20 unit projects, it will be a good way to continue to develop new public housing.

MPHA Action: MPHA will continue to examine opportunities for smaller scale, clustered housing using available public financing and MPHA MTW resources to develop available Faircloth units, while continuing to develop the Minnehaha Townhome project.

2. Heritage Park and 555 Girard
MPHA owns approximately 14 acres of vacant land south of Olson Highway that is part of Heritage Park. The planned Van White Station on the proposed Bottineau LRT line may potentially result in substantial land value increases for Heritage Park and the vacant land owned by MPHA. The report recommends that MPHA should only convey this land for development to maximize the agency’s return. The report strongly suggests that MPHA look first to lease its land so that it can share in increases in the land’s value, give MPHA more ongoing control, and ultimately return the land to public ownership. For Heritage Park and 555 Girard, this means waiting for LRT to open for operation along Olson Highway, which Metro Transit has stated would be in 2021. MPHA should, however, be open to earlier proposals if they promise substantial returns.

MPHA Action: Per the 2013 Board directive, it is current MPHA policy to wait for the construction and operation of the Bottineau LRT line before seeking buyers or renters of MPHA-owned land at Heritage Park. MPHA is also working closely with CPED on the approval of the Van White Station Area Plan and monitoring redevelopment proposals in an around Heritage Park.

3. Glendale Voluntary Conversion
Mr. Cann’s presentation at the June 2016 Board of Commissioner’s meeting also examined the “Sherman Report” and its redevelopment concepts for Glendale. The report pointed out that redevelopment at Glendale will not be financially feasible without converting the public housing units to Project Based Section 8 through voluntary conversion. He stated that the
Sherman Report concepts would not work with a RAD conversion but noted that Aeon’s limited experience with RAD conversions suggests that some developments may work with the addition of tax credit and market rate units. In order for MPHA to pursue voluntary conversion, it would have to meet the cost assessment test prescribed by HUD.

**MPHA Action**: MPHA recently sent to the Board of Commissioners a Glendale “Next Steps” memo. In that memo, staff reported that it is in the beginning stages of hiring an appraiser to examine the value of MPHA’s Glendale Townhome Development. The appraisal will allow staff to complete the cost assessment as required by HUD. Once that assessment is complete, MPHA will know whether or not voluntary conversion is an option that can be pursued for Glendale.

4. **Development Sites at Highrises/Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Conversion**

The report notes that MPHA’s highrise buildings could not be replaced solely by their sales proceeds. Therefore, rehabilitation should be the focus of these buildings, even though MPHA does not receive enough capital funds to pay for all of its rehabilitation needs. The report pointed out that a few highrise sites may have sufficient available land to permit the development of additional new buildings. These new buildings could utilize tax credits and create affordable units that could also generate additional income when combined with a RAD conversion of the adjacent high rise. That strategy could fund substantial rehabilitation of the adjacent highrise building by using Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) equity and debt financing. It should be noted that under RAD, the public housing units would convert to Section 8 assistance. Second, the RAD Limits set by Congress have been exceeded by conversion requests from PHAs across the nation. However, HUD is pursuing additional allocations from Congress.

**MPHA Action**: Staff is in the process of identifying which highrise properties have sufficient available land to accommodate the construction of additional units (probably 3-5 sites total). Staff will then direct an architect to do a simple site assessment to determine (a) if it is possible to construct additional housing on the site; (b) the scale and size of such a development. If feasible sites are found, and additional RAD units are made available, MPHA will still need to conduct a financial assessment to determine the feasibility of the project and the impact of RAD conversions on the Agency’s overall funding and flexibility as related to Capital Funds. Given the complexity of these deals and the questions surrounding RAD and LIHTC, staff recommends prior to pursuing this strategy in full, MPHA should exercise reasonable due diligence and that the Board adopt a process to engage with residents, the community, and key stakeholders.

**Regional Strategies**

1. **Task Force/Faircloth**

The report discussed the possibility of having the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) give extra competitive points to projects that include Faircloth units. This would allow Faircloth
units to be built in suburban Hennepin County as well as in the City of Minneapolis. A similar strategy was implemented successfully with the development of the suburban public housing units as part of the *Hollman* Consent Decree. In order for this to occur, a change in the MHFA “Super RFP” that goes out in June of each year would be necessary and the report recommended that a Task Force comprised of MPHA staff, MHFA, CPED, Hennepin County and the Family Housing Fund be convened to explore this concept. The report notes that this strategy could develop MPHA’s Faircloth allocation much quicker than the small cluster strategy using public affordable housing sources described for the Minnehaha Townhomes discussion.

**MPHA Action:** Staff has included this strategy as part of its ‘Short Term Goals’ in the Draft 2017 MTW Plan. While a Task Force has not been created, staff has reached out to CPED staff to help initiate this Task Force.

2. **Fair Housing**
The report describes HUD-initiated efforts to partly resolve fair housing complaints filed last year against the central cities, MFHA, and the Metropolitan Council. These efforts will likely involve pooling vouchers by metro PHAs to develop project based Section 8 projects in high opportunity areas. MPHA is poised to play a major role in these efforts, and, as a full partner, take the lead in developing procedures and policies, while potentially being compensated for the efforts.

**MPHA Action:** MPHA has been asked by the City of Minneapolis to participate in the Fair Housing Implementation Committee (FHIC) to assist with the implementation of the settlement with HUD. In addition, the Agency has been working with the McKnight Foundation, Cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul and other PHAs in the Region to explore regional strategies for Furthering Fair Housing. MPHA has partnered with Family Housing Fund to conduct an analysis of the Agency’s Section 8 HCV Administrative Policies to explore opportunities for enhancing Fair Housing through our Section 8 programs. Staff has also been working with the City on creation of a Landlord Incentive initiative to promote use of Section 8 in opportunities areas and the exploration of changes in the City’s Human Rights Ordinance that would promote greater use of Section 8.

**City of Minneapolis Strategies**

1. **Tax Levy**
The report recognized that MPHA has the authority to assess a city-wide tax levy that could raise $5-$6 million for public housing operations and rehabilitation. The Minneapolis City Council must approve any such tax levy and has not done so since 2009.

**MPHA Action:** MPHA’s Executive Director and its Chief Financial Officer presented MPHA’s 2017 Budget request to the Mayor in July at its annual budget meeting. Funding the full levy was included in MPHA’s request. The Mayor thought the City could do something to help but wanted to set expectations that a tax levy would be unlikely. This MPHA budget report was also
forwarded to City Council Members along with a letter from MHRC requesting that MPHA receive the tax levy.

2. Tax Increment Financing
The report also identified Tax Increment Financing (TIF) as a possible source for any redevelopment activities. The report states that “TIF Districts could take advantage of the boom in market rate housing to generate tax increment that can be used City wide to address affordable housing needs. Such a district would be especially appropriate around the Prospect Park LRT station, with benefits flowing to Glendale.” Such a district would need to be approved by the City Council after a public hearing process.

MPHA Action: MPHA has yet to pursue this strategy as it is dependent upon an actual development proposal.

This memo is in response to the Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA Report developed by Jack Cann and James Leinhoff. MPHA staff continues to work every day to strengthen and expand the housing available to low income residents. If you have any questions or would like to examine any of these strategies in greater depth, please direct your comments to Executive Director Cora McCorvey.
MEMORANDUM TO:    MPHA Board of Commissioners
FROM:    Cora McCorvey, Executive Director / CEO
SUBJECT:    Sources of Rehab or Development Funds

The Sherman Glendale Report and the Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA Report both detailed issues related to the need for MPHA to identify and acquire funding outside of the normal HUD provided operating and capital subsidy. Currently, MPHA does not receive enough HUD funds to operate and rehabilitate its public housing stock. While being a Moving to Work Agency helps, the long term trends from Congress and HUD are not favorable toward bridging the financial gap of what MPHA needs to operate and manage a well-run public housing agency and what MPHA receives from the Federal Government. This memo describes a variety of other programs and financial sources that MPHA may pursue for rehabilitation or redevelopment.

HUD First Mortgage or Private Mortgage
The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and private lenders offer first mortgage and private financing options which a housing developer could apply for to help rehab or build new developments. This is usually coupled with tax credits and other subsidies such as Project Base Section 8 Vouchers (PBVs) which MPHA could provide to a developer. Alternatively, the MPHA would be permitted to have a mortgage on a mixed-finance development; that is, a development that combines public and private financing.

Rehab or Development
Debt financing could be used for either rehab or new construction for private developers or mixed-finance projects.

Limitations and Constraints
Any mortgage program, either from HUD or privately, would not apply to MPHA’s 6,000-unit public housing stock as federal law prohibits any debt on public housing; except for mixed-finance developments and other very limited circumstances. Because public housing units do not create a reliable stream of net operating income, the units would need to be converted to Section 8 through RAD or voluntary conversion in order to access any type of debt. Federal Law does permit PHAs to apply for loans against future capital funds with limitations but this does not provide any more funding; it only changes the timing of funding stream.
Housing Tax Credits (9% and 4%)
The Federal Tax Reform Act of 1986 created the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program for qualified residential rental properties. LIHTC offers a reduction in tax liability to owners and investors in eligible low-income rental housing projects involving new construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition with rehabilitation. The Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) and Sub-Allocator, City of Minneapolis, have been designated by the Minnesota Legislature as primary allocating agencies of LIHTC in Minnesota.

Rehab or Development
LIHTC could be used for either substantial rehab or new development.

Limitations and Constraints
- 9% credits are capped at $1 million and have a very competitive application cycle.
- 4% credits have no cap on credits and have multiple rounds of funding.
- The Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA report identified LIHTC as a source of funding to create new low income housing or to rehabilitate MPHA’s existing housing stock. LIHTC owners expect that the project generates sufficient cash flow to cover normal operating expenses and adequate replacement reserves. If debt financing is also required, the project must meet the lenders debt coverage. Due to the low operating subsidies provided by HUD for public housing, it is likely that sufficient cash flow would only be generated if the number of public housing units in the project were limited to 10 to 20 percent. The rest of the units would need to be Section 8, tax credit or market rate units.
- The tax credit investor in the project would likely hold a 99.9% ownership in the development, a change that has concerned some residents. MPHA’s involvement and control could range from a general partner, a co-general partner, or a ground lessor. The general partner assumes responsibility for the compliance and profitability of the development.
- Securing 9% tax credits is extremely difficult and competitive and MPHA would need to add significant staff or rely on consultants to pursue LIHTC. The Development Opportunities and Potential New Financial Resources for MPHA Report provides more background on LIHTC.

MHFA – Publicly Owned Housing Program (POHP)
The Publicly Owned Housing Program (POHP) is the State of Minnesota’s main program for providing funds to Public Housing Agencies to rehab their existing housing stock. These funds are in the form of a long-term, zero-interest deferred loan that are not required to be paid back as long as the housing remains operated as low income housing. The funds for this program are provided by the State of Minnesota through bonds every two years. MPHA has successfully applied for funds in 2010, 2012, and 2014 and received significant funding for 600 – 18th Avenue North and 620 Cedar. The funds are available to all state public housing agencies through a competitive RFP process.

Rehab or Development
POHP Grants can only be used for rehab of existing units.

Limitations and Constraints
- Available only to public housing agencies for rehab of existing public housing stock.
• Funds are available from the MHFA every two years. The amount available is dependent upon funding from the State Legislature through the bonding bill.
• Projects funded through POHP must remain public housing or the funds will need to be paid back.
• Only $20 million was available in 2014 and has been allocated to many PHA’s. Historically, awards have rarely exceeded $2 million to any one public housing authority.

MHFA – Consolidated Super RFP
The Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) has a number of programs to support low income and affordable housing as established by the State Legislature. It has set up a “Consolidated Super RFP” process by which a housing agency or affordable housing provider can apply for any of these programs through one proposal. MHFA staff then determines the program that best meets the needs of the applicant. The LIHTC described above are also allocated through this Super RFP process. Many of the programs have an established priority or established goal that it is intended to fund, such as supportive housing, housing for veterans, rural workforce housing, etc. There are also limited bonding funds available for replacement public housing. These are typically replacement for units lost through fires/disasters or in a redevelopment project that may not include public housing such as a highway expansion.

Rehab or Development
Depending on the program, rehab or new construction may be applicable. MHFA has not funded public housing rehab request through this process and directs those requests to the Publicly Owned Housing Program described above.

Limitations and Constraints
• Competitive and intensive application cycle; all programs receive many more applications than funding available.
• MHFA has very stringent design and energy efficiency requirements for most of its programs, much more than HUD public housing requirements.
• Includes the allocation of LIHTC as described above.
• Use of funds limited to specific scope in line with MHFA program goals established by the Legislature and their funding source.

Met Council – LCDA
The Livable Communities Demonstration Account (LCDA) funds innovative re-development projects that efficiently link housing, jobs, services, and transit in an effort to create inspiring and lasting Livable Communities. Grants are available to fund basic public infrastructure and site assembly.

Previously funded project elements include street improvements, plazas, parks, demolition, design, development plans, implementation techniques, market studies, storm water management, zoning, land acquisition, master plans, utility relocation, site assembly and reconstruction. Successful LCDA projects:

• Connect housing, jobs, civic sites, retail centers and local/regional transportation systems.
• Demonstrate a variety of housing densities, types and costs, creative placemaking, environmentally sensitive development, and compact land use.
- Catalyze additional development that efficiently uses land and infrastructure, and supports vibrant, diverse communities.

*Rehab or Development*

LCDA funds are reserved for new or redevelopment projects

*Limitations and Constraints*
- Competitive application cycle.
- Use of funds limited to specific scope in-line with current LCDA goals.
- Requests go through the City of Minneapolis which prioritizes and selects which applications are forwarded to the Met Council.
- Only for use in redevelopment projects, not rehab. As noted above, will only pay for very specific items in a redevelopment project. Site location is important.

*City of Minneapolis - Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF) Program*

The Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF) Program provides gap financing for affordable and mixed-income rental housing, housing production and preservation projects. The purpose of this program is to finance the production and preservation/stabilization of affordable and mixed-income rental housing projects in Minneapolis. Program funds are offered through an annual competitive RFP process.

*Rehab or Development*

Depending on the program, AHTF funds can be used for either rehab or new construction.

*Limitations and Constraints*
- Competitive application cycle and MPHA has not qualified for any specific program until this year’s Minnehaha Townhome project.
- Use of funds limited to specific scope in line with current AHTF goals (approximately $25,000 per unit with a total amount of approximately $500,000 - $750,000).
- The City uses different funding sources for the Trust Fund. Some of those sources are not available to MPHA such as HOME Funds.

*City of Minneapolis - Tax Increment Financing (TIF)*

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a financing tool utilized by local municipalities which allows developments to occur that would otherwise not occur without receiving assistance through TIF. Developments are generally analyzed using the “but for” test, which notes “the development would not occur but for the use of TIF.”

According to the City of Minneapolis Tax Increment Financing Policy, the City has outlined the following Development Objectives whereby the City uses TIF to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Expand the Minneapolis economy to create more living-wage jobs, with an emphasis on providing job opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed.
2. Attract and expand new and existing services, developments and employers in order to position Minneapolis and the region to compete in the economy of the 21st century.
3. Increase the city’s property tax base and maintain its diversity. Clean contaminated land to provide sites for uses that achieve City redevelopment objectives.
4. Provide an array of housing choices that meet the needs of current residents and attract new residents to the city, with an emphasis on providing affordable housing.
5. Eliminate blighting influences throughout the city.
6. Support neighborhood retail services, commercial corridors and employment hubs.
7. Support redevelopment efforts that enhance and preserve unique urban features and amenities, including downtown, the riverfront and historic structures.

**Rehab or Development**

TIF could pay for a rehab or a new development project

**Limitations and Constraints**

- Project may require the creation of a TIF Redevelopment District, requiring City Council action.
- Political aspects.
- Public Housing projects don’t pay property tax so they would have to be part of a larger development district in order to qualify. MPHA may have to convert public housing through a mixed-finance project or Project Based Section 8 in order to qualify.

**Hennepin County - Affordable Housing Incentive Fund (AHIF)**

The Affordable Housing Incentive Fund (AHIF) provides capital financing to create or preserve long-term affordable housing units throughout Hennepin County for very low-income households. Applicants may include government, nonprofit agencies, housing developers or lenders. Financing supports acquisition, rehabilitation or new construction activities. In 2016, approximately $2.7 million was available for projects in Hennepin County.

The Hennepin County Five-Year Consolidated Plan identifies the following Priority Needs:

- Preserve/Create Multifamily Rental Opportunities for extremely low and low-income renter households (at or below 30% AMI and 50% AMI, respectively). Specifically, this includes creating opportunities for large families, the elderly, persons with mental, physical, or developmental disabilities, and public housing residents.
- Preserve/Create Single Family Homeownership opportunities for those at or below 80% AMI.
- Create Housing Opportunities for Homeless Populations. Also see Heading Home Hennepin’s Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness.

**Rehab or Development**

The AHIF Program is eligible for either rehab or new development projects.

**Limitations and Constraints:**

- Competitive application cycle and MPHA hasn’t had projects that were in line with County priorities until this year’s Minnehaha Townhome project.
- Limited sources per project (approximately $300,000 maximum).
- Use of funds limited to specific scope in line with current AHIF goals.
Performance Report for August 2016

Board of Commissioners Meeting -
September 28, 2016
THIS MONTH’S REPORT

- Asset Management Project (AMP) Reports
- Procurement
- Rent Collections
- Facilities and Development
- Finance
- Housing Choice Voucher Program
Glendale AMP 1 –

Total Units 184

- Units Leased: 3
- Average Turnover: 50
  - Down Time: 3
  - Days Make Ready: 25
  - Days for Re-rental: 22
- Total Work Orders
  - 0 emergency work order completed in 24 hours – 100%
  - 142 non emergency work orders completed – 89%

- Occupancy Level: 100%

Scattered Sites AMP 2 –

Total Units 736

- Units Leased: 10
- Average Turnover: 50
  - Down Time: 1
  - Days Make Ready: 26
  - Days for Re-rental: 24
- Total Work Orders
  - 2 emergency work orders completed in 24 hours – 100%
  - 615 non emergency work orders completed – 70%

- Occupancy Level: 98%
North AMP 3 –
Headquarters: 315 Lowry
Total Units 1296
  • Units Leased: 17
  • Average Turnover: 21
    ○ Days Down Time: 5
    ○ Days Make Ready: 11
    ○ Days for Re-rental: 5
  • Total Work Orders
    ○ 0 emergency work orders completed in 24 hours – 100%
    ○ 498 non emergency work orders completed – 53%
  • Occupancy Level: 99%

Northeast AMP 4 –
Headquarters: 1815 Central – Total Units 944
  • Units Leased: 12
  • Average Turnover: 16
    ○ Days Down Time: 3
    ○ Days Make Ready: 7
    ○ Days for Re-rental: 6
  • Total Work Orders
    ○ 4 emergency work orders completed in 24 hours – 100%
    ○ 748 non emergency work orders completed – 61%
  • Occupancy Level: 99%
Hiawatha AMP 5 –
Headquarters: 2123 – 16th – Total Units 886
- Units Leased: 12
- Average Turnover: 23
  - Days Down Time: 5
  - Days Make Ready: 8
  - Days for Re-rental: 11
- Total Work Orders
  - 16 emergency work orders completed in 24 hours – 100%
  - 417 non emergency 84%
- Occupancy Level: 99%

Cedar AMP 6 –
Headquarters: 1611 So. 6th – Total Units 895
- Units Leased: 23
- Average Turnover: 12
  - Days Down Time: 2
  - Days Make Ready: 4
  - Days for Re-rental: 6
- Total Work Orders
  - 11 emergency work orders completed in 24 hours – 100%
  - 442 non emergency 62%
- Occupancy Level: 98%
Horn AMP 7 –
Headquarters: 3121 Pillsbury – Total Units 937

- Units Leased: 9
- Average Turnover: 21
  - Days Down Time: 5
  - Days Make Ready: 4
  - Days for Re-rental: 12
- Total Work Orders
  - 8 emergency work orders completed in 24 hours – 100%
  - 462 non emergency work orders completed 79%
- Occupancy Level: 100%
2016 Rent Collections

- January: 100%
- February: 104%
- March: 98%
- April: 100%
- May: 99%
- June: 99%
- July: 99%
- August: 103%
- September: 90%
- October: 100%
- November: 100%
- December: 103%
**PROCUREMENT MPHA CONTRACTING ACTIVITY**

August 2016

**W/MBE Participation**

- 83% Non-W/MBE
- 17% W/MBE

**Section 3 Contracting**

- Goal: 10%
- Participation: 7%

$695,322 in Section 3 Contract Payments out of $10,591,393 in total construction contract payments

August 2016 Performance Report
Facilities & Development Capital Fund Program Obligation & Expenditure Report

1992 through August 31, 2016

- Funds Received: $334,137,578
- Funds Obligated: $322,662,741
- Funds Expended: $313,505,290
HEATING VALVE REPLACEMENT
Fifth Avenue Highrises
PROJECT DETAILS

The Fifth Avenue Highrises, located at 2419/2433 Fifth Avenue South, are twin 15-story highrises with a total of 254 units. The hydronic heating system shut off valves were experiencing failures and the existing configuration made repairs and routine maintenance challenging. New balancing, isolation, and thermostat control valves were installed in all apartments, as well as in common areas and in the connecting tunnel where valves were extremely difficult to access.

Project Timeframe: July – September 2016
Project Cost: $255,000
HEATING VALVE REPLACEMENT

Before – Leaks from a failing shut off valve

After – New balancing and isolation valves
FINANCE

- Public Housing and Central Office Cost Center activities are all within budgeted levels and are expected to be through the end of the year.

- Congress has not passed an Appropriations Bill for 2017 so a Continuing Resolution is expected to be enacted to fund federal programs as of October 1\textsuperscript{st}. Funding is expected at the current year’s level.

- The 2015 MPHA and HPSSC audit reports have been released. Reports were mailed to all Commissioners. The MPHA Audit Committee meeting was held on September 27\textsuperscript{th} and the State Auditor presented the audit results.
**FINANCE**

- HUD is holding a listening session regarding changes to the amount and types of fees a PHA’s Central Office Cost Center (COCC) can charge and the eligible uses of these funds by the COCC. These changes could significantly impact PHAs that operate under asset management using the COCC model. To more fully understand the impact of such changes when developing possible new rules, procedures, and guidance on the COCC, HUD has chosen to hold listening sessions. MPHA staff are planning on attending this session which will occur in October.
## MPHA Housing Choice Voucher Program Report to Board of Commissioners
### August 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTW Funded Units (Excludes VASH, FUP, &amp; Mod Rehab)</th>
<th>MTW Units Leased (Excludes VASH FUP &amp; Mod) In August</th>
<th>Average Number of Vouchers Leased to Year to Date</th>
<th>% Variance of units Leased to Funded</th>
<th># of Participants Moving and Searching In August</th>
<th># of New Applicants Issued and Searching In August</th>
<th># of New Applicant Admissions In August</th>
<th># of Participant Move Lease ups In August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Applicant Reexams Completed In August</th>
<th>2016 Fiscal Year (Jan - Dec)</th>
<th>HAP Budget Authority (12 months)</th>
<th>$38,051,047 2016 FY Funding</th>
<th>MTW Funded Per Unit Cost (PUC)</th>
<th>Actual Per Unit Cost (PUC)</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>97% of HAP spent to funded</th>
<th>$702</th>
<th>$698</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td>HAP funded to date</td>
<td>$25,367,365 8th month of 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAP spent to date</td>
<td>$24,479,942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Owners at Owner Workshop In August</th>
<th># of HQS Inspections Completed In August</th>
<th>% of Units that Failed HQS In August</th>
<th># of Failed Units in Abatement for Noncompliance In August</th>
<th>Total HAP Amount Recouped (Abatement) In August</th>
<th># of HAP Contracts Canceled for HQS Noncompliance In August</th>
<th># of Family Sufficiency (FSS) Participants Enrolled In August</th>
<th>% FSS Participants contributing to Escrow Accts In August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$10,163</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Mobility Vouchers in Intake or Out Searching</th>
<th># of Mobility Vouchers Leased To date</th>
<th>Total # of Port out Families Billed for In August</th>
<th>Total # Port in Families Administered In August</th>
<th>Amount Collected from Repayment Agreements In August</th>
<th>FY Total to date Collected from Repayment Agreements</th>
<th># of Applicants Remaining On Waitlist</th>
<th># Participants EOP’d (End of Participation) In August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>$4,440</td>
<td>$37,149</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4509 is MPHA's MTW Authorized HCV Unit Baseline for FY 2016. Units leased will fluctuate each month but by close of Fiscal Year, the average number of families served for year should be 4509.

**NOTE:** VASH (235 Vouchers for Homeless Veterans) FUP (100 Family Unification Vouchers) and Moderate Rehabilitation (274 units) are not included in the 4509 baseline; they are ineligible for MTW.

EOPs exclude Project Based Voucher Participants. * Includes All Reinspections **Beginning 2015, Waitlist is being purged
MPHA’s Website

You can view information about the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority on our Website

www.mphaonline.org