**CR-05 Goals and Outcomes**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(a)*

*Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan*. [24 CFR 91.520(a)](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=13-06cpdn.pdf)

This report discusses the State of California (State) outcomes for Fiscal Year 2016-2017 (hereafter referred to FY 2016-17) for the following programs: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grants Program (ESG), National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), and Lead-Hazard Control Program (LHCP). The State continues to make progress by utilizing funds for these programs to increase the supply of affordable permanent housing, improve public infrastructure, and increase public services, public facilities, Rapid-Rehousing (RR), and crisis response services. The State also continues to work toward fulfilling its fair housing goals identified in the 2012 Analysis of Impediments (AI) and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) in the administration of program funds.

In addition to the data provided below, this Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) discusses affordable housing outcomes, homelessness and special needs activities, and other California Department of Housing and Community Development (Department) actions in furtherance of the goals and objectives listed in the Department’s FY 2016-17 Annual Action Plan (AP).

*Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives*. [24 CFR 91.520(g)](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=13-06cpdn.pdf)

The funding categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed by each program for the fiscal year is reflected in the table below.

***Please note****: The data in this section may change as relevant data becomes available.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Goal | Category | Source / Amount | Indicator | Unit of Measure | Expected – Strategic Plan | Actual – Strategic Plan | Percent Completed | Expect  ed – Program Year | Actual – Program Year | Percent Complete |
| Expand homeowner-ship and improve existing housing | Affordable Housing | CDBG: $ **5,675,199**  HOME**: $13,498,858**  Lead Hazard Control Program: **$850,00** | **Homeowner Housing Added** | Household Housing Unit | 329 | 204 | 62% | 11 | 24 | 218% |
| **Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated** | Household Housing Unit | 3142 | 3232 | 103% | 165 | 189 | 114% |
| **Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers** | Households Assisted | 785 | 1734 | 45% | 124 | 261 | 210% |
| Increase economic development opportunities | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: $**11,350,398** | **Jobs created/retained** | Jobs | 115,650 | 74,115 | 61% | 269 | 14 | 5% |
| **Businesses assisted** | Businesses Assisted | 1000 | 17,597 | 176% | 39 | 43 | 110% |
| Increase the supply of affordable rental housing | Affordable Housing | CDBG: $**3,783,466**  HOME: $**21,212,492**  Lead Hazard Control Program: **$2,550,000** | **Rental units constructed** | Household Housing Unit | 851 | 6189 | 727% | 206 | 337 | 165% |
| **Rental units rehabilitated** | Household Housing Unit | 1612 | 1069 | 66% | 150 | 95 | 63% |
| Maintain or increase public facilities | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: $ **$11,350,398** | **Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit** | Persons Assisted | 1,446,900 | 1,442,091 | 99% | 395,145 | 380,302 | 96% |
| **Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income** **Housing Benefit** | Households Assisted | 2,742,050 | 1,754,957 | 64% | 63 | 20 | 32% |
| Maintain or increase public services | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: **$3,783,466** | **Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit** | **Persons Assisted** | 680,550 | 528,956 | 78% | 78,475 | 75,635 | 96% |
| **Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit** | **Households Assisted** | 77 | 49 | 64% | 11 | 0 | 0% |
| Provide homeless assistance & prevention services | Homeless | HOPWA: $ **2,921,564** HOME: $**3,856,817**  ESG: $**23,478,901** | **Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing** | **Households Assisted** | 16,424 | 8,752 | 53% | 884 | 2,771 | 313% |
| **Homeless Person Overnight Shelter** | **Persons Assisted** | 66,515 | 41,600 | 63% | 11,657 | 1,406 | 12% |
| **Homeless-ness Prevention** | **Persons Assisted** | 19,200 | 5,774 | 30% | 1,144 | 774 | 68%% |
| Provide homeless assistance & prevention services | Homeless | HOPWA: $ **2,921,564** | HIV/AIDS Housing Operations | Household Housing Unit | 175 | 131 | 75 | 35 | 44 | 66% |
| Provide homeless assistance & prevention services | Homeless | HOPWA: $ **2,921,564** | **Other: Special Needs** HIV/AIDS Housing Operations | Services, Permanent Housing Placement, Supportive Services | 8,690 | 7,204 | 83% | 1,835 | 1,486 | 81% |

**Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date**

Assess how the jurisdiction’s use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

Consistent with the priorities and specific objectives outlined in the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 (FY 2016-17) Annual Action Plan (AP), the Department allocates the largest share of its U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)) funds to rental housing production, (approximately **$24 million**), as well as homeownership activities, (approximately **$19 million**).   Similarly, **$23 million** is allocated to homelessness assistance and tenant-based rental assistance, and approximately **$11 million** is allocated to infrastructure improvements.   Although each of these activities are important state priorities, the relative share of funds for these activities is consistent with the focus of the HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) programs on housing and homelessness assistance.

For FY 2016-17, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program’s highest expenditures were for public facilities/public infrastructure projects (approximately **$11 million**), followed by housing **(**approximately **$9 million**), then public services (approximately **$3 million**). State statute requires that at least 51 percent of the Department’s CDBG allocation go to housing and housing related activities; no more than 30 percent of the allocation shall be set aside for economic development projects and programs. These expenditures are consistent with CDBG’s funding priorities and meet the state and federal expenditure requirements and limits.  Additionally, the program expended approximately **$11 million** for economic development, along with **$100** thousand for planning-only grants.  While all CDBG activities are greatly needed in California, the Department has identified three top priorities for its CDBG funds: (1) Public Infrastructure (for potable water projects); (2) Public Services (for job training); (3) Economic Development and (4) Homeownership, (pursuant to our Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing ((AI) findings).  The CDBG expenditures for FY 2016-17 are consistent with the programs identified.

**CR-10 Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(a)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Race | CDBG | HOME | HOPWA | ESG |
| White | 386 | 583 | 859 | 9,632 |
| Black or African American | 2 | 40 | 168 | 2,233 |
| Asian | 8 | 18 | 12 | 184 |
| American Indian or American Native | 11 | 9 | 14 | 425 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 2 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Total *Racial/Ethnic Composition (without Hispanic*) | **409** | **650** | **1,053** | 12,574 | |
| Hispanic | 141 | 305 | 611 | 4,493 | |
| Not Hispanic | 268 | 345 | 1069 | 8,081 | |
| Total *Hispanic and Not Hispanic* | 409 | 650 | 1680 | 12,574 | |

**Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds**

**Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted**

In Fiscal Year 2016-2017 (FY 2016-17), the largest racial and ethnic groups served were Whites and Non-Hispanics, although HOPWA and ESG programs served a significant percentage of Hispanics, Blacks or African Americans, and American Indian or American Natives. According to the Department’s 2012 Analysis of Impediments (AI), Whites are a greater percentage of the total population of CDBG and HOME-eligible (non-entitlement) jurisdictions than are minorities, so the above data is somewhat consistent with this trend; however, the programs will continue to work with its grantees to increase service to racial and ethnic minorities to help Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH).

**HOPWA**: Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) race and ethnicity data is collected based on five single-race categories and five multi-race categories. Data collected based on these ten categories cannot be rolled into the five single-race categories as required in the above table. In addition to the **1069** reported above, there are an additional **111** beneficiaries served for a total of **1180**. A breakout of the total race and ethnicity is included in the[form Hud-40110-d](https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/1011/hopwa-caper-form-hud-40110-d/) and attached as Appendix A to this report.

