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)

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)

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source/Amount</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Expected – Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Actual – Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Percent Completed</th>
<th>Expected – Program Year</th>
<th>Actual – Program Year</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand Homeownership &amp; improve Existing Housing</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>CDBG: $5,889,048</td>
<td>Homeowner Housing Added</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>218%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOME: $13,837,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Hazard Control Program: $399,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Homeownership &amp; improve Existing Housing</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>CDBG: $5,889,048</td>
<td>Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>3142</td>
<td>3232</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOME: $13,837,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Hazard Control Program: $399,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Homeownership &amp; improve Existing Housing</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>CDBG: $5,889,048</td>
<td>Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>210%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOME: $13,837,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Hazard Control Program: $399,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Economic Development Opportunities</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $11,777,096</td>
<td>Jobs created/retained</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>115,650</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Economic Development Opportunities</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $11,777,096</td>
<td>Businesses assisted</td>
<td>Businesses Assisted</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Supply of Affordable Rental Housing</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>CDBG: $3,926,032</td>
<td>Rental units constructed</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>165%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Supply of Affordable Rental Housing</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>HOME: $21,037,773</td>
<td>Lead Hazard Control Program: $793,333</td>
<td>Rental units rehabilitated</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or Increase Public Facilities</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $11,778,096</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>1,446,900</td>
<td>1,442,091</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>395,145</td>
<td>380,302</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or Increase Public Facilities</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $11,778,096</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>2,742,050</td>
<td>1,754,957</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or Increase Public Services</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $3,926,032</td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>680,550</td>
<td>528,956</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78,475</td>
<td>75,635</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or Increase Public Services</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $3,926,032</td>
<td>Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Homeless Assistance &amp; Prevention Services</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>HOME: $3,825,050</td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>16,424</td>
<td>8,752</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>313%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Homeless Assistance &amp; Prevention Services</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>HOME: $3,825,050</td>
<td>Homeless Person Overnight Shelter</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>66,515</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11,657</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Homeless Assistance &amp; Prevention Services</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>ESG: $23,478,901</td>
<td>Homeless Person Overnight Shelter</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>66,515</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11,657</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide Homeless Assistance &amp; Prevention Services</th>
<th>HOPWA: $2,921,564</th>
<th>HOME: $3,825,050</th>
<th>ESG: $23,478,901</th>
<th>Homelessness Prevention</th>
<th>Persons Assisted</th>
<th>19,200</th>
<th>5,774</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>1,144</th>
<th>774</th>
<th>68%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Homeless Assistance &amp; Prevention Services</td>
<td>HOPWA: $2,921,564</td>
<td>HOME: $3,825,050</td>
<td>ESG: $23,478,901</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Housing Operations</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Special Needs Provide Homeless Assistance &amp; Prevention Services</td>
<td>HOPWA: $2,921,564</td>
<td>HOME: $3,825,050</td>
<td>ESG: $23,478,901</td>
<td>Other: Special Needs HIV/AIDS Housing Operations</td>
<td>Services, Permanent Housing Placement, Supportive Services</td>
<td>8,690</td>
<td>7,204</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>ESG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>9,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or American Native</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Racial/Ethnic Composition (without Hispanic)</strong></td>
<td><strong>409</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,053</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>3,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>8,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Hispanic and Not Hispanic</strong></td>
<td><strong>409</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Resources Made Available</th>
<th>Amount Expended During Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$37,834,660</td>
<td>$46,542,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$38,568,168</td>
<td>$32,897,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,921,564</td>
<td>$2,458,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$23,478,901</td>
<td>$5,408,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Lead Hazard Control Program</td>
<td>$1,850,000</td>
<td>$810,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: This table is not applicable for States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th>Planned Percentage of Allocation</th>
<th>Actual Percentage of Allocation</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.shtml or 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*. 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**

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

*Table 4 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Income ~ Enter the program amounts for the reporting period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,491,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOME PROGRAM INCOME TABLE (HOME GRANTEES ONLY)**
## Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises

**Contract Indication**: The number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minority Business Enterprises</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Alaskan Native or American Indian</td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>14,530,874</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>7,909,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Business Enterprises</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>16,009,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>7,999,821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises*
## Minority Owners of Rental Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Property Owners</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Alaskan Native or American Indian</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8 – Minority Owners of Rental Property*
## Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

*Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Parcels Acquired</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>13,879,022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Acquired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses Displaced</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Organizations Displaced</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Displaced</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Alaskan Native or American Indian</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10 – Number of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-Year Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of homeless households to be provided affordable housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-homeless households to be provided affordable housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11 – Number of Households Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-Year Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households supported through rental assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households supported through the production of new units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households supported through the rehab of existing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households supported through the acquisition of existing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NARRATIVE**

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

**NARRATIVE:**

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

The Department saw in increase in the overall number of homeless household served. FY 2016-17 was the first year the ESG Redesign was in affect as well as the Department’s efforts to focus on homelessness. The number of non-homeless households was just slightly shot of the Departments goal but reflects many of those units went to homeless families or individuals. The Department also saw in increase in households supported through rental assistance, households supported through the production of new units, and households supported through the acquisition of existing units. However, there was a decrease in the number of supported households through the rehab of existing units.

**Note:** The differences in the totals between the two tables above are attributable to the Special Needs Household category being separately counted in Table 10.

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons Served</th>
<th>CDBG Actual</th>
<th>HOME Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low-income</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-income</td>
<td>35,493</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,617</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

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, 2024 persons were assisted with SO funds.

2. 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, 13,767 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.

3. 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, 1,975 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](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 funds to provide CalWORKs families with limited-term rental assistance to help them access permanent housing or avoid eviction. See [http://www.cdss.ca.gov/CalWORKS](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.

4. 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](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); 91.320 (i).

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); 91.320(j)

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); 91.320(j)
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.

2. Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 24 CFR 91.220(k); 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.

3. Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 24 CFR 91.220(k); 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.

4. **Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies.** 24 CFR 91.220(k); 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](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](http://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)

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. 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 (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 Project-Construction 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 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.shtm](http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/home.shtm) 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, 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.
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)

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 $31,692,853. This includes a beginning balance of $21,491,629, and $10,201,224 in Program Income received by HOME State Recipients.

HOME state recipients received $10,201,224 in PI as follows: (1) PI $6,758,932 and (2) Recaptured Funds $3,442,292. State recipients expended $5,987,623 to provide affordable housing during FY 2016-17 and $443,187 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) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 24 CFR 91.320(j)

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households Served Through:</th>
<th>One-year Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family</td>
<td></td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 – 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

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information
Recipient Name
Organizational DUNS Number
EIN/TIN Number
Identify the Field Office
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance

CALIFORNIA
021225490
680303547
SAN FRANCISCO
Alameda County CoC # CA-502, Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC -- CA-530, Bakersfield/Kern County CoC, CA-604, Butte County-Wide Homeless CoC #CA519, Central Sierra CoC CA-526, Coalition of Homeless Service Providers, CA-506, County of Marin, County of San Bernardino CoC, County of Ventura CoC CA-611, Daly/San Mateo County COC, CA-512, Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC #CA-521, Dos Rios CoC #523, El Dorado County CoC CA-525, Homeless Resource Council of the Sierras CA-515, Humboldt County CoC, Imperial County CoC CA-613, Kings/Tulare CoC #CA-513, Lake County CoC, CA-529, Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, Marin County CoC, CA-507, Mendocino County Homeless Services CoC, CA-509, Merced City and County CoC, CA-520, Napa City & County CoC CA-517, Orange County #602, Redding/Shasta County CoC - CA 516, Richmond/Contra Costa County, Riverside City & County CoC - 608 Roseville/Rocklin, Placer-Nevada County CoC #CA515, Sacramento Steps Forward CA 503 and Housing First Solano CA 518, San Diego City and County CoC; CA-601, San Luis Obispo County CA-614, Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC, CA-602, Santa Cruz/Watsonville – 508, Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC CA-603, Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC, CA-504, Stanislaus CoC, CA-510, Stockton/San Joaquin CoC CA-511, Tehama County CoC CA-527, Yolo Community CoC, Yuba City and County/Sutter County CoC: CA-524
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: Mauro  
Last Name: Lara  
Suffix: 0  
Title: Manager I  
Phone Number: 9162631168  
Extension: 0  
Email Address: Mauro.Lara@hcd.ca.gov

