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1 Executive Summary

As CHA’s Boulevard Homes HOPE VI project moves into its fifth and final year, this report aims to provide an interim assessment of the redevelopment’s progress. In doing so, it updates relevant sections of both our October 2010 baseline report and May 2013 first interim report. In particular, this report offers: (i) a review of development progress, including status and occupancy of the new Renaissance site; (ii) an update on community and supportive services and client progress toward self-sufficiency; and (iii) recommendations for CHA and its partners. We have not conducted a survey of relocatees since the last report, and as such, we have no new survey data to report. The results of our final survey (to be conducted next year) will be included in our final report on the Boulevard Homes redevelopment project. In addition, given that the Renaissance development is still under construction, it is too soon to expect impacts on the surrounding properties. The final report, however, will contain an analysis of the changes that have taken place in the surrounding neighborhoods.

1.a Program Progress and Development

- Construction and lease-up of Phase I – the Retreat at Renaissance – are complete as of January 2014. This attractive, senior-only facility contains a mix of public housing, project-based Section 8, and Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units and was completed four months ahead of schedule and on budget.
• As of June 2014, construction of Phase II, which includes the first family units, is complete, 100% of the units are leased, and 21 families have moved in. The construction of this phase was on budget though delayed slightly due to weather.

• Construction of Phase III of the Renaissance, which includes 60 market-rate units, 52 public housing units, 23 affordable units, and 15 project-based Housing Choice Voucher units, is anticipated to be completed in fall 2015.

• A stand-alone community center opened in July 2014, and will house leasing offices in addition to meeting space, a fitness facility, a computer lab, and other amenities for residents.

• The Renaissance West Community Initiative (RWCI), a separate 501(c)3 non-profit funded with seed money from CHA, is facilitating the development of programming at the community center and coordinating the educational components of the Boulevard redevelopment, including the on-site school and early childhood development center.

• RWCI has been successful in signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS) to operate a pre-K through 8th grade school at the Renaissance. The facility is anticipated to open for the 2017-18 school year and is expected to enroll up to 700 students.

1. b Community and Supportive Services

• CHA has offered extensive supportive services to all households relocated from Boulevard Homes with the goal of helping them to gain or expand employment and otherwise qualify for residence in the new development whether they are interested in moving back or not.

• Children’s Home Society (CHS) delivered supportive services to the relocated residents from February 2010 through March 2014. Since then, Grace-Mar (for non-senior/disabled) and Symmetry Behavioral Health (for senior/disabled) have provided case management to Boulevard-original households.

• The number of households active in case management remained relatively stable during the October 2012-December 2013 period at slightly over 200. In-person
visits with clients fluctuate considerably month-to-month, varying from 133 total contacts in January 2013 to 241 contacts in December 2013.

- Employment among all Boulevard originals active in case management has risen steadily over the study period. Over 50% of non-senior/disabled heads of household were employed as of December 2013, compared to 32.5% in October 2010. As of December 2013, 89% of working heads of household active in case management had maintained employment over the previous three months, compared to 72% in December 2010. Since March 2011, average wages have also increased (from $11,515 to $13,352).

- Utilization of several services remains high, with transportation assistance and life-skills workshops being the two most commonly-accessed services. Relatively few clients, however, were enrolled in or completed occupational skills training or GED classes. Based on interviews with case managers, the relatively small number of enrollments is largely a result of many clients with mental and physical health problems who are not officially considered disabled and clients not enrolling in programs recommended by the case managers.

- In comparison to two CHA developments similar to Boulevard Homes (Southside Homes and Dillehay Courts), Boulevard originals active in case management have experienced larger increases in employment rates, and those working have seen substantially higher increases in average wages. They have also outpaced those inactive in case management in these same indicators of work effort.

- A majority of employed heads of household work more than 30 hours per week (44 of 83, or 53.2%), and nearly a quarter work full time or more (20 of 83, or 24.1%). The latter figure represents a significant increase from our previous report, when only 6.5% (six of 93) of heads of household were employed 40+ hours per week from October 2010 through September 2012.

- The number of evictions has declined since the period immediately following relocation (late 2011). While no Section 9 tenants were evicted in 2013, six Section 8 tenants left CHA for negative reasons (e.g. lease violations, non-payment of rent) in that year.
• Out of 18 senior-only households that were eligible to move into the senior-oriented Retreat at Renaissance, four applied, and all four were accepted. The reasons that other former Boulevard Homes seniors did not apply to move to the Renaissance include being happy in their current location, wanting larger units, and having other household members who were not elderly.

• Seventy-five former Boulevard households have applied to live in Phase II of the development. Of those, 25% were approved, 20% withdrew their applications prior to receiving a decision, and 4% were still being processed. Of the 51% whose applications were denied, half were for previous criminal convictions while the other half were for credit concerns. Note that the Renaissance has instituted more stringent screening criteria compared to other CHA properties.

• Of those who supplied a reason for not applying to return to the Renaissance, nearly two-thirds say they are satisfied with their current housing, and a further 16% have a household that is too large for any unit in the Renaissance development.

1.c Conclusions

• Construction and lease-up of the first two Renaissance phases have gone very smoothly, and the signing of a MOU with the CMS was a major step forward in ensuring the development contains a pre-K through 8th grade school.

• Recently, two new case management agencies have been contracted to work with clients, and a new case management approach, focusing on assessment and referrals, has been adopted. It will be important to monitor this transition and assess outcomes over the remaining period of the program.

• Measures of client work effort have shown substantial improvement over the course of the program. Clients are more likely to be working, more likely to be working more hours, and more likely to hold their jobs longer. These increases indicate that former Boulevard residents are making meaningful progress toward reaching economic self-sufficiency.

• Compared to residents at two similar CHA developments, Boulevard originals active in case management have seen significantly larger gains in employment
and wages. Further, those active in case management have also outpaced inactive residents in these same metrics.

- As of May 2014, the rate of move-backs among the original Boulevard Homes was approximately 11 percent, although this percentage may increase as unit in the final phase become available. Both satisfaction with current housing and inability to meet requirements for criminal history and/or credit ratings account for this rate of return.

- Revisions to the CSS data collection protocols have been effective in providing more detailed and useful information on the types and frequencies of services and activities engaged in by clients. The performance goals of the services have also been clarified.

1.d **Recommendations: CSS Administration**

- It is common for case management agencies to utilize off-the-shelf case management software for tracking, reporting, and analysis of key data. Grace-Mar and Symmetry Behavioral Health should be urged to use a case management database if not already doing so.

- The new case managers need to move as quickly as possible to establish trust relationships and reasonable goals with their clients.

- Carefully monitor and track implementation of the new ‘assess and refer’ case management model. This new model focuses services on heads of household and prioritizes referrals to outside agencies. It is also important to monitor whether residents follow-up with referrals and whether receiving agencies have the capacity to work with CHA clients.

- Case managers should seek to obtain releases of information from clients whenever making referrals, particularly for HIPAA protected counseling, to enable them to support their clients effectively.

- All case managers should be strongly urged to complete the Yardi individual and family assessment module within the database (rather than on paper). The data collected during the assessment process every six months could provide an
enormous amount of information that would be useful to case managers for planning and evaluation and to CHA staff for data reporting.

- Prioritize the assessment of individuals’ ability to work. Data show that an increasing number of heads of household are designated disabled over time. If disability designations can happen sooner rather than later, less time, money, and resources will be expended providing employment services to those individuals.

- Data indicate that Tier IV (elderly and disabled) clients receive as many, if not more, visits from case managers as Tier I-III clients. CHA should consider the needs of this population when developing case manager contact requirements and reimbursement rates.

- CHA and case managers should strive to develop metrics to track and evaluate services provided to Tier IV (elderly and disabled) clients.

1.6 Recommendations: Clients Achieving Self-Sufficiency

- Work with clients whose applications to return to the Renaissance have been denied to address and expunge any previous criminal convictions and ameliorate credit or financial constraints.

- Continue working with residents to improve their employment prospects, whether or not they will qualify to return to the Renaissance. The new non-elderly service provider (Grace-Mar) has more experience in job training and placement, and CHA’s Center for Employment Services (of which Grace-Mar is a partner) should help accomplish this.

- Seek resources to expand funding for transportation assistance, one of the most requested services by clients. With funds provided by the CHA, the CHS provided bus passes to many clients, and the case managers reported that those passes were essential in allowing households to access both employment opportunities and supportive services.

- Investigate ways to increase childcare assistance. CHA may want to consider the San Antonio Housing Authority’s program to train public housing tenants as
childcare providers. This model could provide both employment opportunities for residents and an affordable and easily-accessible childcare alternative.

- Continue working with clients to achieve positive move-outs, whether to affordable housing, market-rate rentals, or homeownership. Encourage clients to enroll in homeownership classes offered by CHA.
2 Introduction

In May 2010, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) awarded the Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) $20.9 million in HOPE VI funds to demolish and redevelop the Boulevard Homes housing development. The five-year grant provided for relocation of existing tenants, case management for relocated tenants while the site is under construction, demolition of the existing Boulevard Homes property, and construction of a new mixed-income community called the Renaissance.

As of July 2014, the Boulevard redevelopment has been ongoing for approximately four years. Relocation of tenants began in August 2010 and continued through March 2011, though some residents remained in temporary housing through August 2011. Demolition of the complex began in January 2011 and finished in June of that year. Phase I of construction, which encompasses the senior-only Retreat at Renaissance, was completed in September 2013, and the building is now fully occupied. Construction on Phase II, which consists of public housing, project-based Section 8, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit units, was completed in June, 2014. Completion of Phase III, which includes both market-rate and affordable (subsidized) units, is anticipated in fall 2015.

This report aims to provide an interim assessment of the Boulevard Homes redevelopment project. In doing so, it updates both our October 2010 baseline report and May 2013 first interim report. In particular, this report provides: (i) a review of program progress, including status and occupancy of the new development; (ii) an update on community and supportive services and client progress toward self-sufficiency; and (iii) recommendations for CHA and its partners.
Data and Methods

Data underlying this report primarily come from three sources: key informant interviews, End of Month (EOM) case management reports, and CHA administrative data, including Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) reports. In December 2013, CURS staff conducted eighteen in-person interviews with CHA staff and management, Children Homes Society case managers and supervisors, and representatives from Laurel Street Residential (the developer of the Renaissance) and Renaissance West Community Initiative (a non-profit tasked with developing the educational and community services portion of the Renaissance). Follow-up interviews have been conducted when appropriate. EOM reports are compiled by case managers for all active clients and provide data on employment and hours worked, in addition to service referrals and course completions. Finally, we consulted CHA administrative data, including lease-up information for the Renaissance and Multifamily Tenant Characteristic System (MTCS), reports, which provide data on wages and income.

1 In addition to these three sources, CURS staff attempted to utilize data from Yardi’s (CHA’s in-house database) case management module. However, despite a significant investment and continued development of this module within the Yardi system, CHA staff was unable to extract any data from the system for analysis.
3 Review of Development Progress

3.a Status of new construction and occupancy of the new development

After receiving the Boulevard Homes HOPE VI grant in May 2010, CHA relocated tenants and commenced demolition later that year. Following infrastructure and site work, construction of the residential development began in early 2013 and will be completed in three phases (Table 3.1). CHA is serving as master developer of the site, while Laurel Street Residential (a spinoff of Crosland Homes) is serving as developer for the residential components. Beyond the HOPE VI grant, the project utilizes funding from several sources, including general operating funds,\(^2\) City of Charlotte Housing Trust Fund, private sources, and Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) (Table 3.2). The development provides a mix of public housing (both Section 9 and project-based Section 8), LIHTC affordable housing, and market-rate units. In addition to housing, the Renaissance will include a CHA-owned community center and an on-site public pre-K through 8th grade school and early childhood development center.

Phase I encompasses the Retreat at Renaissance, a senior-only apartment building that includes 70 public housing (Section 9), 20 project-based Housing Choice Voucher (HCV, or Section 8), and 20 LIHTC units, for a total of 110 units. All are one-bedroom units

\(^2\) CHA’s participation in the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration provided the flexibility to transfer general operating funds to the Boulevard Homes project.
and are restricted to elderly tenants. Construction of Phase I was completed in September 2013 – four months ahead of schedule and on-budget – and the building was fully occupied as of January 2014. Funding for Phase I largely came from equity sources (including LIHTC), with HOPE VI, the Charlotte Housing Trust Fund, and state loans providing additional monies.

**Table 3.1. Unit Mix for the Renaissance by Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>AMI</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Income Limit</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,420</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,260</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$22,350</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Based Section 8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,420</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,260</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$22,350</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$32,100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$37,250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,840</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$38,520</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$44,700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completion Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>September 2013</th>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Laurel Street Residential internal figures, June 2014.

**Table 3.2. Funding for the Renaissance by Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHA (incl. HOPE VI)</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$7.30</td>
<td>$8.80</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Housing Trust Fund</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Loan</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (incl. LIHTC)</td>
<td>$11.20</td>
<td>$7.90</td>
<td>$4.60</td>
<td>$22.70</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Loan</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All dollars reported are in millions. Source: Laurel Street Residential internal figures, June 2014.

Phase II includes low-income rentals open to both elderly and non-senior households. The unit mix consists of 23 public housing, eight project-based HCV, and 43 LIHTC units for a total of 74 one- to three-bedroom units. As of June 2014, construction of
Phase II is complete, units are 100% leased, and the first 21 families have moved in. Similar to Phase I, funding for Phase II was predominantly through equity sources.

Phase III consists of additional family units, with a mix of 52 public housing, 15 project-based HCV, 23 LIHTC, and 60 market-rate rental units totaling 150 units. Of note, Phase III is the only phase to include market-rate units. Laurel Street Residential was awarded LIHTCs for Phase III in January 2013, and expects to close on the project in September/October 2014. Construction will begin immediately afterward and is expected to be complete in Fall 2015; lease-up will occur in the spring through winter of that year. In contrast to the first two phases, Phase III funding includes a substantial amount from CHA (including funds from the HOPE VI grant), the Charlotte Housing Trust Fund, LIHTC, and bank loans.

Laurel Street Residential is also constructing a 13,900 square foot community center that provides offices for leasing, case management, and the Renaissance West Community Initiative, in addition to various amenities for residents. The latter are slated to include a community room and meeting space, fitness facilities, and a business center with computer and internet access. Expected to cost $2.5 million, construction of the community center is wholly funded by CHA and is scheduled to open in July 2014.

3.b Renaissance West Community Initiative (RWCI)

One aspect of the Boulevard Homes redevelopment effort not covered in our previous report is the Renaissance West Community Initiative (RWCI), a 501(c)3 non-profit formed to oversee the project’s educational and community development initiatives. Begun in April 2013 and headed by Laura Clark, RWCI is a separate nonprofit organization with initial seed funding provided by CHA.

RWCI’s efforts are focused on three components of the Renaissance project: programming at the community center, the on-site public pre-K through 8th grade school, and on-site early childhood development center. Construction of the community center is scheduled to finish in July 2014, and RWCI has engaged various local partners, including the YMCA, Charlotte Mecklenburg Library, Communities in Schools, Central Piedmont Community College, and UNC-Charlotte to offer activities at the facility.
Plans for the pre-K through 8th grade school have undergone several revisions, from the initial proposal to construct a public school, to partnering on a charter school with Purpose-Built Communities. However, in early 2014, RWCI signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS) to operate a pre-K through 8th grade public school at the Renaissance West site. A recently-passed bond issue designed to relieve school overcrowding will fund construction of the new facility, which could eventually serve up to 700 students when it opens for the 2017 school year. The school will be public yet operate on the Purpose-Built Communities model, with a board that includes representatives from CMS, RWCI, the community, and parents.

While plans for the on-site school have solidified in recent months, the operator of the on-site early childhood development center remains undecided. Thompson Child and Family Focus was originally interested in operating the facility; however, it later withdrew due to funding concerns. Currently, RWCI is seeking potential partners (likely a non-profit organization) to operate the early childhood center.

RWCI faces a significant task in raising funds for these activities. It is currently working to identify local “champions” - individuals who can contribute a substantial sum to support the child development center. To that end, the organization has engaged fundraising consultants and made initial contacts within the local philanthropic community. A recent grant from the Sisters of Mercy Foundation will support a second staff person to coordinate programming for Renaissance residents, which will allow RWCI Director Laura Clark to concentrate on fundraising.

3 The Purpose-Built Communities model is a holistic revitalization effort that draws upon creating (i) “high-quality mixed-income housing,” (ii) an “effective cradle-to-college education pipeline,” (iii) “enriching community wellness programs,” all coordinated by a lead non-profit organization (http://purposebuiltcommunities.org). The model is based on the experience of Atlanta's Eastlake neighborhood, and Purpose-Built Communities is currently consulting with non-profit partners in numerous cities in addition to Charlotte, including Birmingham, New Orleans, and Omaha.
4  Community and Supportive Services

Public housing authorities receiving HOPE VI grants are required to provide services (termed Community and Supportive Services, or CSS) that help relocated residents “make effective progress toward self-sufficiency,” with a goal of qualifying the former residents to move back into the redeveloped community. To do so, residents must have (i) a maximum 42% debt-to-income ratio, (ii) a high school diploma or GED (or the ability to complete either within six months), and (iii) a minimum six-month work history. Case managers provide services to relocated tenants during the entirety of the grant period.

CHA initially contracted with Children’s Home Society (CHS) – formerly known as Youth Homes, Inc. – to provide case management services to former Boulevard Homes tenants. Relocated households began receiving case management in February, 2010 unless the head of household signed a waiver formally declining these services. At the beginning of Boulevard Homes CSS, CHS case managers had a relatively small caseload – approximately 20 households each – and focused solely on providing services to the head of household. In response to concerns about meeting with clients too often (thus increasing residents’ dependency on case managers) and program costs, CHA and CHS renegotiated their contract in April, 2012, resulting in an increase in caseloads (from

1:20 to approximately 1:34) and adoption of a wrap-around case management model. The wrap-around model included providing support to all family members in hopes that, by stabilizing the household’s children, parents would be better able to initiate and increase work efforts. However, after an internal assessment, CHA staff determined that the costs associated with these more comprehensive, family-focused services were not producing significantly improved work efforts. Thus, in a subsequent round of contract renegotiations in early 2014, CHA proposed a further increase in caseloads to approximately 1:70, returning to focusing solely on the head of household, and adopting an ‘asses-and-refer’ model that prioritized referrals to local social service agencies instead of providing direct support. At this time, CHS’ contract with CHA was not successfully renegotiated. Thus, in April 2014 a contract to provide supportive services to non-elderly/non-disabled households was awarded to Grace-Mar Services, Inc., and a contract for senior and disabled households was approved for Symmetry Behavioral Health.

4.a Data Collection and Methods

To assess the Community and Supportive Services component of the Boulevard Homes redevelopment, CURS staff consulted three data sources. First, we reviewed End of Month (EOM) reports from October 2012 through December 2013, the period covered by this report. Our first interim report of May 2013 contained data on the earlier time period, some of which is included in this report for comparison purposes. Compiled by case managers, EOMs include information on case manager contact with residents, referrals, and client progress toward self-sufficiency. Additionally, our staff conducted in-person interviews with CHA staff and CHS case managers and supervisors in December, 2013. Finally, we consulted CHA administrative data, including lease-up information for the Renaissance and Multifamily Tenant Characteristic System (MTCS), reports, which provide data on wages and income.

4.b Community and Supportive Services Lessons Learned

As discussed previously, CHA originally contracted with Children’s Home Society (CHS) to provide supportive services to former Boulevard Homes residents. In December
2013, CURS staff interviewed CHA and CHS staff concerning program progress and client progress toward self-sufficiency. While CHS is no longer providing Community and Supportive Services (CSS) to Boulevard originals, several lessons learned are applicable to the Boulevard Homes project going forward.

Data collection and reporting have proven challenging to CHA and CHS staff as it relates to case management services. Early in the process, metrics had not been fully established, and both agencies reported frustration with the changing nature of data collection and reporting. CHA established an outcomes-oriented tracking system in April 2013 that appears to have greatly improved the ability to track and evaluate case management services. Case managers praised the new system’s focus on tracking the trajectory of a referral or other case plan goals for an individual rather than merely counting the aggregate number of attempted and achieved contacts. CHA staff believes this new tracking system will provide them with more meaningful data to evaluate the quality of case management and understand the barriers to self-sufficiency among their clients. Further, CHA has established clear goals in terms of increasing the number of: (i) residents paying minimum rent; (ii) tenants working; and (iii) clients maintaining employment more than 12 months. Case managers report that these metrics make it easier for both case managers and supervisors to monitor outcomes.

In developing individual case plans, case managers utilize the assessment module in the Yardi database, and a completed assessment on all family members is required every six months. Both case managers and CHA staff noted both the pros and cons to using this module. CHA staff is disappointed with its complicated structure that makes much of the module unusable. Case managers noted that the assessment, which requires them to ask a series of questions to all members of the household, could be a scheduling challenge and ‘overkill’ – many of the questions simply do not apply to every family member. However, the assessment does provide an opportunity to probe and confront a variety of problem behaviors. While case managers are currently able to complete the

\[5 \text{ CURS prepared a report summarizing these interviews for CHA in February 2013.}\]
assessment either on paper or online, we strongly recommend that all assessments be entered into the Yardi database for future analysis. The data collected during the assessment process every six months could provide an enormous amount of information that would be useful not only to case managers for planning and evaluation, but also to CHA staff for data reporting related to the population served.

Interviewees believed communication difficulties previously hampered CHS’ work toward moving clients to self-sufficiency. The appointment of Monica Nathan as contract manager appears to have ameliorated this challenge considerably. Specifically, Ms. Nathan serves as a single point of contact for CHS staff, and the monthly cross-functional “Team Renaissance” meetings she convenes have set clear expectations for case management. Further, by bringing together representatives from case management, development, relocation, and the Section 8 and 9 programs, these meetings have kept everyone apprised of progress on the new development. The meetings were universally praised throughout our interviews as improving communication and information flow, especially given the multi-faceted nature of the project.

4.c  Contact with Clients

CHS began providing case management services in February 2010, though in its initial months, case managers focused primarily on contacting and assessing client’s needs and interests. As part of their initial contacts with clients, CHS case managers evaluated each household’s needs, classifying each into one of four tiers, with each having its own contact requirements stipulated by CHA. All senior (aged 62 and older) and disabled6 households were categorized as Tier IV; the remaining tiers encompass all non-senior, non-disabled households. Tier I includes non-disabled, non-elderly households with significant needs requiring more intensive services. Tier II represents more stable

6 Disabled households are defined as those where the head of household receives disability assistance through Social Security or Supplemental Security Income (SSI).
families in need of less frequent contact, and Tier III encompasses the most secure families with individuals either working or in school. Table 4.1 relates tier classification standards and initial contact requirements.

Contract renegotiations in April 2012 between CHA and CHS resulted in expanded caseloads and a transition to a more comprehensive, family-focused, wrap-around service model in addition to more flexible requirements for case manager contact with clients (Table 4.1). Previously, contact requirements had varied by tier, but in the new contract, case managers are required only to meet with each client at least once per month but may meet more frequently if needed. Despite initial fears that they could no longer meet with clients as much as they would like, CHS staff reported satisfaction with these new contact requirements which permitted them to continue interacting with higher-need individuals more than once per month. In addition, these new guidelines relaxed contact requirements for less needy or less engaged clients, who may only be contacted once per month, often over the phone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Typical Family Type</th>
<th>Original Minimum Contact Guidelines</th>
<th>Current Minimum Contact Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Families with existing problems that require more intense services</td>
<td>One visit and one phone conversation per week</td>
<td>Once per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat stable families with individuals who have jobs or are enrolled in school or training program</td>
<td>Once per week</td>
<td>Once per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat stable families with individuals who have jobs or are enrolled in school/training program</td>
<td>Twice per month</td>
<td>Once per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elderly or disabled</td>
<td>Once per month or as needed</td>
<td>Once per month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CHA Contract 1791 and Modification 02, April 2012.

Figure 4.1 displays the number of former Boulevard Homes tenants active in case management, where ‘active’ is defined as having met with a case manager in the past month. When case management became fully operational in October, 2010, 209 of 252 Boulevard households still in CHA housing were active in case management. The number of active households increased to 241 in February, 2011 due to a change in reporting requirements; families were now considered active unless they signed a waiver.
refusing services. Since that time, the number of households active in case management has decreased as households either leave CHA housing or opt-out of services. However, in April 2013, ten Boulevard-original households who had relocated to CHA’s Moving Forward pilot sites – where they had been receiving case management through Genesis Project I – were transitioned back to CHS. Over the period covered by this report (October 2012 through December 2013), the number of active households has remained relatively steady at slightly under 200 (pre-April 2013 transition) and over 200 (post-April 2013 transition). In contrast to our previous report – which noted that the number of Tier IV (elderly or disabled) clients had increased substantially – there was little change (except for the transition) from October 2012 through December 2013.

Figures 4.2 and 4.3 show total monthly case management visits for Tiers I-III and IV, respectively.9 Since the beginning of HOPE VI CSS in February, 2010, the number of case manager visits has decreased steadily due to: (i) households leaving CHA or becoming inactive in case management; and (ii) reductions in contact requirements and increases in caseloads. Over the period covered by this report (October 2012 through December 2013), the total number of monthly visits for Tier I-III clients fluctuated from a low of 70 in January 2013 to a high of 130 in June 2013. For Tier IV residents, visits

7 Thus, CSS is an ‘opt-out’ model of case management, where clients receive services by default and must actively opt-out of supports by signing a waiver.

8 These include Cedar Knoll, Claremont, Leafcrest, Tarlton Hill, and Victoria Square. CHA is piloting several innovations as part of their Moving to Work agreement (which CHA terms ‘Moving Forward’) at these developments, including a requirement that mandates residents work 15 hours per week or face sanctions. Tenants at these sites receive case management through an on-site case manager; prior to April 2013, this was provided through Genesis Project I. In April 2013, CHA transitioned to its own in-house case management for these developments; at that time, the former Boulevard residents living at those sites began receiving services from CHS.

9 Our previous report included information on the number of phone calls between case managers and clients; however, with the case management transition, these are no longer tracked after April 2013.
show similar fluctuations, with a low of 63 in January 2013 to a high of 114 in December 2013.

**Figure 4.1. Number of Active Households by Month, October 2010-December 2013**

![Bar chart showing number of active households by month from October 2010 to December 2013.](image)

*Note: The number of active households increased in February, 2011 due to a change in reporting requirements; families would be considered active after this date unless they formally waived supportive services. Source: End of Month reports, October 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.*

Figure 4.4 presents average monthly visits for Tier I-III and Tier IV clients over the entirety of Boulevard Homes CSS. Like total monthly visits, these also show a decrease over time, with an especially dramatic decline during the renegotiation of the CSS contract in early 2013. From October 2012 through December 2013, average monthly visits hover near 1.0 per client, in line with updated contact requirements (Table 4.1). Interestingly, Tier IV (elderly and disabled) frequently receive more average monthly visits than clients in Tiers I-III, even though the latter are subject to more stringent requirements, including a work requirement, for returning to the Renaissance.
**Figure 4.2. Monthly Case Management Visits for Tier I-III Clients, February 2010-December 2013**

![Bar chart showing monthly case management visits for Tier I-III clients from February 2010 to December 2013.](chart1.png)

*Source: End of Month reports, February 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.*

**Figure 4.3. Monthly Case Management Visits for Tier IV Clients, February 2010-December 2013**

![Bar chart showing monthly case management visits for Tier IV clients from February 2010 to December 2013.](chart2.png)

*Source: End of Month reports, February 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.*
Figure 4.4. Monthly Average Case Management Visits for Tier I-III and Tier IV Clients, February 2010-December 2013

Source: End of Month reports, February 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.

4.d  Employment Outcomes

The goal of CSS is to qualify residents to return to the revitalized HOPE VI community, and one of the requirements to do so is a six-month work history. Therefore, case managers have dedicated significant effort to improving employment outcomes among former Boulevard residents. While some Tier IV (elderly or disabled) clients are employed, they are not subject to the work requirement (i.e., a six-month employment history) when returning to the new development. As such, this section only considers Tier I-III households in the data presented.

Figure 4.5 presents the number and percent of active Tier I-III clients working for each month over the entirety of Boulevard Homes CSS. Over time, the number and percent of active clients working has increased steadily (albeit unevenly); at the beginning of case management, only 32.5% of active Tier I-III clients were employed, while today, this number exceeds 54%. For the study period covered by this report (October 2012-
December 2013), the percentage working has fluctuated from a low of 47% (in April and August 2013) to a high of 54% (in December 2013).

**Figure 4.5. Number and Percent of Tier I-III Clients Working Per Month, October 2010-December 2013**

Another measure of work outcomes is the number of hours worked per week. Table 4.2 and Figure 4.6 report average weekly hours worked for non-elderly, non-disabled households. For both, averages are calculated only for employed households. For the study period (October 2012-December 2013), employed households worked an average of 28.3 hours per week, which represents an increase from 26.5 hours reported in the previous report. A majority of employed households work more than 30 hours per week (44 of 83, or 53.2%), and nearly a quarter work full time or more (20 of 83, or 24.1%). The latter figure represents a significant increase from our previous report, where only 6.5% (six of 93) of households were employed 40 hours per week or more.
Table 4.2. Average Weekly Hours Worked Per Week by Employed, Active Tier I-III Clients, October 2010-December 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Weekly Hours</th>
<th>10/2010-9/2012</th>
<th>Percent of all</th>
<th>10/2012-12/2013</th>
<th>Percent of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Hours worked 26.5 28.3

1 Percent of all Tier I-III clients active any month working at least one month during period.

Source: End of Month reports, October 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.

Figure 4.6. Monthly Average Hours Worked by Percentage of Tier I-III Working Households, October 2010-December 2013

Source: End of Month reports, October 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.
Our previous report highlighted high levels of episodic employment – defined as when an individual cycles in and out of work, rather than remaining consistently employed from month to month (i.e., continuous employment) – among Boulevard originals. In contrast, while some clients experienced episodic employment, we find that rates of continuous employment (in addition to overall employment) have remained relatively high over the study period (October 2012-December 2013) and have improved considerably since baseline (October-December 2010).

Table 4.3 presents rates of continuous and episodic employment over the course of Boulevard Homes CSS. The columns of Table 4.3 represent the 13 three-month periods that comprise the 39 months of full case management (October 2010 through December 2013); the latter 15 months (October 2012 through December 2013) are the focus of this report. The first row of Table 4.3 relates the number of heads of household active and employed for any month of each three-month period, while the second row includes heads of household active and employed for the entire three month period. As such, the second row serves as a count of continuous employment, while the difference between the first and second row captures episodic employment. The final row of Table 4.3 relates the proportion of non-elderly, non-disabled heads of households working the entire three-month time period relative to the number working any of the same period, thus measuring rates of continuous (versus episodic) employment.

From October 2012 through December 2013, the rate of continuous employment has remained relatively steady, falling from 95% in the three-month period immediately preceding the report to a low of 81% in July-September 2013, and then rebounding to 89% in September-December 2013. However, in the final quarter of the period covered by this report (September-December 2013), the highest number of households achieved continuous employment (57), and the highest number achieved any employment (64). All of these figures represent a substantial improvement from the beginning of case management services, when only 72% of employed residents were working continuously. One should note, though, that without a matched comparison group, it is
### Table 4.3. Active Tier I-III Employment Duration, October 2010-December 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of household active and employed, entire three-month time period</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of active heads of households employed all or portion of three-month period, percent employed entire three-month time period</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source: End of Month reports, October 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.
not possible to isolate whether case management supports, an improving economy, or some combination of both of these generated the improved employment outcomes.

4.e Employment and Wage Comparison to Dillehay and Southside

A final gauge of work effort is wage income. While qualification for returning to the new development is not contingent on a household’s wage, CHA has a vested interest in improving salaries as tenants pay 30% of their income as rent within $2,500 income bands – thus, increases in wages not only help residents move toward economic self-sufficiency, but also help CHA’s bottom line.

To compare changes in wages and employment among Boulevard originals, we contrasted data on both (i) employment and (ii) average wages for Boulevard originals (separating those active and inactive in case management) and residents at two similar CHA developments, Dillehay Courts and Southside Homes.\(^\text{10}\) Dillehay Courts is a 136-unit, family public housing complex immediately north of downtown Charlotte, while Southside Homes is a 381-unit family public housing development located southwest of downtown Charlotte and 2.5 miles from the Boulevard Homes site. Residents at both Dillehay and Southside were not receiving case management or other supportive services during the period covered by this analysis.

Data reported in this section are collected from quarterly MTCS reports,\(^\text{11}\) and all households receiving an elderly/disabled allowance is excluded from analysis. Employment is defined as a household reporting any wage income, and wages are averaged against those reporting any wage income. Data are presented at quarterly intervals from March 2011 (when Boulevard CSS become fully operational) through

---

10 Since Dillehay and Southside are not receiving case management, their residents do not have end-of-month reports. Thus, this section of the report utilizes MTCS data to compare employment and wages.

11 Because MTCS data are reported here quarterly, and EOM reports are made monthly, determinations of ‘active’ and ‘Tier I-III’ were made for the last month of the quarter (March, June, September, and December, respectively).
December 2013. For greater detail on the methodology and behind this analysis, see the Appendix.

Figure 4.7 presents employment rates across the four groups, and shows that Boulevard originals active in case management have consistently higher rates of employment than those inactive in case management and compared to those at Dillehay and Southside. As of December 2013, 46.1% of active Boulevard households reported some wage income, compared to 36.4% at Southside, 31.0% at Dillehay, and 25.0% among inactive Boulevard originals. In fact, active Boulevard clients have reported the highest employment rates in every quarter since September 2011.

**Figure 4.7. Quarterly Employment Rate for Work-able Households, March 2011-December 2013**

![Graph showing employment rates across four groups from first quarter 2011 to fourth quarter 2013.]


---

12 Again, employment here is measured by the percentage of work-able households reporting any wage income on MTCS reports.
Figure 4.8 shows percent-point change in the employment rate. It indicates that, while both of the comparison groups have higher employment rates in December 2013 than in March 2011, active Boulevard originals experienced the highest rates of employment growth over the study period. Since March 2011, the percent of active Boulevard originals reporting any wage income has increased 14.2 percentage points (from 31.9% to 46.1%), which outpaces both comparison groups. Over the same time period, the employment rate at Dillehay has risen 10.7 percentage points, while employment at Southside has increased 8.2 percentage points. Boulevard originals not active in case management experienced a decline in employment over the study period.

**Figure 4.8. Percent-Point Change in Employment Rate, March 2011-December 2013**


---

13 Percent-point change is change in employment rate from March 2011 through a particular quarter.

14 Note, though, that the population of inactive clients is not held steady throughout the study – households may be active in case management and inactive the next.
Another measurement of work outcomes is income earned from wages. Figure 4.9 reports average wages for work-able households for the four groups. Wages are classified as any income earned through employment, and are averaged by those reporting any wage income. As in employment, active Boulevard originals have the highest average wages at $13,106, followed by inactive Boulevard originals at $11,139, Southside at $11,031, and Dillehay at $10,224. One should note that, over the course of the study period, the average wage income of active Boulevard originals has eclipsed the amount needed to have funds deposited in an incentive account (even absent any non-wage income).

**Figure 4.9. Quarterly Average Wages for Working Work-able Households, March 2011-December 2013**

Finally, Figure 4.10 reports quarterly changes in average wages for work-able households from March 2011-December 2013 for the four groups. Over this period, active Boulevard originals have seen the highest increase, with households earning $1,754 more (on average) in December 2013 than in March 2011. The two comparison sites have seen smaller increases in averages wages: $678 at Southside and $315 at
Dillehay. As with percent working, inactive Boulevard households have seen decreases in average wages, having declined $1,356 (or 10.8%) over the study period.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{Figure 4.10. Change in Average Wages for Working Work-able Households, March 2011-December 2013}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[scale=0.5]{figure4_10.png}
\caption{Change in Average Wages for Working Work-able Households, March 2011-December 2013}
\end{figure}

\textit{Source: Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) reports, 2011-2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.}

\subsection*{4.f Services Accessed}

As increasing work efforts is crucial to the goals of CSS, case managers offer a number of services and supports to improve clients' work-related skills. End of Month reports track a variety of life skills and employment-related services and courses, presented in Tables 4.4 and 4.5, accessed by former Boulevard Homes residents active in case management. As with the previous report, the most frequently utilized service is transportation assistance (most commonly a bus pass). Because transportation is crucial to finding employment and accessing self-sufficiency services – and many former

\textsuperscript{15} Again, note that the inactive population is not held steady over the study period.
Boulevard tenants do not own their own vehicle – it is not surprising that many residents request bus passes from their case managers.

**Table 4.4. Monthly Average Self-Sufficiency Services and Assistance Accessed, October 2010-December 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>10/2010-9/2012</th>
<th>10/2012-12/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Counseling</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Counseling</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs Assistance</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activities</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Medical Services</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Childcare Enrollments</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received childcare</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Development Services</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Not all data are available for every month; rates are calculated only for months in which data are available. Source: End of Month reports, October 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.*

In addition to a lack of transportation, case managers and residents frequently cite childcare as a barrier to obtaining and keeping employment. EOM reports prior to April 2013 only tracked new childcare enrollments and not those receiving childcare subsidies that month; from October 2012 through March 2013, only two former Boulevard residents were referred to childcare services. Beginning in April 2013, EOMs began including both new childcare referrals and households receiving childcare services in a particular month. Over the timeframe for which data is available (April through December 2013), case managers report one new childcare enrollment and a total of nine individuals receiving childcare services. Of those nine, two received assistance every month, while the remainder received assistance for five or fewer months, for a total of 37 instances of clients receiving childcare (an average of 4.1 per month).

---

16 Because of limited funds, childcare reimbursements are only made for employed households, and are subject to a waiting list. When a parent loses employment, CHA policy is that they have 10 weeks to find another job; if they are unable to, they lose their childcare subsidy.
Another new service reported beginning in April 2013 is early childhood developmental services, which include attendance at a childcare facility that provides services for children with developmental needs, specialized educational interventions, or clinical rehabilitation. Because services are reported monthly, clients may utilize early childhood development more than once; from April through December 2013, eight clients accessed early childhood development services. While most of these eight only used these services once or twice, one client utilized them every month for which data is available. In total, case managers report 22 instances (an average of 2.4 per month) of residents accessing early childhood developmental services from April through December 2013.

The second-most accessed service is life-skills workshops provided by CHS, with clients attending 319 workshops over the 15-month study period (October 2012-December 2013), for an average of 21.3 per month. As the skills level of the client population varies, so do workshop topics; these can include budgeting or housekeeping (most suited to Tier I clients) or résumé courses more tailored to Tiers II and III.

During our December 2013 interviews with case managers, several noted mental health and substance abuse issues as a barrier to employment and self-sufficiency. Over the period covered by this report (October 2012-December 2013), case managers made, on average, 7.7 monthly referrals to mental health counseling and 0.5 monthly referrals to substance abuse counseling. The former is slightly higher than the October 2010-September 2012 period (when case managers made 7.1 referrals per month), while the number of referrals to substance abuse counseling is marginally lower (0.8 per month). Because these referrals are made monthly, clients may receive multiple referrals over the study period – i.e., each referral is not for a unique client. Privacy regulations (HIPAA) prohibit case managers from reporting the number of referrals that resulted in the resident attending counseling.¹⁷ Case managers should seek to obtain releases of

¹⁷ However, during our interviews, case managers suggested that the voluntary nature of the CSS case management model made it difficult to both broach difficult subjects such as the need for
information from clients whenever making referrals, particularly for HIPAA protected counseling, to enable them to effectively support their clients.

EOM reports track certain activities for only Tier IV (elderly and disabled) clients, including attendance at group activities, basic needs assistance, and professional medical services. Due to the change in case management reporting in April 2013, case managers only recorded these through March 2013. Tier IV clients frequently accessed these services, though, with 119 instances of attending group activities (an average of 19.8 per month), 93 referrals to basic needs assistance (15.5 per month), and 43 referrals to professional medical services (7.2 per month). While these are no longer reported, we understand from case manager interviews that they continue to make such referrals and hold group activities. We recommend that CHA and case managers develop a meaningful set of metrics to track and evaluate services provided to Tier IV (elderly and disabled) clients.

Other supportive services for which completion data are available (Table 4.5) include CHA-sponsored courses that are available to all CHA residents. While this report primarily concerns the October 2012 through December 2013 period, prior enrollment and completion data are included because some individuals might have enrolled before October 2012 but completed the program after that date. The most popular course for clients is With Every Heartbeat is Life, which helps residents improve their cardiovascular health. Overall, 102 clients have enrolled in this course, and 39 have graduated from it, for a completion rate of 38%. While occupational skills courses have received fewer enrollments (14), the graduation rate for these is substantially higher – 71% (10 of 14). Compared to the previous report, far fewer clients have enrolled in GED

counseling or parenting support and to compel individuals and families to participate in services. Case managers suggested making participation in case management mandatory by imposing some kind of sanction for families that do not participate and follow-through on referrals.

18 Clients may attend more than one per month.
courses (21 vs. 2), and only one client graduated with a GED from October 2012 through December 2013, for an overall completion rate of 13%\textsuperscript{19}. Based on interviews with case managers, the relatively small numbers of clients who have enrolled in job training and GED courses are largely a result of many clients’ mental and/or physical health problems (but who are not officially considered disabled) and clients not following through in enrolling in programs recommended by case managers. Homeownership and entrepreneurship courses did not receive any enrollments or completions during the study period (October 2012-December 2013).

Table 4.5. Enrollment and Completion Rate by Course, October 2010-December 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrollment 10/2010-9/2012</th>
<th>Enrollment 10/2012-12/2013</th>
<th>Total Enrollments</th>
<th>Completion 10/2010-9/2012</th>
<th>Completion 10/2012-12/2013</th>
<th>Total Completion</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Every Heartbeat is Life</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Homeownership Course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED or High School Diploma</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: End of Month reports, October 2010-December 2013, Charlotte Housing Authority

4.9 Clients Leaving CHA

At the time of demolition, 286 households were living in Boulevard Homes; as of April 2014, 221 of these remain in CHA housing\textsuperscript{20}. Figure 4.11 presents biannual snapshots of

\textsuperscript{19} Interviews with case managers have indicated that GED completions were not rigorously tracked prior to April 2013.

\textsuperscript{20} This figure includes both inactive and active households. While the difference in households is 65, in actuality 66 families have left CHA housing. The Boulevard originals cohort gained one household in late 2013 when one original family split, with one family member moving to the redeveloped Retreat at Renaissance while another (non-elderly) remained in the previously-occupied HCV unit.
Boulevard Homes originals: those living in public housing (Section 9), those with Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8), and those who left CHA housing. From the time of relocation (Fall 2010) through June 2011, 35 households left for negative reasons (i.e., were evicted), two left for positive reasons (e.g., moving to homeownership or market-rent rental unit), and three passed away. Since then, move-outs have varied from two to five for every six months, with no clear trend over time. The majority of move-outs are for negative reasons (evictions), often for violation of lease terms (e.g., criminal convictions, unauthorized guests, or drug paraphernalia) or failure to pay rent. Notably, there were no negative move-outs from Section 9 units in 2013; all evictions in that year were for households utilizing Housing Choice Vouchers. No positive move-outs have been recorded since the first half of 2012.

4.h Number of Original Residents Returning to the Renaissance

The goal of HOPE VI CSS is to qualify residents to return to the revitalized community, criteria for which include: (i) a debt-to-income ratio of less than 42%; (ii) a high school diploma or GED (or the ability to obtain one within six months); and (iii) a six-month work history. In addition, Renaissance property managers have stipulated several criteria aimed at reducing crime at the new site, including prohibitions against leasing to anyone with convictions for (i) any crime against person or property in the past seven years or (ii) serious violent or any drug-related crime (including possession) at any point. To that end, case managers have been working with former Boulevard residents to improve employment outcomes, address and explain any previous criminal convictions, help them obtain a GED (when appropriate), and ameliorate any credit or financial issues.

As of May 2014, four of the eighteen senior-only households that qualified for occupancy in the Retreat at Renaissance (Phase I, a senior-only building) had applied, and all were accepted. The reasons that other former Boulevard Homes senior-only households did not move to the Retreat include being happy in their current location, wanting larger units, and having other household members who were not elderly.
Figure 4.11. Residence Type and Move-outs of Original Boulevard Homes Residents over Time

Source: Move-out Reports, 2010-2014, Charlotte Housing Authority.
Seventy-five former Boulevard Homes residents have applied to live in Phase II (the first family units). Of those 19 (25.3%) have been approved; 38 (50.7%) have been denied; 13 (17.3%) withdrew their application before a decision had been made; 21 two applications were still being processed; and one had an income that was too high for the available units 22 (Table 4.6). Former Boulevard residents (including those whose applications have previously been denied) may still apply for the Renaissance until the development is completed (estimated to be Fall 2015) and, if their applications are approved, will be moved to the front of the waitlist. Of those whose applications had been approved, three have since changed their mind and will not return to the Renaissance, while one does not qualify for Family Supportive Services (FSS). 23 Of the remainder, seven have already signed leases, and one has decided to relocate in the final phase, which is slated for completion in Fall 2015. Ten of the approved applications are for LIHTC units, while eight are for public housing units. Coupled with those who have relocated to the Retreat at Renaissance and the one household waiting for a market-rate unit, 24 of 205 active clients (11.7%) have either been approved or are currently living at the revitalized development. For those whose applications were denied, 19 (of 38; 50%) were for credit reasons; of those, one has since been evicted from CHA housing. Another 19 (50%) were denied because of a criminal record.

21 CHA did not provide reasons for those who had withdrawn their applications.

22 This household will instead wait for a market-rate unit at the Renaissance, to be constructed during Phase III.

23 Households returning to public housing (Section 9) or project-based HCV units at the Renaissance must sign FSS contracts, under which they will receive case management for another five years while making progress toward self-sufficiency, which under FSS is defined as the ability to move out of subsidized housing and into a market rate rental or homeownership. Those returning to LIHTC units do not have to sign FSS contracts.
Table 4.6. Number and Percentage of Boulevard Originals Returning to the Renaissance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over income requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Administrative data, June 2014, Charlotte Housing Authority.

In addition to regular EOM reporting, case managers have also tracked client interest in returning to the Renaissance and the reasons why certain households have not applied to live there (Table 4.7). For those households for whom reasons are given, almost two-thirds (61, or 65%) are satisfied with their current housing. An additional 15 (16%) have a family that is too large for any available Renaissance units; Boulevard Homes was one of a handful of CHA developments that included 4- and 5-bedroom apartments, while the Renaissance will not include any units with more than three bedrooms. Other reasons for not returning have substantially fewer responses. Six (6.4%) do not like either the housing types (e.g., would prefer to live in a detached house rather than an attached apartment or townhouse) or the location of the development, while three (3.2%) do not want to participate in the FSS program. All other reasons were shared by two or fewer Boulevard originals and include plans to move out of Charlotte, a pending eviction, having recently signed a lease, or seeking homeownership.

Table 4.7. Reasons Given for Boulevard Originals Not Returning to the Renaissance by Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with current living situation</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason given</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family too big for available units</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't like new development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't want FSS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to move soon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Administrative data, June 2014, Charlotte Housing Authority.
4.i  End of HOPE VI Client Services

Boulevard Homes CSS will end when the Renaissance site is deemed “fully complete” by HUD, which is anticipated in Fall 2015. Case managers have been and will continue to actively work with residents to prepare them for either a return to the Renaissance development (which would entail continued Family Self-Sufficiency [FSS] case management) or termination of case management supports at the end of the HOPE VI project.

Since relocation, Boulevard originals have had two or more case managers under three different case management models (head-of-household only with 1:20 caseloads, wrap-around to all household members at 1:34, and head-of-household under ‘assess and refer’ at 1:70). Current changes in case management agencies mean that the Boulevard Homes CSS clients will continue to experience transition in their case management service provision. While not uncommon, frequent changes in supportive services provision tends to negatively impact case management outcomes. This is largely due to the need for case managers and their clients to build a trusting relationship over time; each time a new case manager is assigned, the process starts over again. Examples of this were noted during our rounds of key informant interviews: several CHA and CHS staff reported that the initial period of case management was fraught with misunderstandings, as residents did not trust their new case managers. However, over time, case managers were able to develop a positive working relationship with their clients, and many noted improved results. Going forward, an important factor for CHA in considering the future of case management services should be maintaining stability in the relationship developed between case managers and clients.
5 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.a Conclusions

- Construction and lease-up of the first two Renaissance phases have gone very smoothly, and the signing of a MOU with the CMS was a major step forward in ensuring the development contains an pre-K through 8th grade school.

- Recently, two new case management agencies have been contracted to work with clients, and a new case management approach, focusing on assessment and referrals, has been adopted. It will be important to monitor this transition and assess outcomes over the remaining period of the program.

- Measures of client work effort have shown substantial improvement over the course of the program. Clients are more likely to be working, more likely to be working more hours, and more likely to hold their jobs longer. These increases indicate that former Boulevard residents are making meaningful progress toward reaching economic self-sufficiency.

- Compared to residents at two similar CHA developments, Boulevard originals active in case management have seen significantly larger gains in employment and wages. Further, those active in case management have also outpaced inactive residents in these same metrics.

- As of May 2014, the rate of move-backs among the original Boulevard Homes was approximately 11 percent, although this percentage may increase as unit in the final phase become available. Both satisfaction with current housing and
inability to meet requirements for criminal history and/or credit ratings account for this rate of return.

- Revisions to the CSS data collection protocols have been effective in providing more detailed and useful information on the types and frequencies of services and activities engaged in by clients. The performance goals of the services have also been clarified.

5. b  Recommendations: CSS Administration

- It is common for case management agencies to utilize off-the-shelf case management software for tracking, reporting, and analysis of key data. Grace-Mar and Symmetry Behavioral Health should be urged to use a case management database if not already doing so.
- The new case managers need to move as quickly as possible to establish trust relationships and reasonable goals with their clients.
- Carefully monitor and track implementation of the new ‘assess and refer’ case management model. This new model focuses services on heads of household and prioritizes referrals to outside agencies. It is also important to monitor whether residents follow-up with referrals and whether receiving agencies have the capacity to work with CHA clients.
- Case managers should seek to obtain releases of information from clients whenever making referrals, particularly for HIPAA protected counseling, to enable them to support their clients effectively.
- All case managers should be strongly urged to complete the Yardi individual and family assessment module within the database (rather than on paper). The data collected during the assessment process every six months could provide an enormous amount of information that would be useful to case managers for planning and evaluation and to CHA staff for data reporting.
- Prioritize the assessment of individuals’ ability to work. Data show that an increasing number of heads of household are designated disabled over time. If disability designations can happen sooner rather than later, less time, money,
and resources will be expended providing employment services to those individuals.

- Data indicate that Tier IV (elderly and disabled) clients receive as many, if not more, visits from case managers as Tier I-III clients. CHA should consider the needs of this population when developing case manager contact requirements and reimbursement rates.
- CHA and case managers should strive to develop metrics to track and evaluate services provided to Tier IV (elderly and disabled) clients.

5.c Recommendations: Clients Achieving Self-Sufficiency

- Work with clients whose applications to return to the Renaissance have been denied to address and expunge any previous criminal convictions and ameliorate credit or financial constraints.
- Continue working with residents to improve their employment prospects, whether or not they will qualify to return to the Renaissance. The new non-elderly service provider (Grace-Mar) has more experience in job training and placement, and CHA’s Center for Employment Services (of which Grace-Mar is a partner) should help accomplish this.
- Seek resources to expand funding for transportation assistance, one of the most requested services by clients. With funds provided by the CHA, the CHS provided bus passes to many clients, and the case managers reported that those passes were essential in allowing households to access both employment opportunities and supportive services.
- Investigate ways to increase childcare assistance. CHA may want to consider the San Antonio Housing Authority’s program to train public housing tenants as childcare providers. This model could provide both employment opportunities for residents and an affordable and easily-accessible childcare alternative.
- Continue working with clients to achieve positive move-outs, whether to affordable housing, market-rate rentals, or homeownership. Encourage clients to enroll in homeownership classes offered by CHA.
6 Appendix: Site Comparison Data and Methodology

In section 4.e, we compare the work efforts of Boulevard originals (both active and inactive in case management) with residents of two similar CHA developments, Dillehay and Southside. Dillehay Courts is a 136-unit complex immediately north of downtown Charlotte, while Southside Homes contains 381 units in southwest Charlotte and is 2.5 miles from the Boulevard Homes site.

For the comparison sites, we pulled residents living in each site in March 2011 and tracked their wages over time. For Boulevard originals, we separated them into those active and inactive in case management. As this analysis uses quarterly MTCS reports, determination of active/inactive status was made in the relevant month (March, June, September, and December, respectively). All households receiving an elderly/disabled allowance were excluded from that quarter’s analysis.

Two metrics are used to determine work efforts: percent working and average wages of those working. Percent working is calculated as the number reporting any wage income divided by the number of work-able households. Average wages are calculated by summing all work-able households’ wages and dividing this amount by the number of work-able households reporting any wage income.

Table 6.1 presents the data used in Figures 4.7 through 4.10, including the number of work-able households, the number of work-able households reporting any wage income, and average wage income for the four comparison groups.
### Table 6.1. Number of working and total work-able households, percent employed, and average wages of those employed for four comparison groups, March 2011-December 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>1q11</th>
<th>2q11</th>
<th>3q11</th>
<th>4q11</th>
<th>1q12</th>
<th>2q12</th>
<th>3q12</th>
<th>4q12</th>
<th>1q13</th>
<th>2q13</th>
<th>3q13</th>
<th>4q13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard (all)</td>
<td>Number working</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-able HHS</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Wages ($)</td>
<td>11,655</td>
<td>10,905</td>
<td>10,763</td>
<td>11,383</td>
<td>12,252</td>
<td>12,022</td>
<td>12,968</td>
<td>13,083</td>
<td>12,522</td>
<td>13,264</td>
<td>12,975</td>
<td>12,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard (active)</td>
<td>Number working</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-able HHS</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Wages ($)</td>
<td>11,352</td>
<td>10,938</td>
<td>11,194</td>
<td>11,109</td>
<td>12,093</td>
<td>11,838</td>
<td>12,968</td>
<td>13,083</td>
<td>12,522</td>
<td>13,324</td>
<td>12,626</td>
<td>13,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard (inactive)</td>
<td>Number working</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-able HHS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Wages ($)</td>
<td>12,495</td>
<td>10,824</td>
<td>9,434</td>
<td>12,229</td>
<td>12,795</td>
<td>12,659</td>
<td>12,664</td>
<td>11,305</td>
<td>13,162</td>
<td>12,939</td>
<td>11,328</td>
<td>11,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillehay</td>
<td>Number working</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-able HHS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Wages ($)</td>
<td>9,909</td>
<td>10,131</td>
<td>9,871</td>
<td>10,392</td>
<td>11,290</td>
<td>10,202</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>10,992</td>
<td>10,861</td>
<td>11,237</td>
<td>10,224</td>
<td>10,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>Number working</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-able HHS</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Wages ($)</td>
<td>10,353</td>
<td>9,897</td>
<td>10,633</td>
<td>10,659</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>11,044</td>
<td>11,122</td>
<td>10,588</td>
<td>11,031</td>
<td>11,031</td>
<td>11,031</td>
<td>11,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) reports, 2011-2013, Charlotte Housing Authority.