**CR-15 Resources and Investments**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(a)*

**Identify the resources made available**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source of Funds | Source | Resources Made Available | Amount Expended During Program Year |
| CDBG | N/A | $37,834,660 | $46,542,099 |
| HOME | N/A | $38,568,168 | $32,897,631 |
| HOPWA | N/A | $2,921,564 | $2,458,785 |
| ESG | N/A | $23,478,901 | $4,727,241 |
| Other | Lead Hazard Control Program | $1,850,000 | $810,738 |

**Table 3 – Resources Made Available**

***NARRATIVE:***

Due to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) Program, Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Lead Hazard Control Program (LHCP) having disencumbered funds, these programs reallocated additional funds to Fiscal Year 2016-2017 (FY 2016-17) activities.

**LHCP:** The total resources made available for the 2014-2017 (2014-17) grant is **$3,400,000**. The total resources made available for FY 2016-17 grant was**$1,850,000**. The amount expended during the program year was **$810,738**. The 2014-17 grant will end on December 14, 2017.

**Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments**

***Please note****: The data in this section will be updated as relevant data becomes available. Where data is currently not available X’s have been used to represent where data is missing.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Area | Planned Percentage of Allocation | Actual Percentage of Allocation | Narrative Description |
| X | X | X | X |

**Table 3 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments**

***NARRATIVE***

The Department had no geographic target areas identified for FY 2016-17 Annual Action Plan (AP). See the FY 2016-17 Annual Action Plan Methods of Distribution (AP 30) at [http://hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/plans-reports/index.shtmlor](http://hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/plans-reports/index.shtmlor%20) a description of the allocation method for each program for FY 2016-17.

**Leveraging**

**Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.**

**CDBG:** Proposals to use CDBG funds with other leveraged funds can improve the feasibility of programs and projects since available funds and resources are often insufficient to fully support most Community Development (CD) or Economic Development (ED) projects and programs. CDBG is generally used as gap financing in conjunction with other federal, state, and private funds.  Localities are encouraged to provide local resources and obtain private support, and to report anticipated and secured funds for the proposed activities. Local contributions typically consist of in-kind staff services, grant administration, gas tax funds, public works funds, permit and other fee waivers.  Private contributions can include mortgage loans, grants from private agencies, in-kind staff time, sweat-equity from rehabilitation projects, and discounts on services from title, pest and appraisal companies.

**HOME**: The HOME Program’s primary forms of leverage for HOME funds are tax credit equity and private bank loans associated with multifamily rental housing, new construction or rehabilitation projects. Secondarily, first mortgage financing on homebuyer acquisition activities provides another main source of leverage. Typically, **every $1** in HOME funds leverages **$3-$4** in private investment. Since HOME generates additional leverage, grantees are able meet the match requirement from these types of sources, as well as other state and local government financing for HOME-eligible activities. HOME currently has an excess of leveraged funds, that will be used to meet the match requirement for the next several years (*See Table 6 below*).

**ESG:** Federal ESG match is provided by its subrecipients on a dollar for dollar basis. Specific sources of match or leverage are identified at the time of application and must comply with [24 CFR 576.201](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/CFR-2013-title24-vol3/CFR-2013-title24-vol3-sec576-201).Sources of match may include (1) local funds from cities and counties, (2) private funds including agency fundraising, cash; and (3) donated goods, volunteers, building value or lease**.** Funds leverage additional local government and private philanthropic investment from foundations. Additionally, the California ESG funds can be used to match federal funds. ESG meets its 100 percent match requirement by relying on these sources from its funded grantees.

**HOPWA**:  Project sponsors leverage funds from various state, federal, local and private resources, including Ryan White Part B funding, for housing assistance, supportive services and other non-housing support. The HIV Care Program (Ryan White Part B), administered by CDPH/OA, provides HIV care services statewide, including the 43 HOPWA-eligible counties. Twenty-one project sponsors are also HIV Care Program providers which allow a seamless approach to the delivery of housing and care services. These services, when used in conjunction with HOPWA services, assist in preventing homelessness and addressing emergency housing needs. HOPWA does not have a match requirement.

**LHCP**:  HUD requires a **10 percent** non-federal match contribution. LHCP’s network of Community-Based Organizations are contracted to meet this requirement. State, local, charitable, non-profit or for-profit entities, private donations, in-kind and owner’s contribution resources are used to meet this requirement. Sub-grantees also provide federal leveraging funds through various resources such as the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and other sources, however, funds from sub-grantees are not counted towards satisfying the non-federal match requirement.

**Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match | |
| 1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year | 263,087,801 |
| 2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year | 10,967,852 |
| 3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2) | 274,055,653 |
| 4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year | 2,433,814 |
| 5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4) | 271,621,839 |

Table 4 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year | | | | | | | | | |
| Project No. or Other ID | Date of Contribution | Cash  (non-Federal sources) | Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges | Appraised Land/Real Property | Required Infrastructure | Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor | Bond Financing | Total Match |
| Total Projects | 6/30/16 | 6,867,868 | 57,000 | 545,349 | 0 | 3,427,783 | 69,852 | 10,967,852 |

**Table 5 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year**

**HOME PROGRAM INCOME TABLE (HOME GRANTEES ONLY)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Program Income* ~ Enter the program amounts for the reporting period | | | | |
| Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period  $ | Amount received during reporting period  $ | Total amount expended during reporting period  $ | Amount expended for TBRA  $ | Balance on hand at end of reporting period  $ |
| 21,491,629 | 9,679,207 | 8,476,397 | 77,562 | 22,694,439 |

**Table 6 – Program Income**

**Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period* | | | | | | |
|  | **Total** | Minority Business Enterprises | | | | | |
| Alaskan Native or American Indian | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black Non-Hispanic | Hispanic | White Non-Hispanic | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contracts** | | | | | | |
| Dollar Amount | **8,751,850** | 0 | 45,330 | 0 | 257,889 | 8,448,631 |
| Number | **19** | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| **Sub-Contracts** | | | | | | |
| Number | **4,732,572** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,364 | 4,730,208 |
| Dollar Amount | **21** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Women Business Enterprises | Male |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contracts** | | | |
| Dollar Amount | **8,941,064** | 0 | 8,941,064 |
| Number | **21** | 0 | 21 |
| **Sub-Contracts** | | | |
| Number | **4,810,764** | 2,364 | 4,808,400 |
| Dollar Amount | **23** | 2 | 21 |

Table 7 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

**Minority Owners of Rental Property**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted* | | | | | | |
|  | **Total** | **Minority Property Owners** | | | |  |
| Alaskan Native or American Indian | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black Non-Hispanic | Hispanic | White Non-Hispanic |
| Number | **0** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dollar Amount | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 8 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

**Relocation and Real Property Acquisition**

***Please note*** *the data in this section may change will be updated as relevant data becomes available. Where data is currently not available X’s have been used to represent where data is missing.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition* | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | **Number** | | | Cost | |
| Parcels Acquired | | | | X | | | X | |
| Businesses Displaced | | | | X | | | X | |
| Nonprofit Organizations Displaced | | | | X | | | X | |
| Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced | | | | X | | | X | |
| Households Displaced | **Total** | Minority Property Enterprises | | | | | | |
| Alaskan Native or American Indian | Asian or Pacific Islander | | Black Non-Hispanic | Hispanic | | White Non-Hispanic |
| Number | **X** | X | X | | X | X | | X |
| Cost | X | X | X | | X | X | | X |

**Table 9 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition**

**CR-20 Affordable Housing**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(b)*

**Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.**

***Please note****: The data in this section will be updated as relevant data becomes available. Where data is currently not available X’s have been used to represent where data is missing.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | One-Year Goal | Actual |
| Number of homeless households to be provided affordable housing units | 2,028 | X |
| Number of non-homeless households to be provided affordable housing units | 656 | X |
| Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units | 1,165 | X |
| Total | 3,849 |  |

Table 10 – Number of Households

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **One-Year Goal** | **Actual** |
| Number of households supported through rental assistance | 2028 | X |
| Number of households supported through the production of new units | 217 | X |
| Number of households supported through the rehab of existing units | 315 | X |
| Number of households supported through the acquisition of existing units | 124 | X |
| Total | **2684** |  |

Table 11 – Number of Households Supported

***NARRATIVE***

**Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.**

*NARRATIVE:*

***Please note****: The data in this narrative section will be updated as relevant data becomes available.*

**HOPWA:**  Homeless prevention services and emergency housing assistance are both needs-based emergency services that are often difficult to project from year to year, resulting in an overestimation of the number of clients to be assisted by several project sponsors.  Some project sponsors also overestimated the number of clients they will assist with case management.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

No future anticipated impacts at this time. The State will continue to try to assist in all activity areas based on local needs, priorities and funding availability.

**Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Persons Served | CDBG Actual | HOME Actual |
| Extremely Low-income | 767 | 252 |
| Low-income | 357 | 244 |
| Moderate-income | 35,493 | 154 |
| Total | 36,617 | 650 |

Table 12 – Number of Persons Served

***NARRATIVE***

The numbers above are consistent with the income targeting of each of these program’s primary activities. The Community Development Block Grant Program’s (CDBG) primary applicant activities were public facilities/infrastructure, public services, and homeownership, activities that primarily serve low and moderate-income individuals. The HOME Investment Partnership Program’s (HOME) largest share of funds is used for rental housing production, which primarily serves low and extremely-low income households.

**CR-25 Homeless and Other Special Needs**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.220(d, e), 91.320 (d, e), 91.420, 91.520(c)*

***Please note:*** *The data in this narrative section will be updated as relevant data becomes available. Where data is currently not available X’s have been used to represent where data is missing.*

**Evaluate the jurisdiction’s progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:**

1. Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

Program funds for Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Street Outreach (SO) activities are designed to engage unsheltered persons to access housing and basic services. In FY 2016-17, **XX persons** were assisted with SO funds.

1. Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

**ESG:** The ESG program continues to fund a number of Emergency Shelter (ES) programs that provide short-term shelter and supportive services to homeless individuals and families while affordable permanent housing is being sought out.  In FY 2016-17, **X,XXX persons** were assisted with ES funds.

**HOPWA:** To address homelessness among Persons Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWH), the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) funds two agencies that provide transitional housing facilities for homeless PLWH. In addition, eight project sponsors provide hotel/motel voucher assistance (ES) to clients while they assist them in locating more stable housing. All HOPWA project sponsors work with homeless PLWH to link them to homeless services within their communities.

1. Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

General Population: The ESG program funds Rapid Rehousing (RR) and homelessness prevention programs which provide short and medium-term rental assistance and supportive services to homeless and individuals and families and those at risk of homelessness so that they can access and maintain affordable, suitable housing.   In FY 2016-17, **X,XXX households** were assisted with RR funds.

Veterans: As noted above, the state is implementing several different programs designed to assist homeless persons, including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth access permanent housing. The **$570 million** in Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program (VHHP) incentivizes developers to partner with Local Continuums of Care, the federal Veterans Administration, and others in developing "low-barrier" housing practices that target supportive housing developed with these funds to Veterans most in need who are least likely to access and maintain housing on their own.  To date, **$252,227,478** in VHHP funds have been awarded.   See the <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/vhhp/docs/VHHP-Award-Data-Summary.pdf> Data Summary for more information.

Families with Children:  The State Department of Social Services (DSS) has received additional state fundsto provide CalWORKs families with limited-term rental assistance to help them access permanent housing or avoid eviction. See <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/CalWORKS.>

**HOPWA:** Project sponsors continue to provide Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility assistance (STRMU), Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA), and housing placement assistance to households at risk of homelessness, including households that have recently experienced homelessness. HOPWA project sponsors collaborate with other local HIV/AIDS and community service agencies to link clients to other needed services to improve housing stability and health outcomes.

1. Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

In addition to the programs discussed above, the following additional programs provide assistance with homelessness prevention activities, particularly for persons leaving publicly funded institutions and systems of care.

**Section 811 Project Rental Assistance (PRA) Program**: The PRA program provides five-year renewable rental assistance to Medicaid beneficiaries ages 18-61 who are homeless or are exiting Medicaid-funded long-term health care facilities, such as nursing homes and intermediate care facilities, or those who are at risk of returning to these institutions because that lack affordable housing with long-term services and support.  To date the program has awarded **$ 7.1 million** to **14 projects** to provide an estimated **163 units** assisted with 811 funds. For more information, see <http://www.calhfa.ca.gov/multifamily/section811/index.htm>.

**No Place Like Home (NPLH) Program**:  During FY 2016-2017, the Department of Housing and Community Development (Department), in partnership with other state and local agencies, successfully developed the NPLH Program. The NPLH Program will provide up to **$2 billion** dollars for the development of permanent supportive housing for seriously mentally ill Californians who are homeless, chronically homeless, or at-risk of chronic homelessness. Over the course of FY 2016-2017, the NPLH team engaged in a robust community outreach strategy that included two NPLH Advisory Committee meetings, **11** Community Workshops throughout California and two interactive webinars. This approach presented the opportunity for advocacy groups, housing developers, community representatives, and mental health practitioners to help craft the program guidelines. The result of this collaborative strategy is the completion of the Program Guidelines and the approval by the California Health Facilities Financing Authority (CHAFFA) Board to issue the bonds.

**HOPWA**: HOPWA services are restricted to low income PLWH for the purpose of alleviating or preventing homelessness. Approximately **62 percent** of clients assisted are at or below **30 percent** of Area Median Income and at risk of homelessness or homeless. Project sponsors are often the first point of contact for PLWH being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care, and are required to assess the housing and service needs of every eligible HOPWA household as part of the intake process for receiving services. In addition to providing housing services to clients, project sponsors routinely collaborate with other local HIV/AIDS and community service agencies to link clients to other needed services.

**CR-30 Public Housing**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.220(h), 91.320(j), 91.420*

**Actions taken to address the needs of public housing**

The Department does not own or operate public housing. In California, public housing is administered directly through local Public Housing Authorities (PHAs). Pursuant to HUD requirements, PHAs are not eligible to apply for CDBG, HOME, NHTF, ESG, HOPWA, or LHCP funds directly. However, PHAs in eligible jurisdictions can work with eligible applicants to plan for the use of program funds to assist low-income tenants in their communities. PHAs in jurisdictions eligible to apply for federally-funded state programs may seek funds for eligible activities through their city or county application development process.

Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

Since the Department does not administer PHA funds, or have any oversight over PHA tenants, it has no actions directed specifically to public housing residents.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

Since the Department does not administer PHA funds, it does not evaluate the status or condition of PHAs.

**CR-35 Other Actions**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.220(j, k), 91.320 (i, j), 91.420, 91.520(a)*

**Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment.** [24 CFR 91.220 (j)](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/search/pagedetails.action?packageId=CFR-2016-title24-vol1&fromState=&granuleId=CFR-2016-title24-vol1-sec91-220)**;** [91.320 (i)](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title24/24cfr91_main_02.tpl)**.**

State law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan containing at least seven mandatory elements including housing. Unlike the other general plan elements, the Housing Element (HE), required to-be updated every five to eight years, is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by the Department.  The HE has many similar requirements to the federally mandated Consolidated Plan (ConPlan) in that it requires a thorough assessment of housing needs –including special needs populations, and the adoption of a comprehensive implementation action plan to address those needs.

The HE contains information about the availability of sites and infrastructure to accommodate new housing needs and requires an analysis of governmental constraints to the production and preservation of housing.  Cities and counties are required by housing element law to have land-use plans and regulatory policies that facilitate the development of a range of housing types to meet the needs of all income groups. The HE must be developed with public input and participation, serves as the basis for land-use and assistance programs to address local, regional and state housing needs.