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete
Program Year Start Date: 07/01/2016  
Program Year End Date: 06/30/2017
3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Abode Services
City: Fremont
State: CA
Zip Code: 94538
DUNS Number: 012042880
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 159391

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Advocates for Mentally Ill Housing, Inc.
City: Auburn
State: CA
Zip Code: 95603
DUNS Number: 191983027
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 94794

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Alternatives to Violence
City: Red Bluff
State: CA
Zip Code: 96080
DUNS Number: 932055726
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 400000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency
City: Jackson
State: CA
Zip Code: 95642
DUNS Number: 105920748
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 899869

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Arcata House Partnership
City: Arcata
State: Ca
Zip Code: 95521
DUNS Number: 011854150
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 490224

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Bridges to Housing
City: Yuba City
State: CA
Zip Code: 95991
DUNS Number: 022099856
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 50000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Carrillo Counseling Services, Inc. dba New Beginnings Counseling Center
City: Santa Barbara
State: CA
Zip Code: 93101
DUNS Number: 071310010
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 161615

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Catholic Charities, Diocese of San Diego
City: San Diego
State: CA
| Zip Code: 92112-1831  |
| DUNS Number: 056747567 |
| Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No |
| Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization |
| ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 154770 |

| Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Center for a Nonviolent Community (CNVC) |
| City: Sonora |
| State: CA |
| Zip Code: 95370  |
| DUNS Number: 119859155 |
| Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Yes |
| Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization |
| ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 63000 |

| Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Center for Domestic Peace |
| City: San Rafael |
| State: CA |
| Zip Code: 94901  |
| DUNS Number: 057382079 |
| Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Yes |
| Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization |
| ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 200000 |

| Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Central California Family Crisis Center, Inc. |
| City: Porterville |
| State: CA |
| Zip Code: 93257  |
| DUNS Number: 173267618 |
| Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No |
| Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization |
| ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 200000 |
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Chico Community Shelter Partnership
City: Chico
State: CA
Zip Code: 95928
DUNS Number: 104645630
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 330000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: City of Salinas Community Development Department
City: Salinas
State: CA
Zip Code: 93901
DUNS Number: 010919447
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 600878

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Committee on the Shelterless
City: Petaluma
State: CA
Zip Code: 94953
DUNS Number: 960253235
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 400000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Community Action Agency of Butte County, Inc.
City: Chico
State: CA
Zip Code: 95973
DUNS Number: 147541270
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 135000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles
City: Los Angeles
State: CA
Zip Code: 91801
DUNS Number: 961608163
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No

Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 2233263
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Community Services and Employment Training, Inc.
City: Visalia
State: CA
Zip Code: 93291
DUNS Number: 091285288
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 175818

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Alameda Housing and Community Development Department
City: Hayward
State: CA
Zip Code: 94544
DUNS Number: 021116418
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No

Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 627261

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Contra Costa Department of Conservation and Development
City: Martinez
State: CA
Zip Code: 94553
DUNS Number: 139441955
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 578558

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Kern Planning and Community Development Department
City: Bakersfield
State: CA
Zip Code: 93301
DUNS Number: 063811350
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 523105

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Riverside Department of Public Social Services
City: Riverside
State: CA
Zip Code: 92503
DUNS Number: 152240540
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 631929

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of San Bernardino Community Development and Housing
City: San Bernardino
State: CA
Zip Code: 92415
DUNS Number: 956002748
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 610745

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of San Diego Housing and Community Development Services
City: San Diego  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92123  
DUNS Number: 009581646  
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No  
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government  
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 939493

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of San Joaquin Community Development Department  
City: Stockton  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95205  
DUNS Number: 112235184  
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No  
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government  
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 404678

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building  
City: San Luis Obispo  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93408  
DUNS Number: 059227611  
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No  
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government  
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 227633

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of San Mateo Department of Housing  
City: Belmont  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 94002  
DUNS Number: 073132177  
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No  
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government  
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 386286
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Santa Barbara Community Services Department  
City: Santa Barbara  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93101  
DUNS Number: 131851003  
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No  
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government  
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 679210

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Sonoma Community Development Commission  
City: Santa Rosa  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95403  
DUNS Number: 835120304  
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No  
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government  
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 489034

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Stanislaus Department of Planning and Community Development  
City: Modesto  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95354  
DUNS Number: 073136772  
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No  
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government  
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 583175

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: County of Ventura Community Development Department  
City: Ventura  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93009  
DUNS Number: 066691122
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient or Contractor Name</th>
<th>Subrecipient Organization Type</th>
<th>Is subrecipient a victim services provider</th>
<th>ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empower Yolo, Inc.</td>
<td>Unit of Government</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>327741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill House of Hospitality</td>
<td>Other Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>708792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Street Project</td>
<td>Other Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>694795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton Interfaith Emergency Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City: Fullerton
State: CA
Zip Code: 92834
DUNS Number: 555890946
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 326875

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Glenn County Health and Human Services Agency
City: Willows
State: CA
Zip Code: 95988
DUNS Number: 079308286
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 190913

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Homeless Services Center
City: Santa Cruz
State: CA
Zip Code: 95065
DUNS Number: 879989929
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 713646

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Homeward Bound of Marin
City: Novato
State: CA
Zip Code: 94949
DUNS Number: 949337059
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 200000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Human Response Network
City: Weaverville
State: Ca
Zip Code: 96093
DUNS Number: 020167198
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Yes
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: InnVision Shelter Network
City: Menlo Park
State: CA
Zip Code: 94025
DUNS Number: 792738726
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 75000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Interval House
City: Seal Beach
State: CA
Zip Code: 90740
DUNS Number: 113510176
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 179888

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action, Inc.
City: Bishop
State: California
Zip Code: 93514
DUNS Number: 139343693
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 339514

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Mendocino Coast Hospitality Center
City: Fort Bragg
State: CA
Zip Code: 95437
DUNS Number: 801826967
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 128725

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Mercy House Living Centers
City: Santa Ana
State: CA
Zip Code: 92702
DUNS Number: 879797165
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 97000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Napa County Health and Human Services Agency
City: Napa
State: CA
Zip Code: 94503
DUNS Number: 071688188
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 320991
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: North Coast Opportunities
City: Ukiah
State: CA
Zip Code: 95452
DUNS Number: 089187264
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 201894

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Orange County Community Resources
City: Santa Ana
State: CA
Zip Code: 92706
DUNS Number: 073507670
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 1208146

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Plumas Crisis Intervention and Resource Center
City: Quincy
State: CA
Zip Code: 95971
DUNS Number: 003377715
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Yes
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 514900

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Poor and the Homeless, Tehama County Coalition
City: Red Bluff
State: CA
Zip Code: 96080
DUNS Number: 065304540
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 183853

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Redwood Community Services, Inc.
City: Ukiah
State: Ca
Zip Code: 95482
DUNS Number: 806636494
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 128725

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Ritter Center
City: San Rafael
State: CA
Zip Code: 94912
DUNS Number: 052949815
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 342100

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency
City: Sacramento
State: CA
Zip Code: 95757
DUNS Number: 166026653
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 893906

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Sierra Saving Grace Homeless Project
City: Merced
State: CA
Zip Code: 95340
DUNS Number: 969818736
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 530564

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Stairways Programming
City: Chico
State: CA
Zip Code: 95927
DUNS Number: 16es11046
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 75000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Stand Up Placer, Inc.
City: Auburn
State: CA
Zip Code: 95604
DUNS Number: 165959859
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Yes
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 400000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Center for Violence-Free Relationships
City: Placerville
State: CA
Zip Code: 95667
DUNS Number: 808730469
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 297617
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Salvation Army, a California Corporation
City: Grass Valley
State: CA
Zip Code: 95945
DUNS Number: 074629460
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Faith-Based Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 254845

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Salvation Army, a California Corporation (Hanford)
City: Hanford
State: CA
Zip Code: 93230
DUNS Number: 074629460
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Faith-Based Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 575818

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Salvation Army, a California Corporation (Sutter Yuba)
City: Marysville
State: CA
Zip Code: 95901
DUNS Number: 074629460
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 387610

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: United Way of Merced County
City: Merced
State: CA
Zip Code: 95340
DUNS Number: 939185096
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 200000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: WomanHaven
City: El Centro
State: CA
Zip Code: 92244
DUNS Number: 363774282
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Yes
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 790471

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Yolo Wayfarer Center (Christian Mission)
City: Woodland
State: CA
Zip Code: 95776
DUNS Number: 184667079
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: No
Subrecipient Organization Type: Faith-Based Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 200000
### CR-65 ESG Persons Assisted (ESG recipients only)

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Households</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused/Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Households</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>2,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused/Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,954</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities*

#### 4c. Complete for Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Households</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>5,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused/Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,782</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12 – Shelter Information X*
4d. Street Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Households</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused/Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,041</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Households</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>10,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>3,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused/Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 - Gender Information
6. Age – Complete All Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Persons Served – Prevention</th>
<th>Total Persons Served – RRH</th>
<th>Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and over</td>
<td>9,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused/Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Persons Served – Prevention</th>
<th>Total Persons Served – RRH</th>
<th>Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Domestic Violence</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons with Disabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Mentally Ill</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Substance Abuse</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Disability</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Unduplicated if possible)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,481</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,156</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 – Special Population Served
CR-70 ESG Assistance Provided (ESG recipients only)

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

10. Shelter Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Units – Rehabbed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Units – Conversion</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of bed - nights available</td>
<td>1,356,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of bed - nights provided</td>
<td>1,096,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Utilization

Table 18 – 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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Rental Assistance</td>
<td>130,763</td>
<td>183,709</td>
<td>66,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance</td>
<td>43,141</td>
<td>116,142</td>
<td>28,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation &amp; Stabilization Services - Services</td>
<td>111,012</td>
<td>176,345</td>
<td>18,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Homelessness Prevention</strong></td>
<td><strong>284,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>476,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>113,145</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 19 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Rental Assistance</td>
<td>760,744</td>
<td>1,068,280</td>
<td>1,073,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance</td>
<td>637,252</td>
<td>897,178</td>
<td>603,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation &amp; Stabilization Services - Services</td>
<td>649,225</td>
<td>1,119,105</td>
<td>758,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,557,221</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,084,563</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,435,302</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 20 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing | 66727 | 28264 | 18154 |
### 11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td>2,805,735</td>
<td>2,643,055</td>
<td>1,156,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2,022,919</td>
<td>1,810,381</td>
<td>974,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Rehab</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,828,654</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,453,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,130,565</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

### 11d. Other Grant Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Outreach</td>
<td>471,688</td>
<td>495,098</td>
<td>336,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>128,462</td>
<td>119,566</td>
<td>281,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>328,727</td>
<td>83,093</td>
<td>111,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 - Other Grant Expenditures

### 11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total ESG Funds Expended</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22,719,632</td>
<td>8,599,668</td>
<td>8,711,951</td>
<td>5,408,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 - Total ESG Funds Expended
### 11f. Match Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-ESG HUD Funds</td>
<td>1,494,548</td>
<td>784,610</td>
<td>483,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Funds</td>
<td>657,774</td>
<td>1,444,077</td>
<td>1,423,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>1,706,566</td>
<td>2,038,524</td>
<td>1,771,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>2,695,789</td>
<td>2,921,691</td>
<td>2,513,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Funds</td>
<td>3,248,522</td>
<td>3,997,721</td>
<td>5,174,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,430,313</td>
<td>2,742,538</td>
<td>1,130,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>156,613</td>
<td>98,914</td>
<td>5,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income</td>
<td>77,982</td>
<td>33,024</td>
<td>48,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Match Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,468,107</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,061,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,550,634</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

### 11g. Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>62,799,473</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,067,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,773,051</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,958,647</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities