



RESEARCH REPORT

Moving to Work and Neighborhood Opportunity

A Scan of Mobility Initiatives by Moving to Work Public Housing Authorities

Martha Galvez

Jasmine Simington

Mark Treskon

February 2017



ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.

Contents

Acknowledgments	iv
Moving to Work and Neighborhood Opportunity	1
Background	1
Summary of Approach	4
Findings: Overview of Key Interventions	7
Activities that Limit Mobility	15
Conclusion	15
Appendix A. Moving to Work Housing Authorities	17
Appendix B. Inventory of Mobility-Related Initiatives by Moving to Work Agencies	18
Appendix C. Inventory of Initiatives Identified by Moving to Work Agencies as Promoting Housing Choice	27
Notes	45
References	46
About the Authors	48
Statement of Independence	49

Acknowledgments

This report was funded by the Urban Institute in support of the Creating Moves to Opportunity (CMTO) project.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute’s funding principles is available at www.urban.org/support.

The CMTO project focuses on identifying and testing programs and policies that hold promise as pathways to improve low-opportunity neighborhoods or facilitate moves to high-opportunity neighborhoods. This review relies on a database of MTW activities created in 2016 for a separate project: HUD’s national evaluation of the MTW program. The authors thank HUD for allowing the additional use of the database for this report. The authors also thank Margery Turner and Mary Cunningham for valuable feedback and review of this work.

Moving to Work and Neighborhood Opportunity

This report explores how public housing authorities (PHAs) granted Moving to Work (MTW) status by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) use their unique policy and fiscal flexibility to help low-income households move to opportunity-rich neighborhoods. Policy and programs adopted through MTW include changes to the tenant-based Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program or policies that increase the affordable housing supply in opportunity neighborhoods through the project-based voucher (PBV) program. PHAs may also use their MTW authority to limit voucher holders' ability to move across PHA jurisdictions.

Intensive mobility programs that couple counseling and services with housing vouchers have received the most attention as promising approaches to helping families move to high-opportunity neighborhoods (Berdahl-Baldwin 2015; Engdahl 2009).¹ In this report, we identify comprehensive programs, but focus mainly on underresearched “lighter-touch” programs, or administrative policies. We draw from an extensive review of publicly available MTW agency plans and reports that document each PHA's initiatives. Box 1 describes the MTW program and the reports we draw from. Appendix A lists the 39 MTW housing authorities, and appendixes B and C summarize the initiatives we identified. Our review does not evaluate the effectiveness of individual agency activities, but rather identifies and describes what MTW PHAs are experimenting with in the field.

Background

Neighborhoods play a key role in individual- and family-level outcomes and in children's long-term prospects. Evidence suggests that moving from high-poverty areas to neighborhoods with lower poverty rates that are free from crime and offer access to economic and educational opportunities can yield long-term gains in health, economic, and educational well-being. The five-city Moving to Opportunity experiment found that people who moved to low-poverty areas experienced improved mental and physical health and higher incomes and employment rates (Turner, Nichols, and Comey 2012). Most recently, Chetty, Hendren, and Katz (2016) found that children who moved to new neighborhoods before age 13 were more likely to attend college, less likely to become single parents,

and earned on average 31 percent more than control group members—in addition to living in lower-poverty neighborhoods as adults.

Despite what we know about the benefits of moving to opportunity-rich areas, location outcomes for households who receive federal housing assistance—including HCV holders—are disappointing (Devine 2003; McClure, Schwartz, and Taghavi 2015; Pendall 2000).² Voucher holders are more dispersed and in lower-poverty neighborhoods compared with place-based housing units, but only about one in five reach neighborhoods with poverty rates below 10 percent (McClure, Schwartz, and Taghavi 2014). Looking at the 50 largest metropolitan statistical areas nationwide, voucher holders in suburban areas fare better than central-city voucher holders in reaching low-poverty areas: nearly 40 percent of voucher holders in suburbs lived in low-poverty census tracts in 2010 (McClure, Schwartz, Taghavi 2015). Nationwide, the typical voucher holder lives in a neighborhood with a poverty rate of about 20 percent and that lacks high-performing schools (Galvez 2010a; Horn, Ellen, and Schwartz 2014; McClure, Schwartz, and Taghavi 2014). In 2010, about 10 percent of tenant-based households (over 200,000 households) nationwide lived in extremely high poverty areas with poverty rates of 40 percent or higher (McClure, Schwartz, and Taghavi 2015). Between 2000 and 2010, the share of voucher holders living in low-poverty tracts decreased from 22 percent to just over 20 percent (McClure, Schwartz, and Taghavi 2015).

Vouchers have also done little to reduce racial disparities in access to opportunity neighborhoods. Nonwhite voucher holders continue to live in higher-poverty, more distressed areas than white voucher holders. But, African American families with children experience a unique benefit in neighborhood quality from vouchers and reach neighborhoods with significantly lower poverty rates than similarly poor households of the same race but without voucher assistance (Sard and Rice 2014).³ Nevertheless, on average, poverty rates and school performance in voucher holders' neighborhoods do not look much different than in the neighborhoods where the typical poor household without a voucher lives.

Voucher holders' inability to reach opportunity-rich neighborhoods may be rooted in several factors, including a shortage of affordable housing, administrative obstacles tied to using a voucher, and landlord discrimination in the housing market (Galvez 2010a). The ongoing housing affordability crisis in United States is well documented (HJCHS 2015; Leopold et al. 2015), and in most jurisdictions, affordable housing shortages and tight market conditions limit the amount of housing available to voucher holders.

The voucher program is also administratively complex, delivered through a network of over 3,000 public housing authorities, each of which may have different rules around using the voucher. Housing

Choice Vouchers involve three-way contractual relationships between PHAs, renters, and landlords. Housing authorities must inspect privately owned units, verify households' eligibility and compliance with program requirements, ensure that units are priced within acceptable levels for their housing markets, and calculate the tenant and housing authority portions of rent payments, which may fluctuate over time with relatively minor changes in household income or composition. Tenants and PHAs pay landlords directly, and payments may be delayed at some PHAs. Landlords may avoid the federal voucher program because for fear that red tape and bureaucratic hassles are inevitable, and non-voucher holders are less complicated to deal with, especially in tight housing markets or in desirable neighborhoods, where vacant units fill up quickly.

Searching for housing with a voucher can be difficult because of the requirements placed on voucher use, the costs associated with searching for housing, and the stigma attached to receiving voucher assistance (Graves 2016). Voucher holders might also be unfamiliar with low-poverty areas or restrict their searches to high-poverty neighborhoods, possibly because these neighborhoods have better access to transit or services (Galvez 2010a; Graves 2016). Finally, discrimination against voucher holders based on their use of housing assistance or by race and ethnicity may prevent families from reaching low-poverty, opportunity-rich neighborhoods. In most PHA jurisdictions, landlords are legally permitted to refuse to rent to voucher holders solely because of their use of vouchers (Berdahl-Baldwin 2015). Voucher holders also tend to be disproportionately nonwhite compared with the populations of the metro areas they live in, and qualitative work suggests they perceive racial discrimination (Popkin and Cunningham 2000). Housing advocates often argue that landlords view voucher program participation as a proxy for race and that discrimination against voucher holders masks racial discrimination, but little empirical evidence supports this (Galvez 2010a; Graves 2016). The research on the impact of laws intended to prevent discrimination against voucher holders is similarly limited (Galvez 2010b; Freeman 2012).

Mobility Efforts through Public Housing Authorities

Many housing authorities and HUD are concerned with ways to address some of these barriers to voucher holders' access to opportunity-rich neighborhoods. But there is limited research about the approaches that PHAs have tried to encourage or support moves. Housing authorities regularly collect data and report back to HUD on the characteristics of individuals and households that receive housing assistance, but no comprehensive clearinghouse of local PHA initiatives or partnerships with local

service providers exists. Activities are unique to local contexts, and systematically assessing activities across the expansive network of local housing authorities is difficult.

Cunningham and coauthors' (2010) comprehensive scan of mobility programs offers insight into the types of programs that may help voucher holders move to better neighborhoods. Some programs offered passive mobility assistance (e.g., tenant education), while others administered more intensive counseling and housing search assistance. The programs had six common components: counseling before the move, counseling after the move, housing search assistance, landlord outreach, financial assistance for moving, and subsequent moving assistance. The study revealed significant gaps in the field's understanding of how mobility programs operate and the extent of their impact. Given the limited research on mobility-related initiatives, the information reported in MTW plans and reports offers a unique opportunity to identify mobility-related efforts that housing authorities are pursuing (box 1).

Summary of Approach

This report explores 45 mobility-related initiatives in place, proposed but not implemented, or closed out as of 2015 among the 39 MTW PHAs. These are drawn from 1,045 initiatives requiring MTW authority that were reported by MTW agencies in their plans for 2015. Of the 1,045 initiatives, 672 were ongoing, and the remainder was not yet implemented, on hold, or closed out.

With some exceptions, we only include activities in our inventory that MTW PHAs describe in their MTW plans as encouraging or limiting mobility. Because the MTW-required documentation may not capture all the initiatives related to neighborhood mobility or may not capture enough information to provide a complete picture of an initiative's goals, this approach may miss some mobility-related activities.

One of the three MTW statutory objectives is to increase housing choice.⁴ MTW PHAs must indicate whether an initiative is designed to increase housing choice by using a standard reporting option in the MTW plans and reports. Of the 1,045 activities we catalogued, 306 activities from 37 MTW PHAs furthered the "increase housing choice" objective (187 ongoing, 54 not yet implemented, 54 closed out, and 11 on hold).

BOX 1

What Is Moving to Work?

Moving to Work (MTW)^a is a demonstration program launched in 2008 intended to allow a small subset of public housing authorities the opportunity to design and test innovative, locally designed strategies. MTW gives public housing authorities exemptions from many public housing and voucher program rules and restrictions and provides them unique flexibility with how they use their federal funds. The program aims to identify new approaches to using federal dollars more efficiently, help residents find employment and become self-sufficient, and increase housing choices for low-income families. Over the next seven years, HUD will designate 100 additional housing authorities with MTW status to join the current 39 MTW housing authorities nationwide.


MTW plans. MTW agencies must submit an annual plan that describes general housing authority operating information, proposed MTW activities, previously approved MTW activities and their status, sources and uses of funds, and any administrative updates for the upcoming year. MTW plans from 2006 through 2016 are publicly available on HUD's website. Some agencies have released 2017 plans on their websites.

MTW reports. MTW agencies must submit an annual report that outlines MTW reporting compliance, housing stock information, leasing information, waiting list information, progress on proposed and approved MTW activities, and administrative information for the current year.

^a MTW housing authority plans and reports are available on HUD's website. See "Moving to Work (MTW)- Participating Sites," HUD, accessed December 15, 2016, http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph/mtw/mtwsites.

FIGURE 1

MTW Agencies with Activities Designed to Increase Housing Choice



Notes: MTW = Moving to Work. PBV = project-based voucher program.

However, our scan revealed that only a few of these activities were directly or clearly linked to neighborhood mobility. Some common types of MTW activities, such as housing development or homeownership, regard increasing housing choice as increasing the number of assisted units available rather than as promoting neighborhood mobility. Further, some PHAs had activities clearly linked to neighborhood mobility but without increasing housing choice. This was the case for initiatives restricting mobility.

In the following sections, we describe some of these 45 activities, to give a sense of what they entail. The full list is included in appendix B. In appendix C, we include the remaining 260 activities from the 306 noted in MTW reports as “increasing housing choice” but that did not provide enough detail to demonstrate their relationship with neighborhood location outcomes.


Twenty-four of the 39 MTW agencies were either planning or implementing a mobility-related effort in 2015. We categorize the activities into four types of interventions or policy changes intended to encourage mobility:

- Comprehensive mobility services
- Incentives and supports for landlords
- Supports for tenants

- Project-based vouchers in high-opportunity neighborhoods

We also uncovered activities that restrict mobility, either through portability policies or conditions tied to voucher use that may prevent households from moving across PHA jurisdictions.

FIGURE 2
MTW Agencies with Activities Related to Geographic Mobility



Notes: MTW = Moving to Work. PBV = project-based voucher program. MTW agencies may be implementing activities in these categories not captured in the Urban Institute database built upon 2015 MTW plans.

Findings: Overview of Key Interventions

We identified 4 PHAs engaged in comprehensive mobility programs, 8 offering incentives to landlords to encourage HCV program participation, 11 that support tenants moving to higher-opportunity areas, and 4 that site PBV properties in high-opportunity neighborhoods. We describe the interventions below and provide examples of each.

Because the MTW plans and reports have not been fully standardized, the levels of detail in the activity descriptions vary by PHA and in our discussion. When possible, we reviewed the most recent (2016) MTW plans and most recently available reports in addition to the 2015 baseline reporting year to gather more detail. In some cases, we drew from other publicly available information to clarify the activities summarized in the MTW documents. The full inventory of mobility-related interventions discussed in this section is included as appendix B.

Comprehensive Mobility Services

Comprehensive mobility services incorporate counseling or case management and other services to HCV recipients before, during, or after they search for housing with their vouchers. Programs may offer help improving credit or financial-readiness services; offer housing search assistance, workshops, or security deposit assistance; or connect families to new service providers near their expected place of residence. Housing authorities rarely offer the services directly and may instead partner with nonprofit service providers or other community-based organizations to work directly with residents.

We identified four programs we considered comprehensive in structure in the District of Columbia; King County, Washington; Massachusetts; and San Diego, California. These programs offer case management and other supports to voucher holders and in some cases have eligibility restrictions.⁵

The **District of Columbia Housing Authority** has implemented a multifaceted initiative (Initiative 8) to improve administrative efficiency and promote deconcentration. The initiative's central element has been to establish submarket payment standards in line with neighborhood rents (and based on ongoing analysis of the local rental market). Other initiative elements include modifying the process for determining reasonable rent, developing a new method for reviewing requests to increase rents and payment standards, enacting administrative changes to improve making payments to landlords, and limiting lease start dates to the first of the month to avoid overlapping leases. These systemic changes affect all residents and have no eligibility criteria. The metric to measure the increase in resident mobility is a combined measure of the number of households able to move to either a better unit or a neighborhood of opportunity. The fiscal year 2010 (FY2010) baseline was 107, with a benchmark of 295 moves. The 2012 report (the most recent available on HUD's website) reported 705 households moving to low-poverty areas in FY2012.

The **King County Housing Authority** enacted two administrative changes that affect households with children seeking to locate in low-poverty markets with access to high-achieving schools: (1) priority selection and admission when choosing to locate in designated high-opportunity areas and modified transfer and occupancy policies, and (2) stipends or reimbursement for educational or living expenses to encourage residency in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Additionally, the housing authority educates families about the connection between place and educational and employment outcomes. The program offers one-on-one counseling to households deciding where to live and continued support once a family moves to a new neighborhood. In 2015, the program had 64 participating households. Ten of those households moved to a high-opportunity neighborhood. The King County Housing Authority tracks the number of households that move to a better unit or

opportunity neighborhood and number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice.

The **Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development's** (DHCD) "Opportunity Neighborhood" initiative supports existing voucher participants or new voucher holders who want to move to high-opportunity areas, defined by DHCD as neighborhoods with high-quality schools, low violence and crime rates, and low poverty rates. The initiative was approved in 2011 but was put on hold and is undergoing final design and implementation planning. It is expected to launch in early 2017. Households receive case management support before and after the move through outside agencies, and other incentives (e.g., transportation assistance, child care referrals, training stipends) are provided based on family needs. The project has been on hold as DHCD finalized the design and eligibility criteria, but upon implementation, DHCD anticipates 300 households will be eligible for the program, and 50 of those households will move to opportunity neighborhoods. DHCD will track the number of households who move to opportunity neighborhoods and the number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice.

As a part of its MTW authority, the **San Diego Housing Commission** (SDHC) has implemented a Choice Communities Initiative designed to increase mobility. As initially implemented, the initiative raised the 40 percent affordability cap to 50 percent for participants moving to selected low-poverty neighborhoods (nine low-poverty zip codes were identified as target areas), initiated a Moving to Opportunity program providing tenant assistance and guidance and tracking household location before and after initiative implementation, created a revolving security deposit loan program, and increased payment standards in low-poverty neighborhoods. The program began in 2010, and families who moved into one of the selected low-poverty neighborhoods were given materials about the program's offerings (San Diego Housing Commission 2012). The MTW documents did not mention eligibility criteria or a target population for the initiative.

Regarding the affordability cap, households need to demonstrate the ability to pay the higher rent and possibly participate in a budgeting workshop. The Moving to Opportunity program provides tenants information and assistance finding housing and local resources and involves outreach to property owners in neighborhoods with few SDHC tenants. The security deposit loan program offers a no-interest loan with low monthly repayments to tenants moving to a designated low-poverty neighborhood with few SDHC tenants. Finally, SDHC analyzed the location of existing voucher tenants to determine neighborhoods where payment standards could be increased to attract tenants. Initial baseline metrics from 2007 to 2008 indicated that 69 percent of tenant moves went between high-poverty neighborhoods, 1 percent went from high- to low-poverty neighborhoods, and 7 percent went

from high- to medium-poverty neighborhoods. Initial benchmarks called for 10 percent of program participants to move from high-poverty to low-poverty neighborhoods by June 2011. Discussion in the 2012 annual report (the most recent available) noted that the 10 percent benchmark was difficult to obtain, as moves from high- to low-poverty neighborhoods increased, but not enough to reach 10 percent: in FY2010, 54 households out of 1,384 movers moved from high- to low-poverty neighborhoods. In 2015, the rent burden cap was lifted to 50 percent for all SDHC residents.

Incentives and Supports for Landlords

We identified six PHAs engaged in eight activities aimed at making landlords more likely to accept HCVs. Financial incentives (e.g., property damage or vacancy insurance) or modifications to inspections requirements are examples of the supports that could persuade a landlord. Financial incentives were the most common. In some cases, these initiatives are aimed directly at landlords in low-poverty areas, while in other cases, they are aimed at encouraging landlord participation in the voucher program overall, regardless of neighborhood location. We include both to shed light on the range of landlord incentives that MTW PHAs are pursuing, and because it may be that landlords who respond to these incentives are in high-opportunity areas.

The **Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh** (HACP) has designed a Preferred Owners Program to promote improved property quality and the number of properties located in quality neighborhoods. Landlords must apply to the program, and HACP will assess their application based on consistency in section passes, completion of standard trainings, quality of property, and commitment to leasing to at least one HCV. Once confirmed as a participant, landlords are given such incentives as priority inspection scheduling, biennial inspections, acceptance of prior inspections conducted less than 60 days ago for vacated units, Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) contract payments for most recent tenancy when the landlord commits to leasing to another voucher holder, and priority placement on HACP's property listing web page. In 2014, the target population was 57 landlords owning 1,394 units leasing to HCV program participants. The 2016 enrollment goal is 12 landlords. HACP will track the following measures: number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80 percent of area median income (AMI) because of the activity, number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80 percent of AMI that would otherwise not be available, number of landlords enrolled in the Preferred Owners Program, and landlords enrolled in the program who rate HACP as "good" or "excellent."

Home Forward (Housing Authority of Portland) created the Landlord Guarantee Fund, which reimburses landlords for damages by Section 8 participants, up to a maximum value of two months' rent. Home Forward also provides vacancy-loss payment to owners through the end of the month after the move-out month when vacancies are unforeseen or unexpected and the owners have not received proper notice of the intent to vacate. The fund is accessible when households come off the waiting list, "port" inside Home Forward jurisdiction, or transfer to a unit in a low-poverty area. In 2013, the Oregon State legislature passed a bill that established a statewide fund and prohibited discrimination against Section 8 voucher renters. In 2016, Home Forward discontinued the fund to avoid duplicating state efforts. During its implementation, Home Forward tracked the following measures: number of households receiving services aimed at increasing housing choice, issued voucher success rate, and average number of days for a voucher holder to lease up.

Supports for Tenants

Voucher holders may face challenges finding housing in opportunity-rich areas. Several MTW housing authorities have launched initiatives to address these challenges and support voucher moves through financial incentives, modifications to voucher payment standards in opportunity areas, or administrative changes. We identified nine housing authorities engaged in 11 initiatives that provide supports for voucher moves. Here, we focus on initiatives that PHAs discuss in terms of promoting mobility. Three broader sets of initiatives are relevant to mobility efforts, but are not always couched in those terms:

- **Local payment standards.**⁶ MTW PHAs can enact different local payment standards across their service area that better reflect particular submarkets' costs. This means relatively lower payment standards in high-poverty low-income areas and higher payment standards in high-income or high-cost areas, providing an incentive for tenants to move to high-income areas. While implementation of these local payment standards by MTW PHAs is broadly similar to how they are being implemented by participants in the Small Area Fair Market Rent Demonstration program (and in Dallas, which is not part of the demonstration),⁷ they are distinct efforts. In addition to the San Bernardino example below and the District of Columbia example above, the Alaska, Atlanta, Champaign, and King County housing authorities have all enacted local payment standards.
- **Asset and income exclusion.** Several MTW PHAs have implemented policies excluding sources of income or assets when calculating rent and eligibility. These efforts aim to encourage self-

sufficiency rather than promote mobility, but tenants could use their additional resources to lease up in high-cost, low-poverty neighborhoods.

- **Lifting the 40 percent cap on income.** Several MTW PHAs have lifted a cap that limits rent to 40 percent of a tenant's income. Allowing a household to spend more than 40 percent of its income on rent opens more-expensive housing options, and some MTW PHAs couch this as increasing housing choice.

The **Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino** (HACSB) studies local market rents and establishes local payment standards for the nine submarkets in its jurisdiction instead of using HUD-published fair market rents to establish payment standards. It divided the county into submarkets containing higher or lower rents than average and then obtained information on market-rate rental housing units in each area. Information about unit size, building type, and unit condition was collected through a survey of various property types. Based on its analysis, HACSB created alternative local payment standards that ranged from \$200 to \$925 (Applied Real Estate Analysis 2011). Having greater authority over payment standards allows HACSB to ensure housing affordability across submarkets to ensure families can move to high-opportunity neighborhoods. Since implementation, the number of families living in the two submarkets with the highest poverty and minority concentration has decreased 9 percent. HACSB tracks the following measures: number of households at or below 80 percent of AMI that would lose assistance or need to move, average HAP cost for MTW units, and percentage of households residing in key submarkets.

The **Housing Authority of New Haven** (HANH) promotes mobility through its Deconcentration of Poverty Initiative (Initiative 1.6, implemented in FY2009).⁸ Under this initiative, HANH approves exception rents for certain units. This includes wheelchair-accessible units, units with four or more bedrooms, units in neighborhoods with low poverty concentration, units in mixed-income developments, and units in new developments designed to promote neighborhood revitalization. HANH also approves rent increases for landlords making capital improvements (e.g., improvements for accessibility). To measure the initiative's effects, HANH tracks the annual number of lease-ups in low-poverty areas (census tracts 1410, 1411, and 1428), for larger bedroom sizes, and for accessibility reasons because of the activity. The annual benchmark for lease-ups in low-poverty areas is 10. The draft 2017 plan notes that 97 voucher households have leased up in low-poverty areas since the initiative was implemented. The 2015 report notes that 13 households moved to low-poverty areas in 2010; 7 moved in 2011 and in 2012, 10 moved in 2013, and 11 moved in 2014.

The **Minneapolis Public Housing Authority** has created a Mobility Voucher program (Activity 2009-6, implemented in 2010) to encourage moves to high-opportunity neighborhoods. It targets households on the voucher waiting list and participants living in areas with concentrated poverty. The program includes incentives for moving costs and escrow accounts to families. Mobility Voucher Program vouchers were more restrictive than normal vouchers, requiring tenants to live in approved communities within Minneapolis for at least three years or lose the assistance. Eligibility requirements included having children who were minors, being employed, and being willing to move to an opportunity neighborhood. This program has had several implementation challenges: budget constraints limited funding for the moving incentives or escrow accounts, eligibility restrictions meant that only 5 of 60 initial applicants were approved, and by FY2015, 40 percent of the original mobility participants who completed the three-year contract had moved back to “racially concentrated areas of poverty.” The housing authority is considering changes to the program, such as expanding the search area to the seven-county metropolitan region, having more assistance from the mobility coordinator in the search and leasing process, and considering a consultant with more experience in mobility counseling to improve the program.

Project-Based Vouchers in High-Opportunity Neighborhoods

MTW agencies have administrative policy flexibilities that make it easier for them to increase the project-based share of their housing assistance portfolio and to use their project-based voucher program to enter higher-opportunity areas than might be available to tenant-based voucher recipients. MTW agencies can increase the percentage of their assistance that is project-based vouchers; increase the share of units in a project that receive PBV assistance; and establish alternative contracting processes for selecting developments. Here, we discuss four housing authorities that frame their approach to PBVs as a tool to reach lower-poverty or opportunity areas.

The **Cambridge Housing Authority** will increase housing choice for low-income households by preserving and building units in traditionally unaffordable areas for its residents, and it will shift from tenant-based to unit-based subsidies. The housing authority believes this will allow it to keep affordable units in high-opportunity and low-poverty neighborhoods. It is constructing 40 units in Temple Place, a development in Central Square, and will track the number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80 percent of AMI because of the activity. Units were completed by March 2016 and are being leased up.

In 2009, the City of Holyoke implemented a transportation redevelopment plan for the Holyoke's Arts and Innovation District as a part of a broader Center City neighborhood revitalization plan. The **Holyoke Housing Authority** (HHA) is reserving 30 PBVs for households seeking to live in this high-opportunity neighborhood (as classified by HHA's plan) to ensure affordable housing in the neighborhood's revitalization. The HHA may waive a requirement limiting the share of PBV units in a project to 25 percent of the project's total and may allow PBV sites to develop their own tenant selection plans with agency approval. After one year of occupancy, households will not be required to receive tenant-based rental assistance as usual to ensure that PBVs are not used in place of tenant-based vouchers. The HHA will track the number of households at or below 80 percent of AMI that would lose assistance or need to move and the number of households able to move to a better unit or opportunity neighborhood because of the activity. As of the 2016 plan, the HHA has implemented an RFP for PBV units in the community.

The **King County Housing Authority** has implemented policies to improve the provision of its PBV program. These efforts include three elements: improving administrative efficiency, better serving special-needs populations, and supporting new affordable housing. The third effort involves prioritizing the assignment of project-based units to those located in low-poverty (below 20 percent) high-opportunity census tracts. The 2015 report notes a 45 percent benchmark of project-based units located in high-opportunity neighborhoods, with the 46 percent outcome reported for that year.

The **Reno Housing Authority** issues PBVs for single-family homes and condos in low-poverty census tracts to public housing families with children. By 2016, 32 households had participated in the program. The housing authority tracked the following measures: average amount of earned income, average amount of household savings and escrow, employment status, number of households removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, average subsidy amount, Reno Housing Authority rental revenue, number of households able to move to an opportunity neighborhood, improvement in census tract poverty level for participating households, and households receiving services aimed at increasing housing choice or self-sufficiency. The University of Nevada, Reno, will conduct a longitudinal study of these families to look at whether moving from a high-poverty census tract to a low-poverty census tract will change outcomes.

Activities that Limit Mobility

One expectation of portable voucher assistance is that recipients can move or “port” across PHA jurisdictions to reach lower-poverty areas, such as moving from a central-city PHA to a suburban area. While many housing authorities are experimenting with policies and initiatives that provide incentives for moving to opportunity neighborhoods, some have restricted household mobility. Usually, households must live in their current jurisdiction for one year before moving or “porting out” to another jurisdiction, unless their current residence is dangerous or in special cases where long-term needs are better met in a different area. A few housing authorities limit household mobility to stabilize local schools or the larger community. PHAs noted the following motivations for the restrictions: fairness, administrative burden, avoiding tenant evasion of work requirements, and limiting the amount of housing dollars leaving their jurisdiction. We identified 14 PHAs that restricted voucher moves; two are highlighted below.

The **Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia**, will only approve ports out that can be verified as employment related and will not “absorb” any ports except for special conditions.⁹ Relocations for education, health (medical/disability), or long-term care are considered case by case. The housing authority will track households’ average earned income affected by this policy, number of residents employed full-time or part-time, number of residents enrolled in an educational or job training program, number of residents unemployed, number of households receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, and number of households that transitioned to self-sufficiency.

The **Keene Housing Authority** restricts households from porting out of their jurisdiction to households suffering from domestic violence or that need to be relocated for financial stability, employment, or educational opportunities. This restriction does not apply to elderly or disabled households and is implemented to maintain affordable housing and keep voucher funding within the Keene community. The Keene Housing Authority tracks the number of port-outs compared with locally utilized vouchers as well as local HAP compared with the percentage of HAP funds expended on ports administered.

Conclusion

Our review of MTW plans and reports reveals various efforts to improve voucher holders’ access to low-poverty, high-opportunity areas. Identifying these initiatives offers promising insights for further research into mobility-related programming and opportunities to rigorously test these efforts.

This inventory also highlights limitations of using the MTW reports and plans to catalog PHAs' mobility-related efforts. Our focus on MTW agencies is because of the policy and funding flexibility that allows them to explore new approaches to providing housing assistance and because publicly available MTW documents provide readily available—though limited—information about their activities. The MTW reports do not, however, provide a comprehensive inventory of mobility-related efforts or in-depth assessments of how PHAs implemented these initiatives, how many households may be affected, or how successful the efforts have been. Additional work to gather information directly from PHAs would be necessary to paint a more detailed and comprehensive picture of MTW activities, or implications for neighborhood location outcomes. For landlord incentives, for example, we need more information to understand how frequently PHA initiatives target or attract landlords in high-opportunity areas. Or without detailed information about how individual programs work, we would need PHA clarification about these initiatives' intended outcomes. A more comprehensive assessment would require intensive engagement with the 39 MTW agencies through qualitative or survey work to identify and describe their activities in more detail.

Appendix A. Moving to Work Housing Authorities

Alaska Housing Finance Corporation
Atlanta Housing Authority
Housing Authority of Baltimore City
Boulder Housing Partners
Cambridge Housing Authority
Housing Authority of Champaign County
Charlotte Housing Authority
Chicago Housing Authority
Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia
Delaware State Housing Authority
District of Columbia Housing Authority
Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority
Holyoke Housing Authority
Keene Housing
King County Housing Authority
Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority
Lincoln Housing Authority
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority
Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development
Minneapolis Public Housing Authority

Housing Authority of the City of New Haven
Oakland Housing Authority
Orlando Housing Authority
Philadelphia Housing Authority
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority
Housing Authority of Portland
Housing Authority of the City of Reno
San Antonio Housing Authority
Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino
San Diego Housing Commission
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara*
Housing Authority of the City of San Jose*
Seattle Housing Authority
Tacoma Housing Authority
Tulare County Housing Authority
Vancouver Housing Authority

*The housing authorities of the County of Santa Clara and the City of San Jose submit joint Moving to Work plans and reports.

Appendix B. Inventory of Mobility-Related Initiatives by Moving to Work Agencies

The initiative descriptions here are taken from or based upon those found in the housing authority annual MTW plans.¹⁰

TABLE B.1

Inventory of Mobility-Related Initiatives

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Comprehensive mobility services	District of Columbia	Ongoing	2005	Modifications to methods for setting total tenant payments and determining Housing Choice Voucher market rents and promoting deconcentration: The DC Housing Authority (DCHA) explored options to enhance its ability to encourage voucher participants to exercise their choice in housing, especially for moving into neighborhoods with low levels of poverty. Recognizing that using one citywide fair-market rent encouraged voucher holders to reside in low-cost, high-poverty neighborhoods, DCHA devised a method for establishing payment standards and reasonable rent determinations in line with market rents. This method allowed DCHA to approve contract rents in line with market rents based on thorough and ongoing analyses of the District of Columbia rental market. By creating the in-house capacity to analyze rents annually, with monthly assessments of changes in DC's submarkets, DCHA has the increased flexibility to be more responsive to changes in established submarkets, while setting payment standards that mirror area rents. Other initiative elements include modifying the process for determining rent reasonableness, developing a new method for reviewing requests to increase rents and payment standards, enacting administrative changes to improve making payments to landlords, and limiting lease start-dates to the first of the month to avoid overlapping leases.
Comprehensive mobility services	King County	Ongoing	2012	To break the cycle of poverty among low-income households, this initiative will explore providing assistance to households with children who seek to locate in low-poverty markets with access to high-achieving schools and high-quality educational environments.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
				Changes under consideration include (1) modification of tenant selection, preference, and occupancy policies to provide eligible applicants priority selection and admission when moving to designated high-opportunity areas, and (2) modification of transfer and occupancy policies to encourage residency in high opportunity neighborhoods for current program participants.
Comprehensive mobility services	Massachusetts	Not yet implemented	2011	The DC Department of Housing and Community Development's Opportunity Neighborhood Moving to Work initiative aims to provide significant supports and encouragement to existing voucher participants and new voucher holders who wish to move to areas with empirically documented improved educational systems, job opportunities, social services, and other opportunities. The department expects that these households' need for housing and other subsidies will abate or diminish. Existing participants and voucher holders moving into these areas will be provided case management support before and after the move through the participating regional administering agencies. Other incentives (e.g., transportation assistance, child care referrals, and training stipends) may be provided based on family needs and budget availability. Families will be encouraged or required to develop a family plan to access opportunities in their new neighborhoods with a special focus on positive-outcome educational programs for children and available jobs for adults. Where appropriate, participants will also be encouraged to participate in the family self-sufficiency program.
Comprehensive mobility services	San Diego	Ongoing	2010	Using the authority to implement a reasonable policy to establish payment standards differing from current program requirements, the poverty deconcentration effort provides incentives for families to move to one of nine local opportunity areas by using the following: Eliminate the 40 percent Affordability Cap, the Moving for Opportunity Program, the Revolving Security Deposit Loan fund, and increased payment standards in low-poverty areas.
Incentives and supports for landlords	Chicago	Ongoing	2000	The Chicago Housing Authority offers vacancy and damage payments to landlords in the Tenant-Based voucher program who agree to re-lease to a voucher family.
Incentives and supports for landlords	Chicago	Ongoing	2011	The Chicago Housing Authority is authorized to provide a modest vacancy payment to participating owners who re-lease a Unit Excellence Program unit to another Housing Choice Voucher participant.
Incentives and supports for landlords	King County	Not yet implemented	2008	Facilitate program transfers in limited circumstances, increase landlord participation, and reduce the impact on the public housing program when tenants transfer.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Incentives and supports for landlords	Lincoln	Not yet implemented	2015	As an incentive for landlords to participate in the Moving to Work tenant-based voucher program, the Lincoln Housing Authority will provide the landlord a one-time additional Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) of \$150 upon the execution of the HAP contract for the new unit and tenant. This HAP payment will be included with all other HAP reported in the voucher management system.
Incentives and supports for landlords	New Haven	Ongoing	2011	Under its Moving to Work agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing Authority of New Haven is authorized to develop its own leased housing program through exceptions to the standard Housing Choice Voucher program to create a successful program with stable landlords, high-quality properties, and mixed-income neighborhoods.
Incentives and supports for landlords	New Haven	Closed out	2010	The Housing Authority of New Haven's ability to effectively manage its Housing Assistance Payment process has been enhanced by implementing mandatory direct deposit of all landlords who participate in the Housing Choice Voucher program. In order to reach the goal of 100 percent direct deposit utilization, all new owners are required to enter in Direct Deposit Agreements starting in FY 2010. Implementation of this initiative rewards landlords with timely and accurate Housing Assistance Payments. This increased efficiency has eased the housing authority's burden to accurately administer 1,370 HAP payments to landlords. This initiative was also expected to minimize landlord complaints on non-payment of Housing Assistance Payments, and it has reduced the number of paper checks processed monthly, which has in turn reduced the cost of administrating the Housing Choice Voucher program.
Incentives and supports for landlords	Pittsburgh	Ongoing	2011	Owners or property managers will apply for the program, and the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh will approve or deny their application based on rigorous guidelines. These guidelines include consistent housing-quality standard inspection passes, completion of online and in-person trainings for owners and property managers, quality and attractiveness of the property, and commitment to leasing to more than one Housing Choice Voucher holder. Incentives provided to member landlords include inspection incentives such as priority inspection scheduling, biennial inspections, and acceptance of prior inspections conducted less than 60 days ago for vacated units. Other incentives include vacancy payments of no more than two months' Housing Assistance Payments for most recent tenancy when the landlord commits to leasing to another voucher holder and priority placement on the housing authority's property listing web page.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Incentives and supports for landlords	Portland	Ongoing	2010	Home Forward has implemented two measures to improve landlord acceptance of Section 8 vouchers in the community (and thus improve voucher holders' ability to successfully lease up). First, the Landlord Guarantee Fund reimburses landlords for damages by Section 8 participants, up to a maximum value of two months' rent. Second, Home forward provides vacancy-loss payment to owners through the end of the month after the move-out month when vacancies are unforeseen or unexpected (such as a death or skip) and the owners have not received proper notice of the intent to vacate.
Incentives and supports for tenants	Alaska	Ongoing	2014	This activity proposes establishing payment standards that do not rely on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's fair market rents for the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation's (AHFC) Housing Choice Voucher jurisdictions. AHFC will continue to examine each market annually to determine if the payment standard is appropriate. AHFC will also ensure that it establishes a payment standard that reflects, not leads, the market. Staff will use an annual, independent study conducted by AHFC's Planning and Program Development Department in cooperation with the State of Alaska Department of Labor. This study surveys Alaska's communities and landlords about its housing markets, including vacancy rates, market conditions, rentals, and utilities. Staff will also collect its own survey data on rentals in the local market.
Incentives and supports for tenants	Baltimore	Not yet implemented	2015	This initiative encourages families to locate and lease units in high-opportunity neighborhoods with low poverty concentrations. Using its Moving to Work authority, the Baltimore regional mobility program will require families to select units consistent with and not larger than the dwelling unit size listed on their voucher.
Incentives and supports for tenants	King County	Ongoing	2007	This policy aims to increase the housing choices available to King County Housing Authority (KCHA) residents by allowing them to transfer among KCHA's subsidized programs. In 2009, KCHA modified its transfer policy to encourage over- or underhoused residents to transfer when an appropriately sized unit became available. In 2010, KCHA allowed expedited access to Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards-rated units for mobility-impaired households
Incentives and supports for tenants	Louisville	Closed out	2007	The activity was to limit the concentration of Housing Choice Voucher-assisted units in complexes of 100 or more units to 25 percent (excluding elderly and disabled and special referral program sites). This activity was closed out at the end of fiscal year 2009 because of its potential to limit voucher holders' universe of housing choices.
Incentives and supports for tenants	Minneapolis	Ongoing	2010	Mobility voucher program: increase housing choices for families on the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority Section 8 waiting list and current program participants who lived in areas concentrated by poverty and who were willing to move into nonconcentrated areas.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Incentives and supports for tenants	New Haven	Ongoing	2009	During fiscal year 2008, the Housing Authority of New Haven (HANH) began to implement Moving to Work rent standards that allow HANH to approve exception rents in the following cases: wheelchair-accessible units; large bedroom-size units, (4 bedrooms or larger); expanded housing opportunities in neighborhoods with low concentrations of poverty; housing opportunities in new development projects that include significant public investment to promote neighborhood revitalization; and mixed-income housing opportunities that promote expanded housing opportunities and deconcentration of poverty. In addition, HANH approved budget-based rent increases for landlords who make major capital improvements in their property, including accessibility modifications.
Incentives and supports for tenants	San Bernardino	Ongoing	2012	This activity allows the Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB) to establish a local payment standard schedule that reflects the varying rental submarkets. With the flexibility provided by this activity, HACSB does not use the Housing and Urban Development-published fair market rents to establish payment standards for its jurisdiction. Instead, HACSB studies local market rents and establishes local payment standards for each of the nine submarkets it has designated within its jurisdiction based upon the market study's results. This activity has increased the housing choice for families, as they can now move to regions with better job prospects, transportation and schools, most of them being low-poverty areas.
Incentives and supports for tenants	San Diego	Not yet implemented	2015	In the Fiscal Year 2015 Moving to Work Plan, the San Diego Housing Authority requests to include four additional flexibilities to further increase housing choice in San Diego: (1) require the resident to participate in supportive services as a condition of tenancy, (2) allow for project-specific waiting lists maintained by the owners or nonprofit providers in compliance with agency standards, (3) approve exception payment standards exceeding 110% of the fair market rents without requiring Department of Housing and Urban Development approval, and (4) increase the number of designated project-based voucher units in a contract after the first three years of the contract have elapsed.
Incentives and supports for tenants	Vancouver	Ongoing	2013	This activity uses funding received under Moving to Work for a pilot subsidy program in partnership with Family Resource Centers at selected local schools. Family Resource Centers selects families to receive the subsidy when they determine that the assistance is needed to prevent a child's family from having to relocate because of financial reasons. The subsidy allows the family to remain in the school's district, providing needed stability for the student.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Incentives and supports for tenants	Vancouver	Ongoing	2014	This activity uses the Moving to Work funds flexibility in Attachment D of the Moving to Work Agreement to fund a replacement for an expiring Washington State-funded program in three local properties. The funding allows the properties to maintain some rents affordable for extremely low-income families below 30 percent of area median income. The amount funded is approximately \$36,000 annually divided between Anthem Park, Esther Short, and Mill Creek properties based on the number of residents renting units with rent lowered under the previous program.
Incentives and supports for tenants	Vancouver	Not yet implemented	2015	This proposed activity is for the Vancouver Housing Authority to create a local program that will “buy-down” rents at a market-rate apartment property (not subsidized or receiving tax credits) so that the units become affordable for, and only available to, households at or below 50 percent of the area median income. If selected, an owner would receive funds from the Vancouver Housing Authority to offset the amount the project would require to reduce apartment rents to reach the affordable level. To be considered affordable, the decreased gross rents will be calculated by taking 33 percent of an income equal to 45 percent of area median income assuming 1.5 persons per bedroom.
Project-based vouchers in low-opportunity neighborhoods	Holyoke	Not yet implemented	2013	Holyoke Housing Authority will set aside 30 project-based vouchers to be used in Holyoke's Arts and Innovation District, ensuring that affordable housing is a central component of the area's revitalization and allowing low-income households to move to a new or rehabilitated unit in a neighborhood of opportunity.
Project-based vouchers in low-opportunity neighborhoods	King County	Ongoing	2004	The King County Housing Authority (KCHA) strategically places project-based Section 8 subsidies in high-opportunity areas of the county to increase access to these desirable neighborhoods for low-income households. Second, KCHA partners with nonprofit community service providers to create housing targeted to special-needs populations, opening new housing opportunities for chronically homeless, mentally ill or disabled individuals, and homeless families with children who traditionally have not been served through KCHA's mainstream public housing and Section 8 programs. KCHA is also coordinating with county government and suburban jurisdictions to underwrite a pipeline of new affordable housing developed by local nonprofit housing providers.
Project-based vouchers in low-opportunity neighborhoods	Lexington	Not yet implemented	2012	Relief from the Department of Housing and Urban Development's approvals before acquiring property will enhance the Lexington Housing Authority's ability to respond quickly to unique market conditions, making the housing authority more competitive with other purchasers in the tight real estate markets typical of the city's low-poverty areas.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Project-based vouchers in low-opportunity neighborhoods	Reno	Ongoing	2014	The Reno Housing Authority is issuing project-based vouchers for single-family homes and condos in low-poverty census tracts to public housing families with children who are in good standing and who meet program requirements. The University of Nevada, Reno, will conduct a longitudinal study of these families to look at whether moving from a high-poverty census tract to a low-poverty census tract changes outcomes. Twenty-five units are currently occupied.
Restrictive mobility policy	Alaska	Ongoing	2014	This supporting activity proposes changes to Alaska Housing Finance Corporation's (AHFC) Housing Choice Voucher administrative plan regarding requirements that Step Program families must meet before allowing a family to port AHFC's voucher to another housing authority's jurisdiction. AHFC does not propose any changes to current Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations regarding portability for Nonelderly Disabled Vouchers or Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers. AHFC will also continue to offer portability under current Housing and Urban Development regulations to all Moving to Work tenant-based voucher holders classified as Classic Program.
Restrictive mobility policy	Cambridge	Not yet implemented	2014	All households with incomes at or more than the area median income will be offered a cash payout if they choose to move into a private market unit in Cambridge.
Restrictive mobility policy	Columbus	Not yet implemented	2015	To address fairness, limit administrative burdens, and help more families, the Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia, seeks to apply a work restriction on port-ins and port-outs. The housing authority will not approve any ports out unless it is employment-related and will not "absorb" any ports in unless the head of household is employed at least 20 hours a week on average and has been employed for six consecutive months or longer. But relocations related to education, health (medical or disability), long-term care, and the like will be considered case by case.
Restrictive mobility policy	Keene	Ongoing	2008	Since 2009, Keene Housing restricts porting out of its jurisdiction to households who provide demonstrable need for a reasonable accommodation, are the victim of domestic violence, or for participants who can show that such a move would demonstrably increase their financial stability, such as a new employment or educational opportunity.
Restrictive mobility policy	King County	Not yet implemented	N/A	Increase family and student classroom stability and reduce program administrative costs by limiting the number of times a Housing Choice Voucher participant can move each year or over a set time.
Restrictive mobility policy	Lincoln	Ongoing	1999	Responsible portability in the Lincoln Housing Authority's Moving to Work (MTW) program aims to reduce costs and prevent families from porting out with their voucher because of its MTW policies. The housing authority anticipated that some families would port out to avoid the work requirements and other expectations of the MTW program. Families are given information about Lincoln's responsible portability policy, and once people are aware of the policy, few formal requests are made.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Restrictive mobility policy	Louisville	Ongoing	2015	Special referral programs address the needs of people not otherwise met in the community and provide the voucher as an incentive for families to move toward economic self-sufficiency. The Louisville Metro Housing Authority established special referral programs with two housing and support services providers at three facilities. Families with specific needs often face barriers to achieving self-sufficiency. The housing authority's special referral Moving to Work Housing Choice Voucher programs are a strong incentive for participants to enroll and complete the program; the current waiting list for Housing Choice Vouchers includes over 15,700 applicants. It also increases housing choice for low-income families interested in these programs. Voucher recipients participating in some special referral programs are required to meet partner program requirements and live on-site, at least at first. Full portability is restored upon program graduation.
Restrictive mobility policy	Massachusetts	Ongoing	2012	Beginning in fiscal year 2012, the Department of Housing and Community Development modified its project-based voucher program guidelines to establish reasonable limits on discretionary moves. The department believes this policy will promote efficiency in the project-based voucher program operation, while ensuring that tenant-based vouchers continue to be available to eligible households on the waiting list.
Restrictive mobility policy	Oakland	Not yet implemented	2015	Revises portability policies in the Housing Choice Voucher program to limit port-outs to local area jurisdictions except for special circumstances.
Restrictive mobility policy	Portage	Ongoing	2009	Families seeking to move out of Portage County are permitted to port to any jurisdiction if the receiving jurisdiction is willing to absorb the household. If the receiving jurisdiction bills the Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority, the family could port to that jurisdiction only if the receiving jurisdiction had payment standards or fair market rents less than or equal to Portage County. This restriction does not apply to portability moves out of Portage County justified under laws and regulations applicable to reasonable accommodations for disability and to federal Violence Against Women Act provisions.
Restrictive mobility policy	San Bernardino	Ongoing	2010	The Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB) applies all Moving to Work requirements to inbound portability participants. Housing Choice Voucher participants porting into San Bernardino County must comply with HACSB's Moving to Work policies and requirements. In addition, a work requirement was implemented for eligible participants porting into HACSB's jurisdiction.
Restrictive mobility policy	San Bernardino	Ongoing	2010	This activity limits voluntary program moves for Housing Choice Voucher participants to once every two years upon verification from their current landlord that they are tenants in good standing. Exceptions to this policy provide for moves related to self-sufficiency and for reasonable accommodation.

Category	Public housing authority	Status	Year	Description
Restrictive mobility policy	San Bernardino	Not yet implemented	2014	To create more housing opportunities for families on our public housing and Housing Choice Voucher waiting lists, and in recognition of certain families attaining self-sufficiency, families who have an annual income that exceeds 80 percent of area median income will be given a six-month transition period to locate new rental housing. After the transition period, families will transition to receiving no housing assistance from the Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino. Public housing families will be required to move, and Housing Choice Voucher families can remain with their current landlord with no assistance or locate alternate housing. Elderly, disabled, and homeownership families will be exempt from the six-month transition requirement.
Restrictive mobility policy	Seattle	Ongoing	2015	Recipients of Housing Choice Vouchers must have one year of residency in Seattle before they can use their voucher to port out to a different community. The one-year residency requirement will apply after the household leases a unit in Seattle with their voucher.
Restrictive mobility policy	Seattle	Not yet implemented	2013	This activity has two components: (1) Housing choice moving cost assistance and support: The Seattle Housing Authority will develop an assistance fund for security deposits and similar costs for voucher participants (under development), and (2) Limiting portability in high-cost areas: The Seattle Housing Authority may deny requests for portability moves to another jurisdiction when the receiving housing authority intends to administer rather than absorb the voucher, and the resulting payment standard would be higher than the Seattle Housing Authority's payment standard (inactive).
Restrictive mobility policy	Tacoma	Ongoing	2012	The Takoma Housing Authority limits outgoing portability except for households who need to move out of the jurisdiction because of reasonable accommodation, employment, situations covered underneath the Violence Against Women Act, and education. The housing authority also allows a family to port out if the receiving housing authority absorbs the voucher. The policy intends to cut back on the number of housing dollars leaving Tacoma and to cut back on the burden of administrating port-outs.
Restrictive mobility policy	Vancouver	Closed out	2005	No description provided.
Restrictive mobility policy	Vancouver	Closed out	2011	All Housing Choice Voucher port-ins are absorbed by the Vancouver Housing Authority.

Appendix C. Inventory of Initiatives Identified by Moving to Work Agencies as Promoting Housing Choice

TABLE C.1

Inventory of Initiatives Promoting Housing Choice as Identified by MTW Agencies

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Live-in aides	2010-8	Closed out	Resident services
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Establish a sponsor-based rental assistance program	2011-4	Closed out	Resident services
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Income limits	2013-3	Closed out	Admissions policy
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Use of Housing Choice Voucher program for persons with disabilities	2010-10	Not yet implemented	Resident services
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Project-based voucher assistance in transitional housing	2010-11	On hold	Resident services
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Homeownership program	2010-13	On hold	Homeownership
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Waiver of automatic termination of Housing Assistance Payment contract	2012-3	On hold	Occupancy policy
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Project-based vouchers: Owner-managed waiting lists	2010-7	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Prisoner reentry	2010-9	Ongoing	Resident services
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Simplification of utility allowance schedules	2011-1	Ongoing	Rent reform
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Local payment standards	2011-2	Ongoing	Other
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Project-based vouchers: Waiver of tenant-based requirement	2011-3	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Project-based vouchers at corporation properties and exceed 25% limit per building	2011-5	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Raise Housing Choice Voucher maximum family contribution at lease-up to 50%	2012-1	Ongoing	Occupancy policy

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Sponsor-based rental assistance program, Karluk Manor	2012-4	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Youth aging out of foster care	2013-1	Ongoing	Resident services
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Empowering Choice Housing Program	2013-2	Ongoing	Resident services
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Mountain View and San Roberto Development	2014-4	Ongoing	Development
Boulder Housing Partners	Affordable housing acquisition and development fund	2015-1	Not yet implemented	Development
Boulder Housing Partners	Allow Boulder Housing Partners to commit project-based vouchers to cover 100% of the units at converted public housing developments	2012-1	Not yet implemented	Development
Cambridge Housing Authority	Integrate near-elderly (ages 58 to 59) into elderly sites' waiting lists	2010-1	Closed out	Admissions policy
Cambridge Housing Authority	Project-based voucher in public housing	2013-2	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility
Cambridge Housing Authority	Expand supply of permanently affordable hard units of housing	2000-4	Ongoing	Development
Cambridge Housing Authority	Create Moving to Work transfer category in administrative plan (Housing Choice Vouchers) and Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy for Federal Public Housing (public housing)	2008-2	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Charlotte Housing Authority	Streamline project-based vouchers and public housing regulations	2015-1	Not yet implemented	Other
Charlotte Housing Authority	Acquisition of general partnership interest	2010-1	On hold	Development
Charlotte Housing Authority	Participant and landlord tracking program	2008-2	Ongoing	Other
Charlotte Housing Authority	Community-based rental assistance	2009-4	Ongoing	Other
Charlotte Housing Authority	Increase acquisition and rehabilitation of existing multifamily properties	2009-7	Ongoing	Development
Charlotte Housing Authority	Land acquisition for future use	2009-8	Ongoing	Development
Charlotte Housing Authority	New construction of affordable units	2011-3	Ongoing	Development
Chicago Housing Authority	Expedited public housing unit acquisition process	2015-01	Not yet implemented	Development
Chicago Housing	Revitalization of 25,000 units	2000-1	Ongoing	Development

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Authority				
Chicago Housing Authority	Project-based voucher contract commitments with 16- to 30-year initial terms	2011-05	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Chicago Housing Authority	Two-year requirement for project-based voucher participant transition to Housing Choice Voucher	2011-07	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Chicago Housing Authority	Payments during initial occupancy/leasing for new construction and substantially rehabilitated properties	2011-08	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Delaware State Housing Authority	500-unit set-aside for Moving to Work-eligible families	2012 B4	Ongoing	Development
Delaware State Housing Authority	Resident Homeownership Program	2004 C1	Ongoing	Homeownership
Delaware State Housing Authority	Renovation of Wexford Village using Moving to Work Housing Choice Voucher reserves	2013 C2	Ongoing	Development
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Maximizing public housing subsidies	1.11.08	Closed out	Other
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Encourage the integration of public housing units into overall HOPE VI communities	23	Not yet implemented	Development
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Modifications to the housing authority's project-based voucher program	2004-1	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Modifications to Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program	2004-3	Ongoing	Homeownership
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Modifications to methods for setting total tenant payments and determining Housing Choice Voucher market rents and promoting deconcentration	2005-8	Ongoing	Rent reform
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Streamlined Operating Subsidy Only Protocol: Operating assistance for rental housing	2005-9	Ongoing	Other
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Site-based intake and waiting list management of public housing, redeveloped properties and service-rich properties	2004-11	Ongoing	Admissions policy
District of Columbia Housing Authority	Local blended subsidy	25	Ongoing	Other
Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority	Convert scattered-site public housing units to project-based Section 8 assistance	2014-7	On hold	Project-based voucher flexibility
Holyoke Housing Authority	Neighborhood revitalization	2013-4	Not yet implemented	Occupancy policy

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Holyoke Housing Authority	Project-basing enhanced vouchers	2015-4	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of Baltimore City	Project-based voucher amendments to the Housing Assistance Payment contract	2015-21	Not yet implemented	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of Baltimore City	Project-based voucher award process	2014-4H	On hold	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of Baltimore City	Encouraging leasing in high-opportunity neighborhoods	2015-23	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Housing Authority of Baltimore City	Limits on project-based vouchers and increased project-based units in a project or building	2006-6	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of Baltimore City	Housing Assistance Payment contract modifications: Floating units	2009-15	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of Champaign County	Emergency Family Shelter Program	2015-1	Not yet implemented	Resident services
Housing Authority of Champaign County	Local inspection standards	2014-1	Not yet implemented	Inspections policy
Housing Authority of Champaign County	Modified definition of elderly	2011-5	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Housing Authority of Champaign County	Local project-based voucher program	2011-7	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of Champaign County	Local payment standards	2012-1	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of Champaign County	Acquisition without Department of Housing and Urban Development prior approval	2012-2	Ongoing	Development
Housing Authority of Champaign County	Affordable housing development	2012-3	Ongoing	Development
Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia	Portability restrictions	2015.02	Not yet implemented	Other
Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia	Community choice	2014.01	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia	Innovations to reduce homelessness	2014.02	Ongoing	Development
Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia	Rent reform	2014.06	Ongoing	Rent reform
Housing Authority of Portland	Local project-based voucher program	10	Not yet implemented	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of Portland	Alternative initial Housing Assistance Payment policy	12	Not yet implemented	Other
Housing Authority of Portland	Broaden range of approved payment standards	13	Not yet implemented	Other
Housing Authority of Portland	Program-based assistance	14	Not yet implemented	Other
Housing Authority of Portland	Local blended subsidy	3	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of Portland	Measures to improve the rate of voucher holders who lease-	9	Ongoing	Occupancy policy

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
	up			
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Development of mixed-use development at 122 Wilmot Road	1.1	Closed out	Development
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Creation of a commercial business venture at 122 Wilmot Road	1.13	Closed out	Development
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Redevelopment of 99 Edgewood Avenue (Dwight Gardens); the housing authority will use Moving to Work block grant banks to develop housing through a mixed-finance process	1.14	Closed out	Development
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Teacher in residence	2.4	Not yet implemented	Resident services
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Development of mixed-finance development for Rockview phase II rental	1.15	Not yet implemented	Development
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Fulton Park modernization	N/A	On hold	Development
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Local total development cost limits	1.2	Ongoing	Development
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Defining income eligibility for the project-based voucher programs	1.4 and 1.10	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Housing Choice Voucher preference and set-aside for victims of foreclosures	1.5	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Deconcentration of poverty (promote expanded housing opportunities for Housing Choice Voucher program)	1.6	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Tenant-based vouchers for supportive housing for the homeless	1.7	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Increase the allowed percentage of project-based voucher units from 75% to 100% in a mixed-finance development	1.9	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Increase the percentage of Housing Choice Voucher budget authority for the agency that is permitted to project base from 20% up to 25%	1.11	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	Development of replacement public housing units with Moving to Work block grant funds	1.12	Ongoing	Development
Housing Authority of	Establishment of site-based		Closed out	Admissions policy

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
the City of Pittsburgh	waiting lists			
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	Establishment of various local waiting list preferences		Closed out	Admissions policy
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	Preapproved inspection certification for multiunit housing	1	Not yet implemented	Inspections policy
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	Preferred Owners Program	2	Not yet implemented	Inspections policy
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	Combined Low-Income Public Housing Program and Section 8/Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program	N/A	Ongoing	Homeownership
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	Modified Housing Choice Voucher program policy on maximum percentage of adjusted monthly income permitted	N/A	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	Modified payment standard approval	N/A	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	Use of block grant funding authority for development, redevelopment, and modernization	N/A	Ongoing	Development
Housing Authority of the City of Reno	Mobility demonstration	2014-2	Ongoing	Rent reform
Housing Authority of the City of Reno	Partner with local nonprofit to provide special-needs housing	2014-8	Ongoing	Resident services
Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino	Operating subsidy for Vista del Sol	16	Closed out	Other
Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino	Local project-based voucher program	11	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino	Local payment standards	12	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Eliminate 40% affordability cap at initial move-in/lease up	2000-3	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Expand use of project-based vouchers at the housing authority's developments undergoing disposition	2009-5	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Simplify rent calculation process	2010-7	Ongoing	Rent reform
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Simplify third-party verification process	2010-8	Ongoing	Rent reform
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Eliminate competitive process for allocation of project-based vouchers to former public	2010-11	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
	housing families			
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Waive 12-month-stay requirement for residents in formerly public housing units converted to project-based vouchers	2010-12	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Establish flat or market rate policy for “over-income” public housing residents at conversion of public housing units to project-based units	2010-14	Ongoing	Rent reform
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Institute biennial inspection schedule for units under contract	2011-15	Ongoing	Inspections policy
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Expand the Section 8 project-based voucher program	2011-16	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Revise eligibility standards	2011-17	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Commitment of Moving to Work funds for leveraging in the creation of additional affordable housing in San Mateo County	2012-26	Ongoing	Development
Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	Provider-based program	2011-27	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Adopt investment policies	2009-12	Closed out	Development
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Minimum two-year occupancy in project-based unit	2010-2	Not yet implemented	Occupancy policy
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Selection of housing authority-owned public housing projects for project-based vouchers without competition	2009-10	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Project base 100% of units in family projects	2009-11	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Allocating project-based vouchers to housing authority-owned projects without competition	2010-4	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
of San Jose				
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Streamlined approval process for exception payment standard for reasonable accommodation: Housing Choice Vouchers	2011-1	Ongoing	Other
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Create affordable housing acquisition and development fund	2012-3	Ongoing	Inspections policy
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara/Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	Create affordable housing preservation fund for housing authority- and affiliate-owned properties	2012-4	Ongoing	Development
Keene Housing	Eligibility administration guidelines (formerly eligibility administration and homeownership)	1999.01.HC	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Keene Housing	Moving to Work homeownership flat subsidy (formerly part of the eligibility administration and homeownership activity)	2008.03.HC	Ongoing	Homeownership
Keene Housing	Reasonable rent determination discontinuance	1999.07.HC	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Keene Housing	40% affordability discontinuance	1999.08.HC	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Keene Housing	Transitional Housing Assistance Shelter Program (formerly shelter housing assistance coupon)	1999.06.HC	Ongoing	Resident services
Keene Housing	Project-based voucher program (formerly project-based coupons)	2008.01.HC	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Keene Housing	Affordable Housing Preservation Program	2014.01.CE	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Keene Housing	Affordable Housing Preservation and Modernization Program	2014.03.HC	Ongoing	Development
King County Housing Authority	Supplemental support for the Highline Community Healthy Homes Project	2012-4	Closed out	Resident services
King County Housing Authority	Redesign the Sound Families Program	2011-2	Closed out	Resident services
King County Housing Authority	Transfer of public housing units to project-based subsidy	2011-1	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility
King County Housing Authority	Section 8 applicant eligibility	2007-4	Closed out	Admissions policy

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
King County Housing Authority	Remove cap on voucher utilization	2007-8	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility
King County Housing Authority	Block grant nonmainstream vouchers	2006-1	Closed out	Development
King County Housing Authority	Modified rent cap for Section 8 participants	2005-18	Closed out	Occupancy policy
King County Housing Authority	Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency grant homeownership	2004-8	Closed out	Homeownership
King County Housing Authority	Flat subsidy for local, nontraditional housing programs	2015-1	Not yet implemented	Rent reform
King County Housing Authority	Implement a maximum asset threshold for program eligibility	2010-10	Not yet implemented	Admissions policy
King County Housing Authority	Allow limited double subsidy between programs (project-based Section 8/public housing/Housing Choice Vouchers)	2008-5	Not yet implemented	Occupancy policy
King County Housing Authority	Income eligibility and maximum income limits	2008-17	Not yet implemented	Admissions policy
King County Housing Authority	Revised definition of "family"	2014-2	Ongoing	Admissions policy
King County Housing Authority	Flexible rental assistance program	2013-2	Ongoing	Other
King County Housing Authority	Short-term rental assistance program	2013-3	Ongoing	Other
King County Housing Authority	Community Choice Program	2012-2	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
King County Housing Authority	Acquire new public housing	2008-1	Ongoing	Development
King County Housing Authority	Develop a sponsor-based housing program	2007-6	Ongoing	Resident services
King County Housing Authority	Enhanced transfer policy	2007-14	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
King County Housing Authority	Payment standard changes	2005-4	Ongoing	Other
King County Housing Authority	Local project-based Section 8 program	2004-2	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
King County Housing Authority	Develop site-based waiting lists	2004-3	Ongoing	Admissions policy
King County Housing Authority	Section 8 occupancy requirements	2004-16	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority	Homeless to Housed	7-Sep	Closed out	Resident services
Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority	Create an affordable housing acquisition and development fund	13-1	Ongoing	Development
Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority	Homeownership matching grant	5-Sep	Ongoing	Homeownership

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority	Create a jail reentry housing program	8-Sep	Ongoing	Other
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority	Public housing acquisition without prior Department of Housing and Urban Development approval	7	Not yet implemented	Development
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority	Conversion of Appian Hills public housing to project-based vouchers	8	Not yet implemented	Development
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority	Development of project-based voucher units at 800 Edmond Street	9	Not yet implemented	Development
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority	Local, nontraditional use of Moving to Work funds: Emergency reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers	11	Not yet implemented	Development
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority	Housing Choice Voucher tenant-based special partners programs	10	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority	Local, nontraditional use of Moving to Work funds for special partners	12	Ongoing	Resident services
Lincoln Housing Authority	Landlord incentive Housing Assistance Payments	Initiative 9	Not yet implemented	Other
Lincoln Housing Authority	Rent burden (rent choice)	Rent Reform 4	Ongoing	Rent reform
Lincoln Housing Authority	Project-based Section 8 units	Initiative 6	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Lincoln Housing Authority	RentWise tenant education	Initiative 7	Ongoing	Resident services
Lincoln Housing Authority	Resident services program	Initiative 8	Ongoing	Resident services
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Increased flat rents	24-2010	Closed out	Rent reform
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Rents set at 30% of adjusted income: Public housing program	33-2012	Closed out	Rent reform
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Flexibility in third-party verifications for Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership	Nov-09	Closed out	Rent reform
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Special referral voucher program with Seven Counties Services Inc.	42-2014	Not yet implemented	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Acquisition of mixed-income sites for public housing	26-2011	Not yet implemented	Development
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Develop locally defined guidelines for development, maintenance and modernization of public	28-2011	Not yet implemented	Development

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
	housing			
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Public housing sublease agreement with Catholic charities	25-2010	On hold	Resident services
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Amount and distribution of Housing Choice Voucher homeownership assistance	Mar-06	Ongoing	Homeownership
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Exception payment standards for Housing Choice Voucher homeownership	13-2009	Ongoing	Homeownership
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Special-referral Moving to Work Housing Choice Voucher Programs (restricted portability until graduation)	44-2015	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	The Villager: Center for Women and Families	Jan-05	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Louisville Scholar House: Family Scholar House (formerly Project Women)	15-2009	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Downtown Scholar House: Family Scholar House with Spalding University	20-2010	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Stoddard Johnston Scholar House: Family Scholar House	31-2012	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Parkland Scholar House: Family Scholar House	38-2013	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Special-referral Moving to Work Housing Choice Voucher Programs (full portability)	45-2015	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Wellspring: Youngland Avenue Facility	34-2012	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Wellspring: Bashford Manor Facility	36-2013	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Day Spring	Jul-08	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	100,000 Homes Initiative	30-2012	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Allocate Moving to Work Housing Choice Vouchers to special referral programs	35-2012	Ongoing	Other
Louisville Metropolitan Housing Authority	Amend Housing Choice Voucher admissions policy to allow for deduction of child care expenses in determining	27-2011	Ongoing	Rent reform

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
	eligibility			
Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development	Value vouchers	2011-1	Not yet implemented	Other
Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development	Opportunity neighborhoods	2011-2	Not yet implemented	Other
Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development	Family Economic Stability Program	2000-1	Ongoing	Other
Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development	Payment standard exceptions	2010-2	Ongoing	Other
Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development	Owner incentive fund	2010-3	Ongoing	Development
Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development	Expiring Use Preservation Initiative	2012-4	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Minneapolis Public Housing Authority	Conversion of 312 mixed-financed public housing units to project-based Section 8	2010-3	Not yet implemented	Development
Minneapolis Public Housing Authority	Targeted project-based initiative	2011-1	Ongoing	Development
Minneapolis Public Housing Authority	Foreclosure stabilization project-based voucher demonstration program	2010-5	Ongoing	Development
Minneapolis Public Housing Authority	Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Voucher Program	2009-6	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Oakland Housing Authority	Standardized transfer policy	2-Nov	Not yet implemented	Occupancy policy
Oakland Housing Authority	Single-room occupancy/studio apartment project-based preservation program	3-Nov	Not yet implemented	Project-based voucher flexibility
Oakland Housing Authority	Acceptance of lower Housing Assistance Payments in project-based voucher units	5-Oct	On hold	Project-based voucher flexibility

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Oakland Housing Authority	Eliminate caps on project-based voucher allocations	1-Dec	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Oakland Housing Authority	Project-based voucher occupancy standards	1-Nov	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Oakland Housing Authority	Project-based voucher transitional housing programs	5-Nov	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Oakland Housing Authority	Local housing assistance program	6-Oct	Ongoing	Other
Oakland Housing Authority	Disposition relocation and counseling services	7-Oct	Ongoing	Resident services
Oakland Housing Authority	Waive 12-month-minimum-stay requirement in converted project-based voucher units	9-Oct	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Oakland Housing Authority	Fund affordable housing development activities	1-Aug	Ongoing	Development
Oakland Housing Authority	Allocation of project-based voucher units: Without competitive process	2-Jun	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Oakland Housing Authority	Allocation of project-based voucher units: Using existing competitive process	3-Jun	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Orlando Housing Authority	Use of project-based vouchers and other resources to develop low-income city-donated property for low-income elderly housing, in conjunction with the redevelopment of Jackson Court/Division Oaks	7	Closed out	Development
Orlando Housing Authority	Supporting up to 50 homeowners for six months each by providing interim financial assistance (vouchers) and counseling to prevent foreclosures	5	Ongoing	Homeownership
Orlando Housing Authority	Provide up to 50 units and supportive services at West Oaks Apartments for up to 18 months for homeless individuals	6	Ongoing	Other
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Expanding use of the low-income housing tax credit	2011-3	Closed out	Development
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Scattered-site income tiering	2011-4	Closed out	Rent reform
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Accessible unit retrofitting and development	2010-1	Closed out	Development
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Assisted living	2009-1	Closed out	Resident services
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Home care services	2009-2	Closed out	Resident services
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Transitional housing facilities	2007-1	Closed out	Resident services
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Voucher issuance	2005-4	Closed out	Other

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Blueprint	2004-8	Closed out	Other
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Flexible subsidy initiative	2014-1	Not yet implemented	Other
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Neighborhood development and revitalization initiatives	2004-1	Ongoing	Development
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Service-enriched housing for seniors and people with disabilities	2004-2	Ongoing	Resident services
Philadelphia Housing Authority	Housing Choice Voucher program efficiencies	2005-3	Ongoing	Other
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Deduction for elderly or disabled adults	PH-8	Closed out	Rent reform
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Providing transitional housing	PH-9	Closed out	Other
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Deduction for absent child	PH-11	Closed out	Rent reform
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Single-fund budgeting with full flexibility for eligible funds	B-4	Closed out	Other
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Initial rent burden cap of 70% of adjusted monthly income	HCV-3	Ongoing	Rent reform
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Amend the homeownership voucher program to include households who are presently homeowners and under foreclosure	HCV-2	Ongoing	Homeownership
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Project-based voucher program	HCV-4	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Transitional housing vouchers	HCV-8	Ongoing	Resident services
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Maximum rent	PH-2	Ongoing	Rent reform
Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	Exclusion of overtime, bonuses, and income from bank assets	PH-12	Ongoing	Rent reform
San Antonio Housing Authority	Block grant funding with full flexibility	FY2011-1	Closed out	Development
San Antonio Housing Authority	Simplify and streamline Department of Housing and Urban Development approval process for the development, redevelopment, and acquisition of public housing	FY2011-2	Closed out	Development
San Antonio Housing Authority	Commitment of project-based vouchers to housing authority-owned or housing authority-controlled units with expiring subsidies (Housing Choice Voucher)	FY2011-6	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
San Antonio Housing Authority	Remove limitation of commitment on project-based vouchers so that they may be committed to more than 25% of the units in family developments without required provision of supportive services	FY2011-7	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility
San Antonio Housing Authority	Local project-based voucher program for former public housing residents	FY2012-11	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility
San Antonio Housing Authority	Elderly admissions preference at select public housing sites	FY2015-2	Not yet implemented	Admissions policy
San Antonio Housing Authority	Modified project-based vouchers	FY2015-3	Not yet implemented	Project-based voucher flexibility
San Antonio Housing Authority	Preservation and expansion of affordable housing	FY2011-1e	Ongoing	Development
San Antonio Housing Authority	Allocate tenant-based voucher set-asides for households referred by nonprofit sponsors who provide supportive services	FY2011-9	Ongoing	Admissions policy
San Antonio Housing Authority	Time-limited working household preference pilot program	FY2013-1	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
San Antonio Housing Authority	Early engagement	FY2014-2	Ongoing	Admissions policy
San Diego Housing Commission	Homeless veteran project-based subsidy program	2013-5	Closed out	Other
San Diego Housing Commission	New public housing transition	2013-9	Closed out	Other
San Diego Housing Commission	Broader uses of funds for individual development accounts	2011-10	Closed out	Other
San Diego Housing Commission	Undertake public housing development	2010-10	Closed out	Development
San Diego Housing Commission	Expand the project-based voucher program (reproposed)	2010-9	Not yet implemented	Project-based voucher flexibility
San Diego Housing Commission	Modify the 40% rent burden requirement	2015-1	Not yet implemented	Occupancy policy
San Diego Housing Commission	Public housing: Flat rent elimination	2013-4	Not yet implemented	Rent reform
San Diego Housing Commission	Project-based subsidy program for the homeless	2012-4	Not yet implemented	Project-based voucher flexibility
San Diego Housing Commission	Establish Housing Choice Voucher homeownership program	2010-8	On hold	Homeownership
San Diego Housing Commission	Moving to Work Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program	2013-1	Ongoing	Rent reform

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
San Diego Housing Commission	Transitional project-based subsidies for the homeless	2013-6	Ongoing	Other
San Diego Housing Commission	Allow lower rents for nonassisted units in housing authority-owned developments	2011-7	Ongoing	Inspections policy
San Diego Housing Commission	Authorize commitment of project-based vouchers to housing authority-owned units	2011-2	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
San Diego Housing Commission	Acquisition of additional affordable units	2011-4	Ongoing	Development
San Diego Housing Commission	Development of public housing units using a combination of funds	2011-7	Ongoing	Development
San Diego Housing Commission	Sponsor-based subsidies for the homeless	2011-8	Ongoing	Other
San Diego Housing Commission	Choice Communities component	2010-4	Ongoing	Rent reform
Seattle Housing Authority	Local asset management program	16	Closed out	Other
Seattle Housing Authority	Development simplification	1	Ongoing	Development
Seattle Housing Authority	Special-purpose housing	8	Ongoing	Resident services
Seattle Housing Authority	Project-based program	9	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Seattle Housing Authority	Waiting lists, preferences, and admission	12	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Seattle Housing Authority	Homeownership and graduation from subsidy	13	Ongoing	Homeownership
Seattle Housing Authority	Short-term assistance	18	Ongoing	Resident services
Seattle Housing Authority	Local nontraditional affordable housing	20	Ongoing	Development
Tacoma Housing Authority	Alternative method for reacting to insufficient funding activity	25	Not yet implemented	Other
Tacoma Housing Authority	Special program vouchers	10	Not yet implemented	Other
Tacoma Housing Authority	Local blended subsidy	13	Not yet implemented	Other
Tacoma Housing Authority	Special purpose housing	14	Not yet implemented	Resident services
Tacoma Housing Authority	Extend allowable tenant absences from unit for active-duty soldiers	1	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Tacoma Housing Authority	Tacoma Public Schools Special Housing Program (formerly McCarver Elementary Project)	2	Ongoing	Other
Tacoma Housing Authority	Allow transfers between public housing and voucher waitlists	4	Ongoing	Admissions policy

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Tacoma Housing Authority	Regional approach for special-purpose housing	15	Ongoing	Other
Tacoma Housing Authority	Creation and preservation of affordable housing	16	Ongoing	Development
Tacoma Housing Authority	Elimination of the 40% rule	18	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Tulare County Housing Authority	Project-based Section 8	Four	On hold	Project-based voucher flexibility
Tulare County Housing Authority	Increase housing choices	Two	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Tulare County Housing Authority	Development of additional affordable housing	Five	Ongoing	Development
Vancouver Housing Authority	Up to 50% of units in a project may be project-based vouchers	2011-03	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility
Vancouver Housing Authority	"Floating units" in project-based voucher program	2011-02	Closed out	Project-based voucher flexibility
Vancouver Housing Authority	Pilot rental subsidy project	2009-01	Closed out	Other
Vancouver Housing Authority	Alternate Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program	2008-02	Closed out	Homeownership
Vancouver Housing Authority	Flat rent and flat Housing Choice Voucher subsidy	2007-01	Closed out	Rent reform
Vancouver Housing Authority	One "request line" single waiting list	2002-01	Closed out	Admissions policy
Vancouver Housing Authority	Rent buy-down local subsidy program	2015-01	Not yet implemented	Project-based voucher flexibility
Vancouver Housing Authority	33% household share rent reform	2015-02	Not yet implemented	Rent reform
Vancouver Housing Authority	Shelter and transitional housing facilities support	2013-03	Not yet implemented	Resident services
Vancouver Housing Authority	Home sharing in Housing Choice Voucher program	2012-03	Not yet implemented	Other
Vancouver Housing Authority	Use of Moving to Work funds for leveraging new affordable housing	2012-02	Not yet implemented	Development
Vancouver Housing Authority	Minimum rent or income limits for new public housing units	2011-01	Not yet implemented	Rent reform
Vancouver Housing Authority	Alternative project-based voucher program	2014-06	Ongoing	Project-based voucher flexibility
Vancouver Housing Authority	Second Step Transitional Housing Program	2014-04	Ongoing	Resident services
Vancouver Housing Authority	Local nontraditional rent subsidy program	2014-03	Ongoing	Other
Vancouver Housing Authority	School Stability Subsidy Program	2013-02	Ongoing	Other
Vancouver Housing Authority	Short-term rental assistance	2012-04	Ongoing	Other
Vancouver Housing Authority	Waiting list preference for applicants without subsidized housing	2010-04	Ongoing	Admissions policy

Public housing authority	Initiative description	Initiative #	Status	Activity category
Vancouver Housing Authority	Special admission procedure for assisted living program	2009-19	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Vancouver Housing Authority	Renter education required for applicants	2009-16	Ongoing	Admissions policy
Vancouver Housing Authority	Simplified utility allowance schedule in Housing Choice Voucher program	2009-08	Ongoing	Rent reform
Vancouver Housing Authority	Time-limited vouchers tied to services	2008-01	Ongoing	Occupancy policy
Vancouver Housing Authority	Public housing rent income based only, no flat rent option	1999-08	Ongoing	Rent reform

Notes

1. Information about mobility counseling efforts and the history of intensive counseling programs will be addressed in a separate companion brief developed by the Poverty and Race Research Action Council.
2. Martha M. Galvez, “Defining ‘Choice’ in the Housing Choice Voucher Program: The Role of Market Constraints and Household Preferences in Location Outcomes” (PhD dissertation, New York University, 2011).
3. Ibid.
4. The other two objectives are to (1) reduce cost and increase cost effectiveness and (2) promote self-sufficiency.
5. A robust comprehensive mobility program is in place in Baltimore and administered by the Baltimore Regional Housing Partnership, not by the Housing Authority of Baltimore City, which is an MTW agency. As a result, the program is not included in this inventory.
6. Local payment standards could be considered landlord incentives, instead of tenant supports because landlords are ultimately the recipients of the higher rent payments. We include them as tenant supports and in the “comprehensive” category because the expectation is that tenants will be encouraged to search in low-poverty, more-expensive neighborhoods if payment standards are higher in those areas.
7. See “Small Area Fair Market Rents,” US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, accessed December 15, 2016, <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr/smallarea/index.html>.
8. The most recent information available describing these efforts is from the 2013 MTW report.
9. Special conditions include when the head of household is employed at least 20 hours a week on average and has been employed for six consecutive months or longer.
10. “Moving to Work (MTW) – Participating Sites,” US Department of Housing and Urban Development, accessed January 4, 2017, https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph/mtw/mtwsites.

References

- Applied Real Estate Analysis Inc. 2011. "Alternative Local Payment Standards for the Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino Housing Choice Voucher Program." San Bernardino, CA: Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino.
- Berdahl-Baldwin, Audrey. 2015. "Housing Mobility Programs in the US." Washington, DC: Poverty and Race Research Action Council.
- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, and Lawrence F. Katz. 2016. "The Effects of Exposure to Better Neighborhoods on Children: New Evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment." *American Economic Review* 106 (4): 855–902.
- Cunningham, Mary K., Molly M. Scott, Chris Narducci, Sam Hall, and Alexandra Stanczyk. 2010. *Improving Neighborhood Location Outcomes in the Housing Choice Voucher Program: A Scan of Mobility Assistance Programs*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Devine, Deborah J., Robert W. Gray, Lester Rubin, and Lydia Tahiti. 2003. *Housing Choice Voucher Location Patterns: Implications for Participant and Neighborhood Welfare*. Washington, DC: Office of Policy Development and Research, US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Engdahl, Lora. 2009. *New Homes, New Neighborhoods, New Schools: A Progress Report on the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program*. Washington, DC: Poverty and Race Research Action Council.
- Freeman, Lance. 2012. "The Impact of Source of Income Laws on Voucher Utilization." *Housing Policy Debate* 22 (2): 297–318.
- Galvez, Martha M. 2010a. *What Do We Know about Housing Choice Voucher Program Location Outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Galvez, Martha M. 2010b. *Getting Past 'No': Housing Choice Voucher Holders' Experiences with Discrimination and Search Costs*. Washington, DC: Poverty and Race Research Action Council.
- Graves, Erin. 2016. "Rooms for Improvement: A Qualitative Metasynthesis of the Housing Choice Voucher Program." *Housing Policy Debate* 26 (2): 346–61.
- HJCHS (Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies). 2015. *America's Rental Housing: Expanding Options for Diverse and Growing Demand*. Cambridge, MA: HJCHS.
- Horn, Keren Mertens, Ingrid Gould Ellen, and Amy Ellen Schwartz. 2014. "Do Housing Choice Voucher Holders Live Near Good Schools?" *Journal of Housing Economics* 23: 28–40.
- Leopold, Josh, Liza Getsinger, Pamela Blumenthal, Katya Abazajian, and Reed Jordan. 2015. "The Housing Affordability Gap for Extremely Low-Income Renters in 2013." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- McClure, Kirk. 2010. "The Prospects for Guiding Housing Choice Voucher Households to High-Opportunity Neighborhoods." *Cityscape* 12 (3): 101–22.
- McClure, Kirk, Alex F. Schwartz, and Lydia B. Taghavi. 2015. "Housing Choice Voucher Location Patterns a Decade Later." *Housing Policy Debate* 25 (2): 215–33.
- Pendall, Rolf. 2000. "Why Voucher and Certificate Users Live in Distressed Neighborhoods." *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (4): 881–910.
- Popkin, Susan J., and Mary K. Cunningham. 2000. *Searching for Rental Housing with Section 8 in the Chicago Region*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- San Diego Housing Commission. 2012. "Choice Communities: Moving Forward." San Diego Housing Commission.

Sard, Barbara, and Douglas Rice. 2014. *Creating Opportunity for Children: How Housing Location Can Make a Difference*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Turner, Margery Austin, Austin Nichols, and Jennifer Comey. 2012. *Benefits of Living in High-Opportunity Neighborhoods: Insights from the Moving to Opportunity Demonstration*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

About the Authors



Martha Galvez is a senior research associate in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at the Urban Institute. Her expertise is in housing and homelessness policy, with a focus on examining how interventions aimed at improving housing stability and choice for low-income families are implemented, and how they affect individuals, families, and neighborhoods.



Jasmine Simington is a research assistant in the Urban Institute's Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center. She works on projects for the Neighborhoods and Youth Development initiative and focuses on research surrounding neighborhoods and schools. Simington's work focuses on place-based initiatives and community-based participatory research in Washington, DC, and other metropolitan areas around the country.



Mark Treskon is a research associate in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at the Urban Institute. His current projects include an evaluation of financial coaching programs and a study measuring the effects of arts-related initiatives on community development. His research interests include housing and homeownership policy as well as neighborhood development and change. Treskon has published peer-reviewed articles and book chapters on community-based planning, home lending policy advocacy, and the arts economy. He has a broad background in quantitative and qualitative research and geographic information systems.

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

The Urban Institute strives to meet the highest standards of integrity and quality in its research and analyses and in the evidence-based policy recommendations offered by its researchers and experts. We believe that operating consistent with the values of independence, rigor, and transparency is essential to maintaining those standards. As an organization, the Urban Institute does not take positions on issues, but it does empower and support its experts in sharing their own evidence-based views and policy recommendations that have been shaped by scholarship. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Urban scholars and experts are expected to be objective and follow the evidence wherever it may lead.



2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

www.urban.org