As of August 28, 2017, **479** of the state's **539** local governments (**88.9 percent**) were found to comply with housing element law. To date, **517 local governments** (**95.9 percent**) have submitted their housing elements for the 5th cycle planning period. Compliance status of individual cities and counties is available on the Department’s website

<http://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/status.pdf.>

**Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs**. [24 CFR 91.220(k);](https://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/conplan/pdf/finalrule_bookview.pdf) [91.320(j)](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2014-title24-vol1/pdf/CFR-2014-title24-vol1-sec91-320.pdf)

In addition to the actions discussed elsewhere in CR 35, the Department continues to provide funds to address all of its housing, infrastructure, homelessness, economic development, and public facilities and services goals. In many communities across California, these continue to be underserved needs; hence, the Department is also putting additional resources toward meeting these needs. Some special initiatives in FY 2016-17 included the following:

1. Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. [24 CFR 91.220(k);](https://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/conplan/pdf/finalrule_bookview.pdf) [91.320(j)](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2014-title24-vol1/pdf/CFR-2014-title24-vol1-sec91-320.pdf)

**LHCP:** The Lead Hazard Control Program (LHCP) is designed to work collaboratively with the LHCP network of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in the delivery of lead hazard control services to low-income households.  Funds are provided to CBOs that statistically have a high number of children with elevated blood/lead levels in their county and the capacity to successfully carry out the goals by meeting and/or exceeding LHCP benchmark goals.

In FY 2016-17, LHCP provided assistance to **33 households** totaling **$810,738**. The program’s primary objectives were to: (1) provide lead hazard control services in 2016-2017 to pre-1978 housing units occupied by low-income households, targeting households with at least one child under the age of six residing in the residence or visiting frequently, a pregnant woman residing in the residence; (2) provide lead hazard awareness education; (3) maximize resources by strengthening collaboration with local housing and health departments to increase lead-safe rental opportunities for low-income households;(4) expand the lead-safe certified workforce in the local communities; (5)  address healthy homes hazards in homes where lead hazards exist; and (6) develop lasting lead-safe training resources.

1. Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. [24 CFR 91.220(k)](https://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/conplan/pdf/finalrule_bookview.pdf); [91.320(j)](file:///\\hqfiles\groups\Caper\2016-17\91.320(j))

**CDBG:** The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, with its Economic Development (ED) activities, has job creation/retention requirements when direct funding is provided to a for-profit business that is not a Microenterprise business. Those jobs must be open to low/moderate-income individuals, and at least **51 percent** of the available jobs must be filled by low/moderate-income individuals. To meet this requirement, the Department encourages CDBG jurisdictions to collaborate with local organizations that are providing job training to provide referrals for job applicants. Jurisdictions may also formally require Business Assistance loan recipients to use job training program referrals. In this way, persons on unemployment and/or in job training programs have access to jobs created from CDBG funding.

1. Actions taken to develop institutional structure. [24 CFR 91.220(k](https://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/conplan/pdf/finalrule_bookview.pdf)); [91.320(j)](file:///\\hqfiles\groups\Caper\2016-17\91.320(j))

The State of California (State) has an institutional structure for both the federal and state programs it facilitates to address underserved needs, affordable housing, lead-based paint hazards, and enhanced coordination between the public and private sector and social services agencies. Currently the State has the federal Emergency Solution Grant (ESG)***,*** Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), and Section 811 PRA (Section 811) programs serving underserved homeless, mentally ill and disabled (see CR15 for ESG, HOPWA, and CR35 for 811). In addition, in 2016 the State approved a new **$2 billion-dollar** program entitled No Place Like Home (NPLH*).*  This program targets chronically homeless and mentally ill which will address affordable housing issues for that underserved population.

In addition to the programs discussed above, the Department has multiple state programs like Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program, Multifamily Housing Program (MHP), and Mobilehome Park Rehabilitation and Resident Ownership Program (MPPROP) that focus on creating and maintaining affordable housing within the state. By means of our federal and state affordable housing programs, the Department is helping to reduce the effects of poverty throughout the state.  The Department’s focus on Concentrated Poverty areas through our 2012 Analysis of Impediments (AI) and now the 2019 Assessment of Fair Housing(AFH) report will also assist in facilitating change in the programs we administer by focusing on building in Areas of Opportunity as defined by HUD AFH regulations currently under development.

The Departments is committed to focusing on consistent engagement with both our public and private housing stakeholders, as well as the social service agencies that provide the Department with feedback on our programs and services.  Every program, both federal and state, which the Department administers, conducts some form of public engagement and outreach to the public and private housing sector and social service organizations.

As stated above, the Department’s strategic plan to address the obstacles to meeting underserved needs, foster, and maintain affordable housing is multifaceted with the administration of both federal and state programs.  The Department has been working with our Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), which runs the State Low-Income Tax Credit (LITC) Program, as well as multiple academics to establish similar criteria for classifying, mapping and rating Areas of Opportunity.  The goal of this collaboration is to have similar eligibility criteria between our Department for Areas of Opportunity that will influence builders to reduce building in Concentrated Areas of Poverty and increase production in Areas of Opportunity, thus helping in the long-term reduction of poverty levels in our state.  Through programs like CDBG, AHSC, and the new state Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Program, the Department is also working to help further develop disadvantage communities. The State’s new Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Program specifically targets the top five-percent of disadvantage communities with the worse pollution in the state. TCC is one of a suite of programs designed to further California’s goal to reduce greenhouse gas levels statewide. TCC targets development in the State that has most disadvantaged communities as defined by a myriad of socio-economic factors.

1. Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. [24 CFR 91.220(k);](https://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/conplan/pdf/2010actionplan.pdf) [91.320(j)](file:///\\hqfiles\groups\Caper\2016-17\91.320(j))

**Section 811***:* The Department continues to implement the Section 811 PRA Program in collaboration with the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), California Department of Developmental Services (DDS), California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), and TCAC.  The program provides project-based rental assistance to affordable housing projects to serve persons ages 18-61 exiting MediCal funded long-term care facilities, such as nursing homes, as well as persons at-risk of returning to these settings due to loss of housing. To date the program has awarded **$7.1 million** to **14** projects to provide an estimated **163 units** assisted with 811 funds. For more information, see <http://www.calhfa.ca.gov/multifamily/section811/index.htm>

Additionally, the Department continues to participate in several interagency committees related to Smart Growth and increasing transit-oriented developments, infill housing, and other housing options to reduce the environmental impacts of commuting through the AHSC Program discussed above. [See: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/ahsc.shtml](See:%20http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/ahsc.shtml)

**HOPWA:** California Department of Public Health/Office of AIDS (CDPH/OA) continues to collaborate with the Department through involvement in the state’s Consolidated Plan (ConPlan) and reporting processes. In addition, CDPH/OA regularly coordinates with the DHCS regarding Medi-Cal and the Affordable Care Act, mental health services for persons living with HIV, the AIDS Medi-Cal Waiver Program. CDPH/OA also works with University of California San Francisco as part of the National Medical Monitoring Project.

CDPH/OA published the *California's Integrated HIV Surveillance, Prevention and Care Plan for 2016-20*, as required by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). CDPH/OA’s HOPWA staff has been involved in the planning process from the start. The need for affordable, safe housing for PLWH is highlighted in the plan.

HOPWA project sponsors participate in their local Ryan White Part B HIV/AIDS Advisory or Planning Group, and actively participate in their local Continuum of Care planning group or homeless task force/coalition to ensure the HIV community is represented.  All project sponsors provide case management services to clients, which include linkages to other agencies, and enhancing collaborative relationships with other government and private service agencies.

**Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service**

1. State and Federally Funded Disaster Assistance: FEDERAL FUNDS

***The National Disaster Resilience Competition (NDRC)*** awarded **$70,359,459** in Community Development Block Grant-National Disaster Resilience (CDBG-NDR) funding to the State of California for the Community and Watershed Resilience Program (CWRP).  The application process was headed by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research in full collaboration with the Department, CalEPA, CAL FIRE, Tuolumne County, the California Conservation Corps, and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy.  The CWRP was designed around three interconnected elements to drive recovery and embed resilience in the social and natural systems of the county.

HUDs award to California provides funding in each of these three areas: 1) Forest and Watershed Health - The three main activities in this pillar are biomass removal, reforestation and restoration, and the creation of a network of strategic fuel breaks to help slow down the path of any future fire in the area, as well as help guard against such sizable damage. 2) Biomass Utilization Facility - The goal of this facility is to provide clean power and provide new jobs and training in the clean energy industry.  If siting can be located in close proximity, heating and cooling to the Community Resiliency Center and residents of Tuolumne County can be included in the design of the facility.  3) Community Resilience Center - This center will serve multiple purposes, including during an emergency as an evacuation center that includes animal boarding, Wi-Fi, and other needed services; provide year-round needed services such as a food bank, education and training facilities, commercial kitchen, and childcare; as well as provide facilities for the California Conservation Corps.

The Department received its grant contract from HUD for this funding in January 2017, HUD approved California’s Fiscal Certification Package, performance metric requirements and Action Plan.  The Department has completed procurement of a CDBG-NDR technical assistance consultant to build capacity and ensure compliance of the program funding across all partners activities.  The contract for that consultant was executed March 2, 2017.

**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG):** The Department released a CDBG Disaster NOFA for the 2015 Butte and Valley Wildfires that affected Lake and Calaveras counties.  Both counties were declared a Federal Disaster [DR-4340-CA NR 016] and State Emergency in September of 2015.  The Department made $**10.4 million** available in CDBG funds to assist those two counties in their recovery effort.  The CDBG Disaster NOFA was released on August 30, 2016. Recently this NOFA’s deadline has been extended to August 31, 2018 to allow the counties more time to address their recovery efforts. In September of 2016, the Department also released a special CDBG Drought Lateral NOFA for **$7 million** for direct funding relief and mitigation of the effects of the California Drought Disaster, as declared by Governor Brown in his 2014 Drought Declaration.  The first round of funding had one award of $**2 million**. In January of 2017, the CDBG Drought Lateral NOFA was amended to extend the application period through May 31, 2017. This NOFA applies to CDBG-eligible installation of water lateral connections to new or existing public water systems as part of the Housing Rehabilitation activity.

**Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service**

STATE FUNDS

1. **Drought Housing Recovery Assistance (DRHA):** The purpose of the Drought Housing Recovery Assistance (DRHA) Program is the provide temporary assistance for personas moving from their current residence, which lacks reasonable access to potable water as a result from the current drought in California. The Department was awarded **$6 million** by the State for DHRA.  Of that $**6 million**, $**3.83 million** was set aside for direct assistance.  Of the $**3.83 million**, $**1.7 million** has been awarded to five areas: Tulare, Yolo, Tuolumne, Kings and Fresno Counties. The Department still has **$2.17 million** in DHRA Assistance to award.

**CalHome Disaster** **NOFA**: In September 2015 the Butte and Valley Wildfires destroyed more than **2,000 homes** and structures in Calaveras and Lake Counties.  In October 2015, state agencies were directed to utilize and employ state personnel, equipment, and facilities for the performance of any and all activities to assist with recovery efforts.   In response to the Executive Order, the Department made available $**7.2 million** for Calaveras and Lake counties through the CalHome program in August 26, 2016.  The allocation by county of the $**7.2 million** was based on the proportion of homes destroyed in each county: **27 percent of homes** in Calaveras County **equals $1.95 million**; and **73 percent of homes** in Lake County **equals $5.25 million**.  This program provides both mortgage assistance for first time homebuyers as well as rehabilitation funds.

**Veterans Housing Bond:** The Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program (VHHP) incentivizes developers to partner with Local Continuums of Care, the federal Veterans Administration, and others in developing "low-barrier" housing practices that target supportive housing developed with these funds to Veterans most in need who are least likely to access and maintain housing on their own. To date $252,227,478 in VHHP funds have been awarded. See the <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/vhhp/docs/VHHP-Award-Data-Summary.pdf>

**Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC):** Administered by the Strategic Growth Council and implemented by the Department, the AHSC Program funds housing and low-carbon transit projects to support infill and compact development that reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. Funding for the AHSC Program is provided from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), an account established to receive Cap-and-Trade auction proceeds. To date, over half billion dollars in AHSC funds have been awarded. See <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/ahsc.shtml>

**Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice.** [24 CFR 91.520(a](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=13-06cpdn.pdf))

The Department continues to take actions to overcome identified impediments to fair housing pursuant to our Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing completed in 2012. In 2016 – 2017, the Department focused on the training and educational objectives set in the AI. From February of 2016 through January of 2017, 15 Departmental staff members took part in the Governmental Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) cohort with multiple other California State Departments, cities and counties throughout Northern California. Cohort members spent a year learning about the history of racial disparities, segregation and lack of access to opportunity for minority groups. GARE cohort members developed community action plans to address disparities both within their governmental workplaces as well as the community’s their government agencies serves. In addition, approximately twenty Departmental staff members took part in a six-month training with the University of California at Davis (UCD) Center for Regional Change (CRC) on fair housing. Participants studied the history of fair housing both nationally and within the State of California; received an academic overview of the AFFH final rule and correlating data tools; and studied the various barriers to fair housing e.g. race, disability, age and culture, just to name a few. By the end of the training participants had researched and developed specific project proposals for addressing barriers to fair housing throughout state and in the programs the Department administers.

The Department has also been working with the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) and the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), multiple academic institutions and fair housing advocates, on developing methodology and tool for evaluating Access to Opportunity locations with a mapping tool.  The objective is to support housing policies, program guidelines and regulations among all three State housing agencies that promote availability of affordable family housing with improved access to opportunity locations. For further information on the progress the state is making on the AI please see the AI Implementation Status Report in the attachments to the CAPER, located at: <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/plans-reports/docs/state_of_ca_analysis_of_impediments_full%20report0912.pdf>

**CR-40 Monitoring**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.230, 91.330, 91.430*

**Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements**

**CDBG:** Due to the geographic size of the state, which stretches for almost 1,000 miles and the number of grants that are in some of the most remote, rural, and isolated areas, the Department is not able to physically visit every Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) grantee. In addition, the state is hampered in the ability to conduct on-site monitoring by the ongoing decline in both federal and state resources for program administration. Due to these factors, the Department has requested and is now receiving technical assistance from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for its administration of the CDBG program. Furthermore, the Department is currently working side-by-side with stakeholders on redesigning the CDBG program to be more effective and efficient for the grantees the Department serves.

In lieu of activity monitoring every contract, the Department is currently developing a risk assessment process. This risk assessment process could evaluate the following criteria: (1) whether a grantee is new or seldom receives CDBG grant; (2) whether the grantee is a low performer in achieving required approvals; (3) whether documents submitted by the grantee are incorrect and show lack of understanding of program regulations and requirements; (4) whether the grantee has had any previous findings. This risk assessment process would be used to determine which grantees should be monitored on-site, and which grantees would receive a remote monitoring. Additionally, the Department would periodically sample invoices and use the results of the sample invoice reviews in the risk assessment process to determine the monitoring list.

**HOME**: HOME does four primary types of monitoring for its funded activities:

**(1) Close-out monitoring** is done for all-funded activities to assess overall compliance with the requirements of the HOME Regulations and Standard Agreement. In FY 2016-17, the Department completed six A-133 single audit findings for Programs. In July 2016, the Department utilized the risk assessment tool to complete risk assessments of **198** jurisdictions. Due to that risk assessment, the Department anticipates performing **three-to-four** on site close out monitoring’s of the jurisdictions that scored the highest on the risk assessment. The Department will have the monitoring completed by October of 2017. In addition, the Department completed **seven** closeout monitoring for rental and First Time Home Buyer (FTHB) projects (done within 12 months of project completion).

**(2)** **CHDO Project** **Long-Term Monitoring** is done by the Department on rental and homebuyer projects involving Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs).  On these projects, the Department holds the Note and Deed of Trust.  The purpose of this monitoring is to assess ongoing compliance with HOME rent and occupancy requirements, fair housing requirements, and the ongoing physical and financial condition of the project.  As part of this assessment, annual review of project rents, operating budgets, and financial statements is performed to check compliance with project rent and operating requirements pursuant to the Department’s Uniform Multifamily Regulations (UMRs) and [24 CFR 92.252.](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/retrieveECFR?gp=&SID=43f1c5cd006a77ecd7f1dc31477036cc&n=pt24.1.92&r=PART&ty=HTML) Annual Affirmative Marketing Reports and **5-year** Affirmative Marketing Plans are also reviewed.  Site visits to assess compliance with HOME income limits, income verification requirements, rent restrictions and federal Housing Quality Standards are also performed. (UPCS standards will be used in future years as required.)  Site visits are performed pursuant to the requirements set forth in [24 CFR 92.504](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2016-title24-vol1/pdf/CFR-2016-title24-vol1-sec92-504.pdf) (d).  In FY 2016-17, the Department performed **79** site visits on CHDO loans.  The Department met **100** percent of the site visits that had been required during the fiscal year.

**(3) State Recipient Long-Term Monitoring** is an assessment of performance of the above monitoring activities by local jurisdictions. HOME state recipients are the lenders for rental and homebuyer new construction and rehabilitation projects where they have applied directly to the Department for HOME funds, rather than the CHDO being the recipient of the funds. An office review consists of an Annual Monitoring Report, questionnaire and Project Compliance Report, that asks about project financial condition and compliance with other federal HOME requirements, a copy of the project utility allowance schedule (form HUD-52667); a copy of the state recipient’s last long term monitoring Summary Letter and Clearance Letter to the project owner/manager, a copy of Physical Conditions report, and a copy of the project Annual Affirmative Marketing Analysis Report.

In FY 2016-17, **164** assessments of state recipient monitoring activities were completed.  Following from these assessments, the Department staff monitors individual projects directly, where risk assessment of individual project compliance with HOME requirements indicate that these projects should receive a site visit from Department staff.  In FY 2016-17 **six** of these site visits by the Department staff were completed. A total of **158** site visits were performed on state recipient’s projects.  More information regarding the results of all HOME project site visits, whether done by the Department or state recipient staff, is discussed in the HOME Monitoring Data accompanying this CAPER.

**(4) Rental ProjectConstruction Closeout Monitoring** is also done throughout the year.  The Department is in the process of updating checklists and will be performing ten State Recipient (SR) closeout monitoring in October and November 2017.  Minority Business Enterprise/Women Business Enterprise (MBE/WBE) and [Section 3](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/section3/section3) goals assessment and outreach activities are monitored as part of HOMEs grantee Annual Performance Reports.  See the Annual Performance Report Form at <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/home.shtml> for more information.

**ESG**: The ESG program monitors sub-grantee performance primarily through desk monitoring of financial expenditures to ensure that requests for ESG funds comply with the HUD ESG expenditure guide. Other federal requirements are also monitored including, but not limited to, Written Standards requirements and participation in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS).

**LHCP**: The Lead Hazard Control Program (LHCP) monitoring performance standards are evaluated on a quarterly basis taking into account the number of inspections, units completed, units referred from local housing/health agencies, and expenditures as proposed by quarter and compared to the actual completed. In addition, the timeliness of fiscal and programmatic reports, quality of programmatic reports, results of on-site monitoring, results of LHCP inspections, and timeliness to resolve performance deficiencies will be monitored. Continued periodic field visits to supervise work activities, training and technical assistance, on-site visits, and desk reviews are utilized to ensure program contractual compliance. When LHCP requires subcontracting activities, LHCP is to follow state procurement procedures, which includes the open and fair competitive bidding process and using minority owned businesses. This is also part of monitoring standards and procedures.

**Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance**

**HOPWA:** The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) project sponsors are required to submit an annual application to the California Department of Public Health/Office of AIDS (CDPH/OA), which includes a program implementation plan describing community planning and collaboration efforts, anticipated goals, and a budget detail of activities to be provided. When selecting new project sponsors, CDPH/OA includes outreach to minority businesses, faith-based, and grass roots organizations in the Request for Application process.

Monitoring activities include both onsite compliance monitoring visits and desk monitoring through review and analysis of required progress reports and invoice back-up detail documentation. CDPH/OA also performs a variety of technical assistance activities, including phone calls, e-mails, and webinars with project sponsors. This year, CDPH/OA implemented quarterly webinars, which provide focused technical assistance to project sponsors. CDPH/OA has developed monitoring procedures and survey tools based on the HUD Monitoring Handbook for HOPWA, which are utilized during onsite monitoring visits. A periodic project sponsor risk analysis is completed, which rates project sponsor performance in descending order, from highest to lowest risk; CDPH/OA uses this risk analysis to prioritize compliance monitoring visits.

**Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.**

Pursuant to [24 CFR Part 91](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title24/24cfr91_main_02.tpl), citizen participation requirements for states, the Department provides adequate notice at the opening of the **15-day comment period** and the public hearing on the CAPER. The notice is provided by wide distribution (including but not limited to county planning departments, depository libraries, distribution through electronic mailing lists of the affected federal programs, and posting on the Department’s website). Copies of the CAPER Public Notices are included with the CAPER at: <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/plans-reports/index.shtml>. The public comment period runs from **Wednesday, September 13 through Wednesday, September 27.** All comments are due to the Department by **Tuesday, September 26, 2017 at 5:00 pm.** The Department will also be holding a public hearing on **Friday, September 22, 1:30 – 4:30 p.m.**

In addition to comments received through public hearings, the Department will accept public comments in any form convenient to the public, including through written responses, facsimile, and e-mail. The state will consider all comments and respond to comments received in writing or orally at public hearings in the CAPER.

**CR-45 CDBG (CDBG grantees only)**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(d)*

**Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction’s program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.**

To address concerns raised by the United States (US) Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the California State Legislature regarding California’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (the Department) is initiating a process to redesign the CDBG Program. The purpose of the Redesign is to streamline the Department workload to reflect budgetary shortages, address low expenditure rates and high levels of unspent Program Income (PI),1 and meet federal requirements while ensuring the program is effectively serving the needs of California’s rural and non-entitlement communities in line with national best practices and state priorities.

The 2017 CDBG Redesign will be undertaken in partnership with the CDBG Advisory Committee and a broad array of other stakeholders over the next 12 months and will coincide with technical assistance (TA) provided by HUD to assess California’s CDBG program and make recommendations to improve the program and ensure compliance with federal requirements. Additionally, the CDBG Redesign will address the issues raised in the Budget Trailer Bill, SB 106,2 which expressed legislative intent for improving the CDBG program and directed HCD to engage in specific activities to address stakeholder concerns. The result of this Program Redesign process will be the development of new CDBG Program Guidelines. Upon completion of the new guidelines, they will be submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) for approval and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee of the California Legislature (JLBC) will be notified before adoption.

Concurrent with the work of the CDBG Redesign, the Department will be receiving technical assistance (TA) from a HUD-authorized provider tasked with assisting it in identifying fiscal and programmatic changes that will improve the expenditure rate, reduce the amount of PI on hand, and improve the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the CDBG Program. One specific task the Department has requested the TA provider to assist with is identifying places in which the federal program requirements and state program requirements differ, and where there is room for improvement in aligning these requirements.

As is stated in federal statute, *the local jurisdictions know best that their greatest needs are*. The Department’s objective is to facilitate CDBG funding to meet those needs in manner consistent and compliant with CDBG statute and regulation.  Overall, the state’s local jurisdictions tend to apply for housing, public infrastructure and public services.  There are a handful of jurisdictions with robust economic development programs, which are focal in their utilization of CDBG funding.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?** | No |

**[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.**

**CR-50 HOME (HOME grantees only)**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(e)*

Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. [24 CFR 92.351(b)](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title24/24cfr92_main_02.tpl)

**New construction and rehabilitation rental project activities:** For these activities, the Department uses the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Affirmative Marketing Form 935.2A to evaluate a project owner’s five-year affirmative marketing plan. This form is evaluated prior to loan closing. In addition, projects must submit an annual reporting form similar to the 935.2A that requires owners to annually assess the effectiveness of their affirmative marketing efforts. For the HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) program First Time Home Buyer (FTHB), Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR), and Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) activities; HOME Recipients must complete a Demographic Analysis form that requires them to examine the racial, ethnic, gender, age, and disability Census characteristics of their HOME jurisdiction compared to the program’s applicants, beneficiaries, rejected and wait-listed heads of household. If under-or-over-representation by more than 10 percent exists, the jurisdiction must describe and implement actions to correct this imbalance. HOME uses these tools to monitor local activity demographics for imbalances of protected classes, and to engage property managers and local program operators in discussions about ways to address identified imbalances. Over time, these imbalances are corrected or alleviated through targeted marketing in the local community. See:<http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/plans-reports/index.shtml> for copies of the forms.

Understanding the importance of affirmative marketing and the barriers to program participation due to race, ethnicity, gender, age, or disability status has increased through the use of these tools, and through information provided identifying particular barriers to accessing assistance such as inconsistent program funding levels, poor consumer credit, hesitancy to take on additional homeownership debt, and higher incomes among certain groups versus others.

**Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics**

Total Program Income (PI) available for 2016-17 was **$31,170,836**. This includes a beginning balance of **$21,491,629,** and **$9,679,207** inProgram Income received by HOME State Recipients.

HOME state recipients received **$9,679,207** in PI as follows: (1) PI **$6,323,077** and (2) Recaptured Funds **$3,356,130**. State recipients expended **$5,639,937** to provide affordable housing during FY 2016-17 and **$402,646** was expended for administrative costs.

Compiled data to date shows that the majority of PI project beneficiaries for FY 2016-17 are approximately **33 percent** Hispanic White and **67 percent** Non-Hispanic White homeowners in **Related/Two Parent (30%) and Related/Single Parent (35%)** households, (FTHB, TBRA and OOR activities), earning between **61-80%** of area median income. The majority of units funded were **2- and 3-bedrooms**, and most household sizes ranged from **1-5**-person households.

Note that the number of rental projects funded with PI is typically lower due to lower amounts of PI available at any given time, not enough to completely fund a rental project and not often enough to fund the few rental projects underway at any given time.

Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. [24 CFR 91.220(k)](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2010-title24-vol1/pdf/CFR-2010-title24-vol1-sec91-220.pdf) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). [24 CFR 91.320(j)](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2014-title24-vol1/pdf/CFR-2014-title24-vol1-sec91-320.pdf)

The Department’s rental housing production programs continue to consult with the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) on jointly funded projects. Other current efforts to foster and maintain affordable housing were previously discussed in CR 35. In addition, given the size and scope of housing and community development needs in California, it is the Department’s goal to review each program’s obstacles in meeting the state’s affordable housing needs after each funding round has been completed and prior to the beginning of the next one.  Each program seeks to further refine its method of distribution when necessary to adjust to changing markets and economic conditions in the state.

**CR-55 HOPWA (HOPWA grantees only)**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(f)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Households Served Through: | One-year Goal | Actual |
| Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family | 702 | 631 |
| Tenant-based rental assistance | 38 | 40 |
| Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds | 50 | X |
| Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds | N/A | N/A |
| Total | 790 | 715 |

Table 10 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

**NARRATIVE:**

During FY 2016-17, Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility (STRMU) assistance was made available to **631 PLWH** residing within the 40-county service area. In addition, two project sponsors provided Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA). Two agencies provided transitional housing to help clients maintain stable housing, and eight agencies provided emergency housing through hotel/motel voucher assistance. Expenditures for TBRA decreased significantly due to a loss of three project sponsors (Kern, Fresno Housing Authority and Fresno Public Health) due to Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Areas (EMSA) status. One project sponsor declined to offer TBRA this fiscal year. Some project sponsors assisted clients in locating and securing housing through housing information services and/or security deposit assistance. All sponsors provided case management and other supportive services, funded through HOPWA or other resources such as the federal Ryan White Part B program. Sponsors representing the 40-county area expended funds by activity as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16% | = TBRA |
| 40% | = STRMU |
| 1% | = Permanent housing placement assistance (e.g., security deposits, 1st month’s rent, credit checks, utility hookups) |
| 5% | = Facility based housing assistance (emergency or transitional housing) |
| 10% | = Housing information services and resource identification. |
| 16% | = Supportive services (e.g., case management, transportation, life skills, meals) |

## CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

**ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps***

**For Paperwork Reduction Act**

***Please Note:*** *This information is still being updated and may have additional information added after the public comment period.*

**1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete**

**Basic Grant Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recipient Name** | CALIFORNIA |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organizational DUNS Number** | 021225490 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EIN/TIN Number** | 680303547 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identify the Field Office** | SAN FRANCISCO |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance** |  |

**ESG Contact Name**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Prefix** | Ms |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **First Name** | Karen |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Middle Name** | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Last Name** | Patterson |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Suffix** | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | Section Chief |

**ESG Contact Address**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Street Address 1** | 2020 West El Camino Avenue |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Street Address 2** | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **City** | Sacramento |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State** | CA |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ZIP Code** | 95833- |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Phone Number** | 9162631466 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Extension** | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fax Number** | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Email Address** | karen.patterson@hcd.ca.gov |

**ESG Secondary Contact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Prefix** | Mr |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **First Name** | John |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Last Name** | Alexander |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Suffix** | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | Manager I |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Phone Number** | 9162631575 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Extension** | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Email Address** | john.alexander@hcd.ca.gov |

**2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Year Start Date** | 07/01/2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Year End Date** | 06/30/2016 |

**3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient**

|  |
| --- |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** ABODE SERVICES **City:** Fremont **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94538, 4306 **DUNS Number:** 111131111 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** HOMELESS COALITION OF SAN BENITO COUNTY **City:** Hollister **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95024, 2710 **DUNS Number:** 933317591 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 133780 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** ARCATA HOUSE, INC. **City:** Arcata **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95521, 5502 **DUNS Number:** 011854150 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 243253 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** FOOTHILL HOUSE OF HOSPITALITY **City:** Grass Valley **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95945, 6704 **DUNS Number:** 006461814 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 317845 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** MARTHA'S VILLAGE & KITCHEN, INC **City:** San Diego **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 92102, 3332 **DUNS Number:** 123443157 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 168000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** COMMUNITY ACTION OF NAPA VALLEY **City:** Napa **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94559, 3155 **DUNS Number:** 119843340 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** TURNING POINT FOUNDATION **City:** Ventura **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 93001, 4615 **DUNS Number:** 608847216 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 228384 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** THE SALVATION ARNY **City:** Grass Valley **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95945, 5509 **DUNS Number:** 074629460 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 76125 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** FULLERTON INTERFAITH EMERGENCY SERVICES **City:** Fullerton **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 92834, 6326 **DUNS Number:** 555890946 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 225235 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Samaritan House **City:** San Mateo **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94403, 4666 **DUNS Number:** 884486341 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Ritter Center **City:** San Rafael **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94912, 3517 **DUNS Number:** 052949815 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 142000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** the Gathering Inn **City:** Roseville **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95678, 0297 **DUNS Number:** 189981918 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 168385 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Alternatives to Violence **City:** Red Bluff **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 96080, 0135 **DUNS Number:** 932055726 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Yolo Wayfarer Center Christian Mission (Fourth and Hope) **City:** Woodland **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95776, 1248 **DUNS Number:** 184667079 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 150000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Center for Domestic Peace **City:** San Rafael **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94901, 3923 **DUNS Number:** 057382079 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Central California Family Crisis Center **City:** Porterville **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 93257, 2355 **DUNS Number:** 173267618 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Committee on the Shelterless **City:** Petaluma **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94953, 2744 **DUNS Number:** 960253235 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** WomanHaven, Inc. **City:** El Centro **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 92244, 2219 **DUNS Number:** 363774282 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 198455 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Trinity Center Walnut creek **City:** Walnut Creek **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94596, 4037 **DUNS Number:** 079218515 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 110000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Chico Community Shelter Partnership **City:** Chico **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95928, 4402 **DUNS Number:** 104645630 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 168385 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Stand Up Placer, Inc. **City:** Auburn **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95604, 5462 **DUNS Number:** 165959859 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 200000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** The Salvation Army, a California corporation **City:** Marysville **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95901, 0024 **DUNS Number:** 074629460 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 336730 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Tri-Valley Haven for Women **City:** Livermore **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94550, 7062 **DUNS Number:** 834704538 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 168000 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Good Samaritan Shelter **City:** Santa Maria **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 93454, 8669 **DUNS Number:** 023282457 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 105584 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Cornerstone Community Development Corp. **City:** San Leandro **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94577, 5103 **DUNS Number:** 788170355 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 336770 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** City of Hayward **City:** Hayward **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 94541, 5007 **DUNS Number:** 040010175 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 199955 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Tehama County Community Action Agency **City:** Red Bluff **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 96080, 4314 **DUNS Number:** 803593529 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 78935 |
| **Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Community Action Agency of Butte County, Inc. **City:** Chico **State:** CA **Zip Code:** 95973, 0523 **DUNS Number:** 147541270 **Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N **Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization **ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 168385 |

**CR-65 ESG Persons Assisted (ESG recipients only)**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(g)*

**4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
| Adults | 71 |
| Children | 72 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 0 |
| Total | 143 |

**Table 11 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
| Adults | 2,707 |
| Children | 1,045 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 4 |
| Missing Information | 63 |
| Total | 3,818 |

**4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities**

Table 12 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
| Adults | 5,954 |
| Children | 1,817 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 2 |
| Missing Information | 9 |
| Total | 7,782 |

**4c. Complete for Shelter**

Table 13 – Shelter Information X

**4d. Street Outreach**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
| Adults | 1,938 |
| Children | 73 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 1 |
| Missing Information | 12 |
| Total | 2,024 |

Table 14 – Household Information for Street Outreach

**4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
| Adults | 10,670 |
| Children | 3,007 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 7 |
| Missing Information | 84 |
| Total | 13,767 |

Table 15 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Total |
| Male | 5,447 |
| Female | 4,997 |
| Transgender | 26 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 8 |
| Missing Information | 194 |
| Total | 10,672 |

**5. Gender—Complete for All Activities**

Table 16 - Gender Information

**6. Age – Complete All Activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Total |
| Under 18 | 3,004 |
| 18-24 | 1,118 |
| 25 and over | 9,549 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 12 |
| Missing Information | 83 |
| Total | 13,766 |

Table 17 – Age Information

**7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities**

**Number of Persons in Households**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subpopulation | Total | Total Persons Served – Prevention | Total Persons Served – RRH | Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters |
| Veterans | 661 | 3 | 192 | 334 |
| Victims of Domestic Violence | 923 | 10 | 206 | 673 |
| Elderly | 992 | 1 | 311 | 473 |
| HIV/AIDS | 88 | 0 | 13 | 52 |
| Chronically Homeless | 155 | 0 | 359 | 1,230 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Persons with Disabilities | | | | |
| Severely Mentally Ill | 3,695 | 18 | 895 | 2,001 |
| Chronic Substance Abuse | 2,632 | 3 | 216 | 1,496 |
| Other Disability | 3,589 | 19 | 897 | 1,981 |
| Total (Unduplicated if possible) | 9,916 | 40 | 2,008 | 5,478 |

Table 18 – Special Population Served

**CR-70 ESG Assistance Provided (ESG recipients only)**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(g)*

***Please note:*** *the data in this section may change will be updated as relevant data becomes available. Where data is currently not available X’s have been used to represent where data is missing.*

**10. Shelter Utilization**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of New Units – Rehabbed | X |
| Number of New Units – Conversion | X |
| Total Number of bed - nights available | 1,094,559 |
| Total Number of bed - nights provided | 890,383 |
| Capacity Utilization | X |

Table 19 – Shelter Capacity

**11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)**

See data in the **e-cart file**.  Additional outcome data will be collected in future years per HUD requirements for HMIS project and system level measures.

**CR-75 ESG Expenditures (ESG Recipients only)**

*Regulation Citation(s): 24 CFR 91.520(g)*

**11. Expenditures**

**11a. *ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | | |
|  | **2014** | **2015** | 2016 |
| Expenditures for Rental Assistance | 130,763 | 183,709 | 64,627 |
| Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance | 43,141 | 116,142 | 25,464 |
| Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services | 111,012 | 176,345 | 11,673 |
| Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal Homelessness Prevention | 284,916 | 476,196 | 101,764 |

Table 20 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

**11b. *ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | | |
|  | **2014** | **2015** | 2016 |
| Expenditures for Rental Assistance | 760,744 | 1,068,280 | 1,026,973 |
| Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance | 637,252 | 897,178 | 492,495 |
| Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services | 649,225 | 1,119,105 | 605,587 |
| Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program | 510,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing | 2,557,221 | 3,084,563 | 2,125,055 |

Table 21 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

**11c. *ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | | |
|  | **2014** | **2015** | 2016 |
| Essential Services | 2,805,735 | 2,643,055 | 1,077,994 |
| Operations | 2,022,919 | 1,810,381 | 821,931 |
| Renovation | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Major Rehab | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conversion | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 4,828,654 | 4,453,436 | 2,125,055 |

Table 22 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

**11d. *Other Grant Expenditures***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | | |
|  | **2014** | **2015** | 2016 |
| Street Outreach | 471,688 | 495,098 | 236,701 |
| HMIS | 128,462 | 119,566 | 256,793 |
| Administration | 328,727 | 83,093 | 107,003 |

Table 23 - Other Grant Expenditures

**11e. Total ESG Grant Funds**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total ESG Funds Expended | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| 21,072,075 | 8,127,980 | 8,216,854 | 4,727,241 |

Table 24 - Total ESG Funds Expended

**11f. Match Source**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Other Non-ESG HUD Funds | 1,494,548 | 784,610 | 280,800 |
| Other Federal Funds | 657,774 | 1,444,077 | 853,334 |
| State Government | 1,706,566 | 2.038.524 | 1,577,387 |
| Local Government | 2,695,789 | 2,921,691 | 1,841,466 |
| Private Funds | 3,248,522 | 3,997,721 | 4,136,808 |
| Other | 3,430,313 | 2,742,538 | 1,130,158 |
| Fees | 156,613 | 98,914 | 5,044 |
| Program Income | 77,982 | 33,024 | 5,444 |
| Total Match Amount | 13,468,107 | 14,061,099 | 9,830,441 |

Table 25 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

**11g. Total**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| 36,153,769 | 21,596,087 | 22,277,953 | 14,557,682 |

Table 26 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities