

Final Report

**State of Indiana Consolidated
Annual Performance and
Evaluation Report (CAPER)**

Program Year 2011
(July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012)



Final Report

September 28, 2012

**State of Indiana Consolidated Annual
Performance and Evaluation Report
(CAPER) for Program Year 2011
(July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012)**

Prepared for

State of Indiana
Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs
Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority
One North Capitol Avenue, Suite 600
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317.232.8831

Prepared by

BBC Research & Consulting
1999 Broadway, Suite 2200
Denver, Colorado 80202
303.321.2547 fax 303.399.0448
www.bbcresearch.com
bbc@bbcresearch.com

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Public Notice for CAPER Review	ES-2
Applicable Areas	ES-2
Organization of Report	ES-2
Resources	ES-3
Program Income.....	ES-3
Other Resources to Fulfill Goals	ES-4
Geographic Distribution	ES-6
Families and Persons Assisted	ES-8
Fair Housing Activities	ES-8
Other Relevant Actions	ES-14

I. Goal Assessment

Five-Year Strategic Goals, Objectives and Outcomes	I-1
Performance Measures Summary	I-13

II. Housing and Community Development Activities

Priority Housing and Community Development Needs	II-1
Use of CDBG and HOME Funds to Meet Identified Needs	II-3
Housing Activities	II-6
Community Development Activities	II-13
Administrative Funds and Prior Period Adjustments.....	II-18
Activities in Support of Affordable Housing and Community Development.....	II-18
Monitoring.....	II-23
Civil Rights Performance Monitoring Activities by the State	II-25
Leveraging Resources	II-25

III. Homeless Activities

Homelessness in Indiana	III-1
Consolidated Plan Goals and Outcomes.....	III-3
PY2011 Awards	III-5
ESG Summary	III-12

IV. Activities to Assist Persons Living with HIV/AIDS

HIV/AIDS in Indiana IV-2
HOPWA Program Accomplishments IV-5
Coordination IV-11
Compliance..... IV-11
Barriers IV-12
Performance Chart IV-13

Appendices:

Appendix A. Public Comments A-1

Executive Summary

State of Indiana 2011 CAPER

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the 2011 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the State of Indiana. It covers the July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 program year.

At the end of each program year, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires all HUD block grant recipients to submit a “performance and evaluation report” concerning the use of HUD grant funds. According to HUD, this report must include:

- An assessment of how such use addresses the objectives identified in the Consolidated Plan;
- Information on the proposed and actual accomplishments for each year that the CDBG funds were awarded;
- Resources made available and the investment of these resources;
- The geographic distribution and location of investments;
- The families and persons assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of persons assisted);
- Actions taken to affirmatively further fair housing; and
- Other actions indicated in the Strategic Plan and Action Plan.

This information is compiled into the “CAPER.” The overall goal of the CAPER is to enable HUD and citizens to assess the recipient’s progress toward meeting long-term goals.

Beginning October 1, 2006, each CAPER is to include the status of the grantee's efforts toward implementing HUD’s “performance measurement system requirements” described in the Federal Register Notice dated March 7, 2006. This includes descriptions of how the State's programs provided new or improved:

- availability/accessibility,
- affordability,
- sustainability of decent housing,
- a suitable living environment, and
- economic opportunity.

This State of Indiana CAPER reports on program activities for four HUD block grants administered by two State agencies. For the State’s 2011 program year, these agencies and awards included:

- Office of Community and Rural Affairs (OCRA)—primary administrator of the State Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program;
- Indiana Housing and Community Development (IHCDA)—administrator of the State HOME Investment Partnerships Program, the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program, the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program, and a portion of the CDBG program dedicated to housing.

This CAPER was completed in accordance with Sections 104(d) and (e) of the Housing and Community Development Act and Title 24 CFR Part 91 and Part 570, which pertain to State submissions of the CAPER.

Public Notice for CAPER Review

The 2011 CAPER was available for public review between September 13, 2012 and September 28, 2012. A hard copy of the CAPER was on file with OCRA, and electronic copies were available on OCRA's website. Public comments were encouraged and accepted during this period. The public notice announcing the availability of the CAPER is attached to this section.

Applicable Areas

The State of Indiana Consolidated Plan covers all non-entitlement areas in the State. The term "entitlement areas" refers to cities and counties that, because of their size, are able to receive federal HUD funding directly. These areas must complete a Consolidated Plan separately from the State to receive funding. The requirements for receiving CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds directly are all slightly different, but are generally based on size and need of the community. For purposes of this report, "non-entitlement" refers to cities and towns that do not file Consolidated Plans individually and are not able to receive funding from the HUD programs directly.

The entitlement areas in Indiana during PY2011 include the cities of Anderson, Bloomington, Carmel, Columbus, East Chicago, Elkhart, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Gary, Goshen, Hammond, Indianapolis, Kokomo, LaPorte, Lafayette, Michigan City, Mishawaka, Muncie, New Albany, South Bend, Terre Haute, West Lafayette, and Hamilton County and Lake County.

Organization of Report

This Executive Summary contains the required narrative for the CAPER as specified in the recently issued CPD-11-03 titled Reporting Requirements for the State Performance and Evaluation Report (PER). Topics include:

- A description of resources made available;
- The geographic distribution and location of investments;
- Actions taken to affirmatively further fair housing a summary of impediments and actions take to overcome the effects of impediments;
- Actions taken to remove barriers to affordable housing; and
- Other relevant actions indicated in the Strategic Plan and Action Plan.

Discussions of the activities to address homelessness, chronic homelessness and persons with HIV/AIDS appear in Sections II, III and IV.

The comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the Consolidated Plan appears in Section I.

The additional CDBG requirements outlined in CPD-11-03 appear in the report as follows:

- The use of CDBG funds is located in Section I.
- The relationship of that use to the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan with special attention to high priority activities appears in Section I. Goal Assessment.
- The nature and reasons for any changes in program objectives appears in Section I.
- Any changes that the State would have made based on its experiences are discussed in Section I.
- How CDBG benefitted low and moderate income persons appears in Section I.
- An evaluation of progress meeting goals and providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served appears in Section I.

Resources

The primary resource used to address the needs identified in the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan is HUD block grant funding. Figure ES-1 shows the total amounts PY2011 funding allocated by HUD and administering agency.

Exhibit ES-1. 2011 Action Plan Funding by Program and State Agency

Source:
U.S. Department of
Housing & Urban
Development.

Program	FY 2011 Funding Allocations
CDBG (Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs)	\$28,547,816
HOME (Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority)	\$14,749,773
ESG (Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority)	\$2,802,467
HOPWA (Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority)	<u>\$980,761</u>
Total	\$47,080,817

Program Income

OCRA received a minimal amount of program income during PY2011 from the following sources:

- Batesville has an Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund from which they received \$17.91 interest during the reporting period leaving a balance of \$12,832. The balance will be used on a Main Street project, currently being prepared to submit for grant funding.
- Randolph County has an Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund from which they have received \$42,025.40 in principal and interest during the reporting period. Total Program Income Received: \$42,043.30.

The total program income committed to projects during the reporting period is \$83,332; commitment date of July 13, 2011 to Marion.

In the event OCRA receives CDBG Program Income, such moneys will be placed in the Community Focus Fund for the purpose of making additional competitive grants under that program. Reversions of other years' funding will be placed in the Community Focus Fund for the specific year of funding reverted. The State will allocate and expend all CDBG Program Income funds received prior to drawing additional CDBG funds from the US Treasury. However, the following exceptions shall apply:

1. This prior-use policy shall not apply to housing-related grants made to applicants by the Indiana Housing & Community Development Authority (IHCDA), a separate agency, using CDBG funds allocated to the IHCDA by OCRA
2. Program income generated by CDBG grants awarded by OCRA using PY2011 CDBG funds must be returned to OCRA, however, such amounts of less than \$25,000 per calendar year shall be excluded from the definition of CDBG Program Income pursuant to 24 CFR 570.489.

All obligations of CDBG program income to projects/activities require prior approval by OCRA. This includes use of program income as matching funds for CDBG-funded grants from the IHCDA. Applicable parties should contact OCRA at (317) 232-8333 for application instructions and documents for use of program income prior to obligation of such funds.

Other Resources to Fulfill Goals

Affordable Housing and Community Development Fund. Beginning in fiscal year 2008, the Affordable Housing and Community Development Fund began receiving new revenue to support its activities, generating approximately \$10 million to invest in the past two years. This revenue is expected to generate funding annually for investment in housing and community development activities across the Indiana. IHCDA administers the Development Fund and distributes proceeds through its Strategic Investment Process.

Indiana Foreclosure Prevention Network. Community service and housing-related organizations, government agencies, lenders, realtors, and trade associations have come together in a public-private partnership to provide a multi-tiered solution to Indiana's foreclosure problem. This statewide initiative is targeted public awareness campaign that utilizes grassroots strategies and mainstream media to drive Hoosiers facing foreclosure to a statewide toll-free helpline and educational website.

Anyone who has fallen behind on his or her mortgage payments, or thinks they might, will be encouraged to call 877-GET-HOPE or to visit www.877GETHOPE.org. The confidential, toll-free helpline, operated by Momentive Consumer Credit Counseling Service, is available daily from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Whenever possible, counselors will assist homeowners over the phone. If more extensive assistance is needed, the counselor will refer the homeowner to a local foreclosure intervention specialist.

The Don't Let the Walls Foreclose In On You: Get Help, Get Hope public awareness campaign evokes a sense of urgency, recognizes that foreclosure can happen to anyone, and offers a message of hope. Marketing materials including brochures, posters, and other collateral pieces will be distributed through a variety of local outlets such as:

- Places of worship;
- Utilities;
- WorkOne centers;
- Community-based organizations; and
- Hospitals;
- State and municipal agencies.
- Libraries;

IFPN is collaborating with the Indiana Association of Realtors to identify and train its members in short sale transactions. When a foreclosure prevention specialist determines that a short sale is the most appropriate solution, he or she will have a pool of realtors to assist with the transaction. Similarly, IFPN has reached out to the Indiana Legal Services, Indiana Bar Association, and the Pro Bono Commission to identify and train attorneys who may assist homeowners during the foreclosure process.

Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). IHCD utilizes set-aside categories in its Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program to target the housing priorities set forth in the agency's strategic plan and to achieve the goals in the Statewide Consolidated Plan. Below is a list of the set-aside categories in the 2012-2013 Qualified Allocation Plan:

- Qualified not-for-profit;
- Large City;
- Community Impact;
- Small City;
- Elderly;
- Preservation; and
- Housing First;
- General.
- And Rural

IHCD further supports strategic objectives by targeting evaluation criteria of LIHTC applications based on rents charged, constituency served, development characteristics, high performance housing characteristics, project financing and market strength, and other unique features and services.

Section 8 voucher program. IHCD administers vouchers to help approximately 4,100 families pay their rent each month. The HCV program services are provided by Local Subcontracting Agencies throughout the State of Indiana.

In an effort to better align Indiana's strategic housing goals with targeted voucher recipients, IHCD has established the following preference categories (with point amounts for each category in parentheses):

- Former participant terminated due to insufficient funding (900);
- Applicant was on waiting list prior to June 1 2007 (400);
- Applicant is legal resident of the state of Indiana (200);
- Applicant is currently homeless (50);
- Applicants are working or enrolled in education/training program (50);

- Applicant is age 62 or older (50);
- Non-elderly (61 years or younger) family head of household, spouse, or sole member meets HUD's definition disabled (50)
- Institutionalized, or at risk of institutionalization, is living in or at risk of being placed in a nursing facility, long term rehabilitation center or hospital (50);
- Member of the family meets HUD's definition of being disabled (50).

Geographic Distribution

Figures ES-2 through ES-5 show the geographic distribution by county of CDBG, ESG and HOPWA funds for PY2011. HOME dollars that were not used for downpayment assistance were provided to Vigo County (Mental Health Association—\$944,962); Bartholomew County (Cambridge Square Apartments—\$1.547 million); United Senior Residences (also Bartholomew County—\$400,000); and Jacob's Village (Evansville).

**Figure ES-2.
CDBG (Non Housing) Allocation, Number of Projects and Beneficiaries by County, PY2011**

County	Proposed Beneficiaries	Low to Moderate Income Beneficiaries	Amount Committed	County	Proposed Beneficiaries	Low to Moderate Income Beneficiaries	Amount Committed
Allen	738	417	\$ 40,000	Newton	413	233	\$ 48,600
Bartholomew	2,329	1,333	\$ 76,527	Noble	8,846	5,695	\$ 116,513
Blackford	6,889	3,250	\$ 50,000	Orange	2,273	1,205	\$ 546,000
Boone	4,160	2,271	\$ 200,000	Perry	7,170	4,073	\$ 49,500
Brown	732	428	\$ 48,000	Putnam	1,145	663	\$ 1,700,000
Carroll	17,898	9,354	\$ 48,600	Randolph	487	316	\$ 1,100,000
Crawford	1,981	1,373	\$ 630,000	Ripley	1,487	877	\$ 40,000
DeKalb	3,763	2,200	\$ 629,000	Rush	417	245	\$ 30,000
Fayette/Rush	186	106	\$ 20,700	St. Joseph	1,948	1,148	\$ 436,995
Grant	5,656	3,219	\$ 50,000	Starke	100	100	\$ 424,620
Greene	118	66	\$ 498,676	Steuben	5,113	3,072	\$ 50,000
Hamilton	22,175	10,352	\$ 650,000	Tippecanoe	3,659	1,529	\$ 915,000
Henry	174	91	\$ 39,600	Tipton	380	194	\$ 50,000
Howard	295	207	\$ 600,000	Vermillion	980	553	\$ 38,160
Huntington	1,346	684	\$ 40,000	Wabash	413	269	\$ 500,000
Jasper	1,455	791	\$ 48,600	Warrick	996	542	\$ 50,000
Jennings	6,515	2,867	\$ 122,000	Wayne	790	462	\$ 50,000
Marion	6,910	3,988	\$ 650,000	White	813	345	\$ 250,000
Miami	1,137	504	\$ 50,000	Whitley	129	77	\$ 94,600
Monroe	206	127	\$ 30,000	Total			\$ 111,011,591

Source: Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

**Figure ES-3.
Housing Development Fund
(CDBG Housing) Allocation by Location, PY2011**

Source:
Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority, CO4PR10.

Town/County	Funded Amount
Carlisle	\$ 477,500
Elnora	\$ 214,000
Montgomery	\$ 86,750
Liberty	\$ 330,000
Plainville	\$ 150,000
Howard	\$ 447,195
Milton	\$ 288,000
French Lick	\$ 260,000

**Figure ES-4.
ESG Allocation by Location, PY2011**

Town/County	Total Clients Served		Dollars Allocated For...			Total Budget Allocated	
	Essential Services	Homelessness Prevention/Housing Assistance	Essential Services	Operations	Homeless Prevention		
Allen	958	199	\$ 94,477	\$ 94,238	\$ 11,628	\$ 200,343	
Bartholomew	430		\$ 10,600	\$ 63,212	\$ 1,488	\$ 75,300	
Dearborn	232		\$ -	\$ 41,551	\$ -	\$ 41,551	
Delaware	261	149	\$ 20,300	\$ 71,457	\$ -	\$ 91,757	
Elkhart	409	78	\$ 22,500	\$ 37,116	\$ 7,605	\$ 67,221	
Floyd	76	197	\$ 33,417	\$ 52,839	\$ 1,000	\$ 87,256	
Grant	74		\$ 5,932	\$ 33,989	\$ 1,940	\$ 41,861	
Hancock	84		\$ -	\$ 12,050	\$ -	\$ 12,050	
Hendricks	176	60	\$ -	\$ 43,200	\$ 1,121	\$ 44,321	
Howard	1,566		\$ 9,883	\$ 69,448	\$ 1,000	\$ 80,331	
Jackson	125		\$ -	\$ 46,396	\$ 1,000	\$ 47,396	
Jasper	92		\$ 500	\$ 14,396	\$ 6,000	\$ 20,896	
Kosciusko	129		\$ -	\$ 37,396	\$ -	\$ 37,396	
Lake	553	38	\$ -	\$ 91,009	\$ 2,307	\$ 93,316	
LaPorte	245		\$ 9,000	\$ 81,013	\$ 5,000	\$ 95,013	
Madison	388		\$ 5,000	\$ 38,898	\$ 2,500	\$ 46,398	
Monroe	514	258	\$ 41,025	\$ 63,255	\$ 4,500	\$ 108,780	
Morgan	154	47	\$ -	\$ 47,091	\$ -	\$ 47,091	
Porter	164	164	\$ 14,750	\$ 51,755	\$ 300	\$ 66,805	
Putnam	71		\$ 549	\$ 5,205	\$ -	\$ 5,754	
Ripley	140		\$ -	\$ 24,197	\$ -	\$ 24,197	
Tippecanoe	2,068		\$ 80,892	\$ 155,228	\$ 16,551	\$ 252,671	
Vanderburgh	1,270	244	\$ 43,142	\$ 216,345	\$ -	\$ 259,487	
Vigo	299		\$ 2,570	\$ 38,197	\$ 2,168	\$ 42,935	
Washington	166		\$ 1,000	\$ 29,790	\$ 6,000	\$ 36,790	
Wayne	162		\$ 1,000	\$ 18,176	\$ 4,300	\$ 23,476	
Whitley		46	\$ 11,227	\$ 20,500	\$ 6,500	\$ 38,227	
			Total	\$ 407,764	\$ 1,497,947	\$ 82,908	\$ 1,988,619

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

**Figure ES-5.
HOPWA Allocation by Region, PY2011**

Region	Formula Allocation	Region	Formula Allocation
Region 1 Lake, LaPorte, Porter	\$256,986	Region 8 Clay, Parke, Sullivan, Vermillion, Vigo	\$47,326
Region 2 Elkhart, Fulton, Marshall, Pulaski, St. Joseph, Starke	\$120,400	Region 9* Decatur, Fayette, Henry, Ripley, Rush, Union,	
Region 3 Adams, Allen, DeKalb, Huntington, Kosciusko, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben, Wabash, Wells, Whitley	\$200,000	Region 10 Bartholomew, Greene, Lawrence, Monroe, Owen	\$96,986
Region 4* Benton, Carroll, Clinton, Fountain, Jasper, Montgomery, Newton, Tippecanoe, Warren, White		Region 11 Crawford, Jackson, Jefferson, Jennings, Orange, Switzerland	\$25,000
Region 5* Blackford, Delaware, Grant, Jay, Randolph		Region 12 Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Knox, Martin, Perry, Pike, Posey, Spencer, Vanderburgh, Warrick	\$182,000
Region 6* Cass, Howard, Madison, Miami, Tipton		*Regions 4, 5, 6, 9	\$ 155,986
		Total	\$1,084,684

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority, HOPWA CAPER.

Families and Persons Assisted

Please see Section II for data on the families and persons assisted using CDBG and HOME, Section III for ESG and Section IV for HOPWA, including beneficiaries' racial and ethnic status as available.

Fair Housing Activities

Every year, as part of the State's Annual Action Plan, a review of fair housing impediments is conducted. A comprehensive AI is planned for fall 2012 through winter 2013. Currently, according to the latest data in the last Annual Action Plan, the following barriers to fair housing in the State of Indiana currently exist:

Private sector impediments

Increase in alleged violations concerning rentals. There has been an increase in the number of complaints of alleged violations concerning the discrimination in the terms/conditions/privileges relating to rental; discriminatory refusal to rent; discriminatory refusal to negotiate for rental; and discrimination in services and facilities relating to rental in recent years.

Predatory lending and access to credit. One outcome from the financial crisis has been that FHA mortgages have absorbed the subprime market. According to Mortgage Bankers Association data, the market share of subprime loans retracted by 2.5 percent while FHA's share grew by 6 percent from 2007-2009. Additionally, the 2009 HMDA data listed a poor credit history as the top reason that credit is denied to home purchase and home improvement loan applicants in Indiana. There are little data about how prevalent predatory lending practices are or how significant they are in creating fair housing barriers, although most studies suggest that elderly and minorities are disproportionately likely to be victims. *This impediment was found to exist in both 2006 and 2010.*

Public sector impediments

Fair housing awareness. ICRC is the primary organization that receives and investigates complaints in the State's nonentitlement areas. The numerous nonentitlement areas and size of the State, as well as the limited resources of ICRC, make it difficult to ensure that residents in all areas of the State are aware of fair housing issues and know how to file a complaint when they feel they have been discriminated against. *This impediment was found to exist in both 2006 and 2010.*

Impediments in both private and public sectors

Lack of affordable housing and services, particularly for special needs populations. Lack of quality, affordable housing was a common theme of the stakeholders interviewed for the current AI updates and previous AI and updates. Many landlords reportedly do not want to serve low income households. There is a stigma about affordable housing in many rural areas. Stakeholders also reported a lack of senior housing and services for persons who are disabled and have mental illnesses. During the 2009 AI update, 2010 AI and 2011 AI update, many stakeholders commented on the lack of affordable, accessible housing for persons with disabilities as being a major barrier to housing choice in the State. *This impediment was found to exist in both 2006 and 2010.*

Complaint data from the ICRC reported the third most common alleged violation complaint made during 2007 to 2010 was the "Failure to provide reasonable accommodation." During 2006 to 2010, the alleged violation of "failure to provide reasonable accommodation" made up 12 percent of the complaints. *This impediment was found to exist in both 2006 and 2010.*

Housing discrimination. According to ICRC complaint data, the most common types of housing discrimination in the State are based on race/national origin, disability and familial status. A resident survey completed in 2010 asked if discrimination in housing is a problem in their community and what is that discrimination based on. Twenty-three percent of the resident responses were that discrimination is not a problem, followed by discrimination being based on disability, family size and race/ethnicity. *This impediment was found to exist in both 2006 and 2010.*

Fair Housing Action Plan. To address the impediments identified above, the State of Indiana will execute the following Fair Housing Action Plan. .

1. All grantees of CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA funds will continue to be required to:
 - a) Have an up-to-date Affirmative Marketing Plan; b) Display a Fair Housing poster in a prominent place; and c) Include the Fair Housing logo on all print materials and project signage. All grantees of HOME, ESG, and HOPWA are still required to provide beneficiaries with information on what constitutes a protected class and instructions on how to file a complaint.

In addition, beginning in March 2011, OCRA will require CDBG grantees to promote fair housing practices using the following guidelines:

- **Step 1—Develop a Fair Housing Ordinance.** The grantee should work with their attorney to develop a Fair Housing Ordinance if one does not exist. A sample Fair Housing Ordinance has been provided by OCRA. Once the ordinance has been developed, the ordinance must be formally adopted by the grantee and submitted to the OCRA Civil Rights Specialist for review on or before Release of Funds.

- **Step 2— Display the Applicable Fair Housing Posters.** Upon receipt of the grantee’s Civil Rights/Section 3 Officer Notification, the OCRA Civil Rights Specialist will provide the applicable fair housing posters to grantees’ Civil Rights/Section 3 Officer. These posters must be displayed at public buildings, such as local government buildings, and must always be posted at the job site.
 - **Step 3—Conduct Fair Housing Activity.** Grantees must choose an activity from the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Checklist (Civil Rights Form 3)¹ to conduct during the grant period. Examples of acceptable steps to promote Fair Housing practices include but are not limited to distributing the Fair Housing Brochure, reviewing sales and rental practices in the community, or conducting a Fair Housing Assessment.
2. All grantees of CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA funds will continue to be monitored for compliance with the aforementioned requirements as well as other Fair Housing standards (e.g., marketing materials, lease agreements, etc.). As part of the monitoring process, OCRA and IHCDA staff will ensure that appropriate action (e.g., referral to HUD or appropriate investigative agency) is taken on all fair housing complaints at federally funded projects.
 3. OCRA requires all CDBG projects to be submitted by an accredited grant administrator. Civil rights training, including fair housing compliance, will continue to be a required part of the accreditation process. IHCDA will continue to incorporate fair housing requirements in its grant implementation training for CSBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA grantees.
 4. IHCDA will serve on the Indianapolis Partnership for Accessible Shelters and, through this Task Force, will educate shelters about Fair Housing and accessibility issues, and help identify way to make properties more accessible.
 5. IHCDA will work with ICRC to have testers sent to IHCDA funded rental properties to ensure they are in compliance with the Fair Housing Act. The goal for the number of properties tested per year is 4 per year. The program will begin in 2012.
 6. IHCDA will also ensure that the properties it has funded are compliant with uniform federal accessibility standards during on-going physical inspections, as part of the regular inspections that occur. The goal for the number of properties inspected per year for fair housing compliance is 100 per year.
 7. IHCDA will expand its Fair Housing outreach activities by 1) Posting ICRC information and complaint filing links on IHCDA website, and 2) enhancing fair housing month (April) as a major emphasis in the education of Indiana residents on their rights and requirements under Fair Housing.

¹ <http://www.in.gov/ocra/2575.htm>

8. IHCDCA established the Indiana Foreclosure Prevention Network (IFPN), a program to provide free mortgage foreclosure counseling to homeowners. IFPN was launched in the fall of 2007, and is a partnership of community-based organizations, government agencies, lenders, realtors, and trade associations that has devised a multi-tiered solution to Indiana's foreclosure problem. This statewide initiative includes a targeted public awareness campaign, a telephone helpline, an educational website, and a network of local trusted advisors. IHCDCA has established a goal to provide 2 to 5 education trainings on foreclosure prevention and predatory lending each year.
9. IHCDCA will receive regular reports from ICRC regarding complaints filed against IHCDCA properties and within 60 days ensure an action plan is devised to remedy future issues or violations.

Fair housing accomplishments. The State of Indiana has completed the following actions to affirmatively further fair housing:

1. IHCDCA worked with ICRC to conduct fair housing seminars throughout the State. Seminars were held in Gary, Terre Haute, the Burmese Advocacy Center (Fort Wayne) and South Bend. These events also offered CLE training for fair housing attorneys.

In addition, ICRC held a meeting with the Hispanic Outreach Group to discuss fair housing testing. ICRC has selected a pilot community for testing and began recruiting applicants for the testing program. Testing is scheduled to begin at the end of the year and, after an evaluation of the program, be expanded statewide in the future.

2. IHCDCA staff monitored 120 grantees for compliance with CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA requirements as well as other Fair Housing standards (e.g., marketing materials, lease agreements, etc.). This monitoring number reflects unduplicated grantees and includes both close-out and ongoing compliance monitoring. As necessary, IHCDCA referred compliance issues to HUD or the appropriate investigative agency to ensure action is taken on all fair housing complaints at federally funded projects.
3. OCRA is requiring CDBG grantees to promote fair housing practices using the following guidelines:
 - **Step 1—Develop a Fair Housing Ordinance.** The grantee should work with their attorney to develop a Fair Housing Ordinance if one does not exist. A sample Fair Housing Ordinance has been provided by OCRA. Once the ordinance has been developed, the ordinance must be formally adopted by the grantee and submitted to the OCRA Civil Rights Specialist for review on or before Release of Funds.
 - **Step 2—Display the Applicable Fair Housing Posters.** Upon receipt of the grantee's Civil Rights/Section 3 Officer Notification, the OCRA Civil Rights Specialist will provide the applicable fair housing posters to grantees' Civil Rights/Section 3 Officer. These posters must be displayed at public buildings, such as local government buildings, and must always be posted at the job site.

- **Step 3—Conduct Fair Housing Activity.** Grantees must choose an activity from the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Checklist (Civil Rights Form 3)² to conduct during the grant period. Examples of acceptable steps to promote Fair Housing practices include but are not limited to distributing the Fair Housing Brochure, reviewing sales and rental practices in the community, or conducting a Fair Housing Assessment.
4. IHCDCA continued to incorporate fair housing requirements in its grant implementation training for CSBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA grantees. During PY2011, IHCDCA provided comprehensive grant implementation training for nascent grantees as well as customized one-on-one trainings for more seasoned developers.
 5. IHCDCA worked with ICRC to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to have ICRC test IHCDCA-funded rental properties to ensure that they are in compliance with the Fair Housing Act. The testing program began in 2012.
 6. During PY2011, IHCDCA completed physical inspections to ensure that the properties it has funded are compliant with uniform federal accessibility standards. These inspections also included fair housing compliance.
 7. IHCDCA promoted Fair Housing Month in April to bring even greater emphasis on the rights and requirements under Fair Housing law.
 8. IHCDCA worked with the Mortgage Fraud and Prevention Task Force to identify strategies to help consumers avoid predatory lending and foreclosure. The recommendations from this series of meetings with industry leaders, advocates, government agencies and elected officials resulted in the passage of HEA 1793 empowering IHCDCA to develop a public awareness campaign, provide access to free telephone and web-based counseling, and refer homeowners to a network of trusted advisors including foreclosure prevention specialists, realtors, and attorneys. An integral part of the network is identifying fraudulent and predatory loans that are then disclosed to the Attorney General's office.
 9. IHCDCA worked with ICRC to establish a reporting mechanism on complaints filed against IHCDCA properties to ensure an action plan is devised to remedy future issues or violations.

Program year 2010 to 2014 fair housing goals and 2011 accomplishments. The following matrix summarizes the State's Fair Housing Action Plan for program years 2010 to 2014 to minimize impediments and includes the 2011 accomplishments to date.

² <http://www.in.gov/ocra/2575.htm>

**Figure ES-4.
Fair Housing Action Plan Matrix, PY2010 to 2014**

Task Description	Impediments Addressed	Activities	Goals					Accomplishments				
			2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
1. Fair housing outreach and education.	▪ Discrimination faced by Indiana residents. Fair housing awareness.	▪ Grantees will be required to:										
		1) Have an up-to-date affirmative marketing plan;	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		2) Display a fair housing poster;	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		3) Include the fair housing logo on all print materials.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		▪ OCRA CDBG Grantees will be required to:										
		1) Develop a Fair Housing Ordinance.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
2. Fair housing compliance and monitoring.	▪ Discrimination faced by Indiana residents.	▪ Monitor HUD funds for compliance (grantees).	40-50	40-50	40-50	40-50	40-50	120				
		▪ IHCDCA will refer compliance issues to HUD (as needed).	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A			
3. Fair housing training.	▪ Discrimination faced by Indiana residents. Fair housing awareness.	▪ CDBG grant administrators will be trained in fair housing.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		▪ New IHCDCA grantees will receive fair housing training.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
4. Increase accessible housing.	▪ Lack of affordable housing for special needs populations.	▪ IHCDCA will serve on the Indianapolis Partnership for Accessible Shelters	X	X	X	X	X					
5. Fair housing testing.	▪ Discrimination faced by Indiana residents. Lack of quality, affordable housing.	▪ Work with ICRC to test IHCDCA funded rental properties (properties).	4	4	4	4	4	0				
6. ADA inspections.	▪ Lack of affordable housing for special needs populations.	▪ Inspect IHCDCA funded properties for ADA compliance (properties).	100	100	100	100	100	117				
7. Public outreach and education.	▪ Lack of awareness of fair housing.	▪ Expanding fair housing information on IHCDCA website.										
		1) Post ICRC information/complaint filing links;	X	X	X	X	X			X		
8. Reduce predatory lending and education.	▪ Predatory lending and foreclosures.	2) Promote fair housing month (April) and residents fair housing rights.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		▪ Provide foreclosure prevention and predatory lending education (trainings).	2-5	2-5	2-5	2-5	2-5					
9. Prevent discrimination.	▪ Discrimination faced by Indiana residents. Lack of quality, affordable housing.	▪ IHCDCA will oversee the Indiana Foreclosure Prevention Network.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
		▪ Receive reports of complaints filed against property owners funded by IHCDCA.	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A			

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority and Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

Other Relevant Actions

Stellar Communities program. The Stellar Communities program is a multi-agency partnership designed to fund comprehensive community development projects in Indiana's smaller communities. OCRA and IHCDA, along with the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and the State Revolving Fund are participating in this innovative program.

The Stellar Communities program started with a call for letters from chief elected official detailing potential projects and general need of the community based on a required current comprehensive plan and other recent planning efforts on behalf of the community. Forty-two letters were received.

From the 42 letters the state funding team chose 12 finalists. The CEO's of 12 finalists were invited to participate in a workshop that detailed what the funding team is requiring in the strategic investment plan proposal document that will serve as the final base evaluation for determination of the pilots.

After the submission of the 12 proposals, site visits were conducted to evaluate projects and tour the project area. The funding team met to score and determine the two pilots. Criteria were based on the following:

- Identify at least one project to be completed in each of the 3 program years. The total number of projects is solely limited to the community's ability to successfully complete the projects.
- Identify/document project cost estimates, local match amounts and sources, and additional funding resources.
- Completion of the site visit checklist from the resource team.
- Document and support the level of need for each project and the significance of each project in the overall revitalization efforts within the community;
- Capacity of the applicant to administer the funds;
- The long-term viability of the strategic community investment plan;

The Cities of Greencastle and North Vernon were chosen as the two first year pilot communities in April 2011.

**AVISO DE REGISTRO
DEL
INFORME COMBINADO DE EVALUACIÓN DEL DESEMPEÑO ANUAL**

Para ver una versión en español de este anuncio de Aviso de Registro del Informe Combinado de Evaluación del Desempeño Anual visite el sitio web www.in.gov/ocra. Para traducciones al español de los documentos mencionados en este anuncio, escribir al Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs, One North Capitol, Suite 600, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 o E-mail bdawson2@ocra.in.gov.

**NOTICE OF FILING
OF
COMBINED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT**

Notice is hereby given that the Indiana Office of Community & Rural Affairs, and the Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority will file their 2011 Combined Annual Performance Evaluation Report with the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) on or about September 30, 2012. These programs are funded through the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development under Title I of the Housing & Community Development Act of 1974 as amended.

The Combined Annual Performance Evaluation Report provides information on the expenditure of activities with regard to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, the Home Investment Partnership (HOME) Program, the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) Program, and the Housing Opportunities for Persons With Aids (HOPWA) Program. The Office of Community & Rural Affairs will have the Combined Annual Performance Evaluation Report available for public inspection prior to its submission. Members of the public, especially persons of low to moderate income, are invited to review the Combined Annual Performance Evaluation Report prior to its submission during the hours of 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Thursday, September 13, 2012 through Friday, September 28, 2012, at the Indiana Office of Community & Rural Affairs, One North Capitol, Suite 600, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

Information regarding the Combined Annual Performance Evaluation Report can be obtained by writing to: Office of Community and Rural Affairs, Grant Support Division, c/o Beth Dawson, One North Capitol, Suite 600, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2027. Additional information may also be obtained via e-mail at bdawson2@ocra.IN.gov or by phone at 1-800-824-2476.

SECTION I.
Goal Assessment

SECTION I.

Goal Assessment

This section of the CAPER describes the State's Consolidated Plan goals and performance measures established in the 2010-2014 Five-year Strategic Plan and 2011 One-Year Action Plan. It then compares the goals and planned outcomes with actual performance.

It should be noted that the State typically uses a competitive application process when awarding the grants. Therefore, the actual allocations and anticipated accomplishments may not equal the proposed funding goal. For example, the State may have a goal to build 10 units of rental housing and receives no applications proposing this goal. Therefore, the goal would not be met.

Five-Year Strategic Goals, Objectives and Outcomes

The State of Indiana established the following goals, objectives and outcomes to guide its Consolidated Plan for program years 2010 to 2014. In addition to five year projected outcomes, the 2011 outcome/goal is presented. The 2011 outcomes/goals are used in this CAPER to assess the State's progress in meeting its 2011 allocation plan.

Decent Housing:

Goal 1. Expand and preserve affordable housing opportunities throughout the housing continuum.

- **Objective DH-2.1 (Affordability):** Increase the supply and improve the quality of affordable rental housing.

DH-2.1 outcomes/goals:

- Support the **production of new affordable rental units** and the **rehabilitation** of existing affordable rental housing.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 675 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 100 housing units; \$2,989,819 HOME
 - *Targeted to elderly and persons with disabilities:* 33 housing units
 - *2011 actual:* 174 housing units; \$3,420,583 HOME

- **Objective DH-2.2 (Affordability):** Increase and improve affordable **homeownership opportunities** to low and moderate income families.

DH-2.2 outcomes/goals:

- Provide and support homebuyer assistance through **homebuyer education and counseling and downpayment assistance.**
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 2,500 households/housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 700 households/housing units; \$3,986,425 HOME
 - *2011 actual:* 1,019 homebuyers; \$5,692,371 HOME

- Provide funds to organizations for the **development of owner occupied units**.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 125 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 25 housing units; \$996,606 HOME
 - *Targeted to special needs populations:* 5 housing units
- Provide funds to organizations to complete **owner occupied rehabilitation**.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 1,500 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 240 housing units; \$3,597,025 CDBG & \$498,303 HOME
 - *Targeted to elderly and persons with disabilities:* 160 housing units
 - *2011 actual:* 107 housing units; \$2,269,000 CDBG
 - *2011 actual:* 34 housing units; \$485,673 HOME
- **Objective DH-2.3 (Affordability):** Build capacity of affordable housing developers.

DH-2.3 outcomes/goals:

 - Provide funding for **predevelopment loans** to support affordable housing.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 25 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 5 housing units; \$249,152 HOME
 - Provide funding for **organizational capacity**.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 80 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 8 housing units; \$498,303 HOME

Goal 2. Reduce homelessness and increase housing stability for special needs populations.

- **Objective DH-1.1 (Availability/Accessibility):** Improve the range of housing options for homeless and special needs populations.

DH-1.1 outcomes/goals:

 - Support the construction and rehabilitation of **permanent supportive housing** units.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 250 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 50 housing units; \$5,000,000 HOME
 - *Targeted to special needs populations:* 50 housing units
 - Provide **tenant based rental assistance** to populations in need.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 1,000 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 200 housing units; \$1,000,000 HOME
 - *Targeted to special needs populations:* 200 housing units
 - *2011 actual:* 108 families; \$335,643 HOME

■

Objective DH-1.2 (Availability/Accessibility): Support activities to improve the range of housing options for special needs populations and to end chronic homelessness through the **Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)** program by providing operating support to shelters, homelessness prevention activities and case management to persons who are homeless and at risk of homelessness.

DH-1.2 outcomes/goals:

- Operating support—provide shelters with operating support funding.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 83 shelters receiving support annually; \$5,411,374 over next five years *2011 actual:* 55 shelters; \$1,472,470 ESG
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 83 shelters; \$1,360,526 ESG
 - *2011 actual:* 55 shelters; \$1,472,470 ESG
- Homelessness prevention activities—provide contractors with homelessness prevention activity funding.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 550 clients assisted; \$7,547,451 over next five years
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 110 clients assisted; \$72,000 ESG
 - *2011 actual:* 110 clients assisted; \$68,691 ESG
- Essential services—provide shelters with funding for essential services.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 53 shelters; \$2,136,078 over next five years.
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 80 percent of clients will be provided with such services, for an estimated 16,000 clients assisted annually; \$400,000 ESG
 - *2011 actual:* 80 percent of clients will be provided with such services, for an estimated 16,000 clients assisted annually; \$400,845 ESG
- Anticipated match: Shelters match 100 percent of their rewards.
- Anticipated number of counties assisted: 89 counties annually.
- Anticipated number of clients served over next five years: 150,000 (unduplicated count) with 95,000 assisted with temporary emergency housing.
- Other ESG activities:
 - Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)—Require the use of the HMIS for all residential shelter programs serving homeless individuals and families. HMIS is a secure, confidential electronic data collection system used to determine the nature and extent of homelessness and to report to HUD on an annual basis. This requirement will be met by only funding entities that either currently use HMIS system or commit to using it once awarded. The HMIS must be used on a regular and consistent basis. The ESG Coordinator will periodically check with the HMIS coordinator to monitor utilization. Claim reimbursement is contingent upon participation in and completeness of HMIS data records. Domestic violence shelters are excluded from this requirement in accordance with the Violence Against Women’s Act.

- Require participation in annual, statewide homeless Point-in-Time Count and submission of this data to IHCDA.
 - Strongly encourage ESG grantees to attend their local Regional Planning Council Meetings in their region of the Continuum of Care (IN-502) regularly. The ESG RFP inquires about attendance to and involvement in the meetings. . The response is heavily weighed upon evaluation of the RFP.
- **Objective DH-1.3 (Availability/Accessibility):** Improve the range of housing options for special needs populations through the **Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)** program by providing recipients who assist persons with HIV/AIDS with funding for housing information, permanent housing placement and supportive services.

DH-1.3 outcomes/goals:

➤ **Housing information services.**

- *Five-year outcome/goal:* 375 households
- *2011 outcome/goal:* 75 households; \$98,076, HOPWA
- *2011 actual:* 343 households; \$182,995

➤ **Permanent housing placement services.**

- *Five-year outcome/goal:* 500 households
- *2011 outcome/goal:* 100 households; \$49,038, HOPWA
- *2011 actual:* 30 households; \$17,408 HOPWA

- **Objective DH-2.4 (Affordability):** Improve the range of housing options for special needs populations through the **Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)** program by providing recipients who assist persons with HIV/AIDS with funding for short term rental, mortgage, and utility assistance; tenant based rental assistance; facility based housing operations; and short term supportive housing.

DH-2.4 outcomes/goals:

➤ **Tenant based rental assistance.**

- *Five-year outcome/goal:* 1,000 households/units
- *2011 outcome/goal:* 200 households/units; \$441,342, HOPWA
- *2011 actual:* 110 households; \$361,603 HOPWA

➤ **Short-term rent, mortgage and utility assistance.**

- *Five-year outcome/goal:* 1,500 households/units
- *2011 outcome/goal:* 300 households/units; \$196,152, HOPWA
- *2011 actual:* 220 households/units; \$211,311 HOPWA

➤

Facility based housing operations support and short-term supportive housing

- *Five-year outcome/goal:* 35 units (facility based) and 100 units (short-term supportive)
- *2011 outcome/goal-facility based:* 7 units; \$49,038, HOPWA
- *2011 outcome/goal-short term supportive:* 21 units; \$49,038, HOPWA
- *2011 actual:* 16 households; \$33,784 HOPWA

Suitable Living Environment:

Goal 3. Promote livable communities and community revitalization through addressing unmet community development needs.

- **Objective SL-1.1 (Availability/Accessibility):** Improve the quality and/or quantity of neighborhood services for low and moderate income persons by continuing to fund programs (such as OCRA's **Community Focus Fund**), which use CDBG dollars for community development projects ranging from environmental infrastructure improvements to development of community and senior centers.

SL-1.1 outcomes/goals:

- **Emergency services**—Construction of fire and/or Emergency Management Stations (EMS) stations or purchase fire trucks.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 35-45 projects
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 6 projects; \$2,000,000 CDBG
 - *2011 actual:* 3 projects; \$1,500,000 CDBG
- Construction of **public facility projects** (e.g. libraries, community centers, social service facilities, youth centers, etc.). Public facility projects also include health care facilities, public social service organizations that work with special needs populations, and shelter workshop facilities, in addition to modifications to make facilities accessible to persons with disabilities.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 30 public facility projects
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 4 public facility projects (anticipate receiving two applications for projects benefiting special need populations); \$2,000,000 CDBG
 - *2011 actual:* 2 projects; \$1,000,000 CDBG
- Completion of **downtown revitalization projects**.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 10 downtown revitalization projects
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 2 downtown revitalization projects; \$500,000 CDBG.
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 1 downtown revitalization project; \$250,000 CDBG.
- Completion of **historic preservation projects**.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 10 historic preservation projects
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 1 historic preservation project; \$500,000 CDBG
 - *2011 actual:* 1 projects; \$500,000 CDBG

- Completion of **brownfield/clearance projects**.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 10-25 brownfield/clearance projects
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 2 clearance projects; \$600,000 CDBG
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* No projects funded in PY2011.

- **Objective SL-3.1 (Sustainability):** Improve the quality and/or quantity of public improvements for low and moderate income persons by continuing to fund programs (such as OCRA's **Community Focus Fund**), which use CDBG dollars for community development projects ranging from environmental infrastructure improvements to development of community and senior centers.

SL-3.1 outcomes/goals:

 - Construction/rehabilitation of **infrastructure improvements** such as wastewater, water and storm water systems.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 120 infrastructure systems
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 20 systems; \$11,594,357 CDBG
 - *2011 actual:* 11 projects; \$6,200,000 CDBG

- **Objective SL-3.2 (Sustainability):** Improve the quality and/or quantity of public improvements for low and moderate income persons by continuing the use of the planning and community development components that are part programs (such as OCRA's **Planning Fund**) funded by CDBG and HOME dollars.

SL-3.2 outcomes/goals:

 - Provide **planning grants** to units of local governments and CHDOs to conduct market feasibility studies and needs assessments, as well as (for CHDOs only) predevelopment loan funding.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 145 planning grants
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 30 planning grants; \$1,300,000 CDBG
 - *2011 actual:* 31 studies; \$1,400,000 in CDBG dedicated to planning.

- **Objective SL-3.3 (Sustainability):** Improve the quality and/or quantity of public improvements for low and moderate income persons through programs (such as the **Flexible Funding Program**, newly created in 2010) offered by OCRA. OCRA recognizes that communities may be faced with important local concerns that require project support that does not fit within the parameters of its other funding programs. All projects in the Flexible Funding Program will meet one of the National Objectives of the Federal Act and requirements of 24 CFR 570.208 and 24 CFR 570.483 of applicable HUD regulations.

SL-3.3 outcomes/goals:

 - Provide project support for community development projects.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 10-25 community development projects

- *2011 outcome/goal:*
 - ✓ **Flexible Funding Program:** 3 projects; \$1,000,000 CDBG;
 - ✓ **Stellar Communities:** 4 projects; 2,000,000 CDBG
 - ✓ **Main Street Revitalization Program:** 2 projects; \$500,000 CDBG

Economic Opportunities:

Goal 4. Promote activities that enhance local economic development efforts.

- **Objective EO-3.1 (Sustainability):** Improve economic opportunities for low and moderate income persons by coordinating with private industry, businesses and developers to create jobs for low to moderate income populations in rural Indiana.

EO-3.1 outcomes:

- Continue the use of the OCRA's **Community Economic Development Fund (CEDF)**, which funds infrastructure improvements and job training in support of employment opportunities for low to moderate income persons.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* 1,300 jobs
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 200 jobs; \$2,000,000 CDBG
- Fund training and micro-enterprise lending for low to moderate income persons through the **Micro-enterprise Assistance Program**.
 - *Five-year outcome/goal:* Will be made available if there is demand
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* Due to low demand this program has been suspended for 2010 and 2011.

A matrix outlining the Consolidated Plan five-year goals, objectives and outcomes and action items for program year 2012 is provided at the end of this section in Figure I-1.

Administration. The State of Indiana will use CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds to coordinate, monitor and implement the Consolidated Plan objectives according to HUD. During the five-year Consolidated Plan the State will create annual Action Plans and CAPER documents acceptable to HUD while working to affirmatively further fair housing.

Figure I-1 on the following page shows the allocation and accomplishment for Goal 1 during 2010.

Figure I-1.
GOAL 1. Expand Affordable Housing Opportunities, Award Goals and Accomplishments, PY2011

Goal	Funds	Objective Category	Activities	Funding Goals	Assistance Goals	Award Allocated	Actual Units	Actual Beneficiaries
1. Expand and preserve affordable housing opportunities throughout the housing continuum.	CDBG and HOME	DH-2.1 Affordability	New and rehabilitated rental units	\$4.5 million	135 housing units <i>50 units targeted to elderly and persons with disabilities</i>	\$3.4 million	174	174
		DH-2.2 Affordability	Owner occupied rehabilitation	\$5 million	300 housing units <i>200 units targeted to elderly and persons with disabilities</i>	\$2.2 million	107	
	HOME	DH-2.2 Affordability	Homebuyer education, counseling, downpayment assistance (DPA)	\$3 million	500 households	\$758,000 DPA		1,019
		DH-2.2 Affordability	Owner occupied unit development	\$1 million	25 housing units			
		DH-2.3 Affordability	Predevelopment loans Organization capacity funding	\$250,000 \$800,000	5 housing units 16 housing units supported			
Total for Goal 1				\$14,550,000				

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

Figure I-2 on the following page shows the goals and accomplishment for Goal 2 during 2010.

Figure I-2.
GOAL 2. Reduce Homelessness and Increase Housing Stability, Award Goals and Accomplishments, PY2011

Goal	Funds	Objective Category	Activities	Funding Goals	Assistance Goals	Award Allocated	Actual Units
2. Reduce homelessness and increase housing stability for special needs populations.	HOME	DH-1.1 Availability/Accessibility	Construct permanent supportive housing units	\$5 million	50 housing units		
			Tenant Based Rental Assistance	\$1 million	200 housing units		
	ESG	DH-1.2 Availability/Accessibility	Operating support for shelters	\$1,360,256	55 shelters	\$1.5 million in assistance	
			Homeless prevention activities	\$72,000	110 clients	\$83,000	417 people
			Essential services	\$400,000	16,000 clients	\$400,000	12,000 people
	HOPWA	DH-1.3 Availability/Accessibility	Housing information services	\$30,000	75 households	\$183,000	343 households
			Permanent housing placement services	\$70,000	100 households	\$17,408	30 households
			Supportive services	\$65,000	200 households	\$14,346	310 households
	HOPWA	DH-2.4 Affordability	Tenant Based Rental Assistance	\$425,000	200 households	\$361,600	110 households
			Short-term rent, mortgage, utility assistance	\$200,000	300 households	\$211,300	220 households
			Facility-based housing operations support	\$25,000	7 units	\$33,000	
			Short-term supportive housing	\$45,000	21 units		
	Total for Goal 2				\$8,692,256		

Source: Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs and Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

Figure I-3 on the following page shows the allocation and accomplishment for Goal 3 and Goal 4 during 2010.

Figure I-3.
Goal 3, Promote Livable Communities and Goal 4, Local Economic Development Efforts, Awards Goals and Accomplishments, PY2011

Goal	Funds	Objective Category	Activities	Funding Goals	Assistance Goals	Award Allocated	Beneficiaries (people)
3. Promote livable communities through addressing unmet community development needs.	CDBG	SL-1.1 Availability/	Fire/ Emergency Management Stations/Equip	\$2.55 million	5-6 stations	\$1.5 million	163,881
			Public facility projects	\$3 million	6 public facility projects, <i>2-3 benefitting special needs</i>	\$1 million	51,854
			Downtown revitalization projects	\$1 million	2 revitalization projects	1 project	5,000
			Historic preservation projects	\$500,000	2 preservation projects		
			Brownfield/clearance projects	\$500,000	2-5 clearance projects	1 project	380
	SL-3.1 Sustainability	Infrastructure system improvement projects	\$14,638,347	24 systems	\$6 million	258,518	
CDBG & HOME	SL-3.2 Sustainability	Planning grants	\$1 million	29 planning grants	\$1.4 million		
		Foundation grants	As needed	As needed			
CDBG	SL-3.3 Sustainability	Project support for community development	\$2 million	2-5 community projects	\$958,215	36,886	
4. Promote activities that enhance local economic development	CDBG	EO-3.1 Sustainability	Continue Community Economic Development Fund	\$2.5 million	275 jobs	\$3,000,000	
Total for Goals 3 & 4				\$28,138,347		\$3,958,215	516,519

Source: Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs and Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

Performance Measures Summary

This section discusses the State's accomplishments during PY2011 as compared to its five-year goals and annual outcomes.

OCRA Performance Measurement. There were modest differences in how funds were allocated during the program year. For example, the aggregate amount of awards made to construct fire and EMS stations was higher than anticipated, as was the allocation to infrastructure improvements. However, the number of public facilities projects was consistent with expectations considering that projects benefitting special needs populations exceeded expectations.

Reasons for changes from expected funding levels. As noted above, the actual activity funding levels differed somewhat from anticipated funding. This was largely due to the types of requests that were received during funding rounds, not due to changes in allocation plans or annual objectives. Given

Relationship of activity funding to high priority needs. The following figure shows the high and medium priority community development needs identified in the State's 2010-2014 Five-year Consolidated Plan. The high priority needs—solid waste disposal improvements, flood drain improvements, stormwater improvements, water/sewer system improvements, water/sewer/stormwater plans and economic development plans and projects—all received funding in accordance with their prioritization in 2011.

During PY2011, CDBG was also disbursed to a number of projects to assist with the State's goals of improving housing and neighborhood conditions for special needs populations: \$500,000 was disbursed to a senior center; \$440,000 to a center for persons with disabilities; \$310,433 to homeless facilities; and \$786,633 to various neighborhood revitalization projects.

**Figure I-4.
High, Medium and Low Priority Needs, 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan**

Priority Community Development Needs	Need Level	Priority Community Development Needs	Need Level
Public Facility Needs		Planning	
Asbestos Removal	Medium	Community Center Studies	Medium
Emergency Services Facilities	Medium	Day Care Center Studies	Medium
Health Facilities	Medium	Downtown Revitalization	Medium
Neighborhood Facilities	Medium	Emergency Services Facilities	Medium
Non-Residential Historic Preservation	Medium	Health Facility Studies	Low
Parking Facilities	Low	Historic Preservation	Medium
Parks and/or Recreation Facilities	Low	Parks/Recreation	Low
Solid Waste Disposal Improvements	High	Senior Center Studies	Medium
Other	Low	Water/Sewer/Stormwater Plans	High
		Youth Center Studies	Medium
Infrastructure		Youth Programs	
Flood Drain Improvements	High	Child Care Centers	Medium
Sidewalks	Low	Child Care Services	Low
Stormwater Improvements	High	Youth Centers	Medium
Street Improvements	Medium	Youth Services	Low
Water/Sewer Improvements	High	Other Youth Programs	Medium
Other Infrastructure Needs	Medium		
Public Service Needs		Economic Development	
Employment Training	Low	CI Infrastructure Development	High
Handicapped Services	Low	ED Technical Assistance	Medium
Health Services	Low	Micro-Enterprise Assistance	High
Substance Abuse Services	Low	Other Commercial/ Industrial Improvements	High
Transportation Services	Low	Rehab of Publicly or Privately-Owned Commercial/Industrial	High
Other Public Service Needs	Low	Other Economic Development	High
Senior Programs		Anti-Crime Programs	
Senior Centers	Medium	Crime Awareness	Low
Senior Services	Medium	Other Anti-Crime Programs	Low
Other Senior Programs	Medium		

Source: State of Indiana 2010-2014 Five-year Consolidated Plan.

Community Economic Development Grant benefits. Three grants were made from the Community Economic Development Grant program for job creation activities. Details on these grants and job creation progress follow.

Delaware County Community Economic Development Fund Grant. Grant for \$1,000,000 was made to Delaware County on behalf of Progress Rail Manufacturing Company (PRL, Inc.). Project was to assist with establishing a new locomotive manufacturing facility in Muncie, Indiana. The grant funds were used to purchase paint booths where four painters can be working at the same time to paint the machinery. Each painter is on an independent lift and is supplied with fresh air while in the booth while paint fumes are captured and filtered by the booth. The company pledged to create 200 new jobs, at least 102 of which would be made available to or filled by Low-to Moderate Income level persons. The jobs to be created include 100 Welders and 100 Assemblers. The grant agreement was fully executed on May 4, 2011 and completion date is September 30, 2012. Release of Funds was obtained June 21, 2011. The equipment has been purchased and funds will be drawn down in July, 2012. Monitoring is anticipated to be completed by September 30, 2012. Hiring has been aggressive and the job creation goal has been exceeded. To date, 268 jobs have been created with 143 of those being held by low/moderate income persons.

Miami County Community Economic Development Fund Grant. Grant for \$2,000,000 was made to Miami County to assist Dean Baldwin Painting, LP, a business which specializes in aircraft strip and paint services on airline, military and corporate aircraft. This project involves the expansion and renovation of an existing aircraft hangar on a former Air Force Base located in Miami County. This company pledged to create 200 new jobs, at least 103 to be made available to or held by Low to Moderate Income persons. The net new Indiana employees to be hired by job title are as follows: 1 General Manager, 1 Safety and Facilities Manager, 1 Training Manager, 1 Program Manager, 1 Material Manager, 3 Human Resources Administrative Assistants, 1 Chief Inspector, 1 Lead Inspector, 5 Inspectors, 1 Lead Mechanic, 4 Mechanics, 3 Mechanic's Helpers, 1 Paint Manager, 2 Paint Supervisor, 12 Paint Leads, 102 Entry Level Prep 2, 28 Paint 1 and Paint 2, 15 Paint 3 Master Painter, 2 Janitors, 3 Hangar Maintenance, 4 Stockroom, 4 Security Guards, 1 Training Administrative and 2 Water Treatment Techs. The grant agreement for this project was fully executed on November 16, 2010 and the completion date was set as March 31, 2012. The bids came in substantially higher than anticipated so the project was re-bid. This time the bids came in within budget and release of funds was granted May 22, 2012. Because of the Delay the completion dated was modified to March 31, 2013. Construction was started on June 18, 2012 with an anticipated completion date of December 31, 2012. No jobs have been created to date.

Whitley County Community Economic Development Fund Grant. Grant for \$55,000 was made to Whitley County to assist Recycle Processes, Inc. lease equipment for a new facility that will establish a state- of- the- art metal processing plant. The company pledged to create 14 new jobs with at least 8 of those jobs being held by low/moderate income persons. The job titles are to be 5 Office Clerical positions, 3 Crafts workers (machine operators) 4 Craft Workers (mechanics) and 2 Technicians. The original site of the facility fell through and a new site is being sought. The Release of Funds date of June 30, 2012 was not met and no new jobs have been created to date.

CDBG dollars leveraged. During PY2011, CDBG awards leveraged \$14,009,000 in matched dollars. This was more than 100 percent of the \$12 million in grant awards committed during the program year.

ESG Performance Measurement. IHCDA requires that all contracts with shelters be performance based. Based on the type of shelter program funded with ESG (Emergency/Day Shelter or Transitional Housing), each used three objectives specific and relevant to their shelter type. The goals state a minimum required percentage goal to be met by the end of the fiscal year. This year, however, only the six month outcomes were gathered, due to the changes in IDIS. Thus, the following average actual performances reflect the six month outcomes of the shelters and do not necessarily reflect the performance outcomes of the entire fiscal year.

Emergency/Day Shelters performance objectives for 2011-12 program years were the following:

- 50 percent of clients in shelter program will move to transitional or permanent housing upon completion of the program. Average actual performance: 64 percent
- 25 percent of clients in shelter program will increase or maintain their employment income or entitlements upon exit from the program. Average actual performance: 61 percent
- The average length of stay for clients who move to transitional or permanent housing upon completion of the program will be 45 days or less. Average actual performance: 49 days

Transitional Housing performance objectives for 2011-12 program years were the following:

- 65 percent of clients in transitional housing will increase or maintain their employment or entitlements upon exit from program. Average actual performance: 76 percent
- 69 percent of transitional residents will move from transitional to permanent housing. Average actual performance: 75 percent
- The average length of stay for transitional housing clients who move to permanent housing will be 180 days or less. Average actual performance: 224 days
- The Emergency Shelter Grant Program Monitor to date has monitored 22 percent of the shelters funded with ESG in the state for the 2011-12 program year. The Program Monitor utilizes a monitoring tool. Monitoring visits occur on average two per month, with the bulk of them occurring during the spring, summer and fall months.

ESG beneficiaries. During PY2011, ESG funds benefitted the following people and special populations:

- **Number of Persons served:** 12,037 adults and children through shelter, transitional housing and non-residential services (supportive services).
- **Disability.** : 3,231 people with some type of physical or mental disability benefitted from ESG.
- **Veterans.** : 322 veterans were assisted with ESG.
- **Race/ethnicity.** : The majority of residents assisted (68 percent) with ESG were White. 24 percent were African American and 5 percent were Hispanic.

In PY2011, the allocation of ESG led to the following results:

- Approximately 12,000 homeless persons received residential assistance.
- 417 people received homeless prevention rental or utility assistance.
- 25 shelters were funded and expended homeless prevention activity funding.
- An average of 67 percent of all clients housed through the ESG program moved into permanent housing upon discharge. This is a 10 percent increase from the prior year. The Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program likely accounted for some of this increase.

HOPWA performance measurement. During PY2011, HOPWA recipient site visits were completed for two project sponsors and file monitoring were completed for two project sponsors; this is equal to two thirds of the HOPWA project sponsors in the state. In addition, all project sponsors were monitored monthly.

Generally, HOPWA project sponsors met the overall goals and objectives outlined in the Consolidated Plan for the State of Indiana, as shown in the HOPWA CAPER Measuring Performance Outcomes report.

Through the competitive application and utilization of the HOPWA Annual Performance Report, IHCDA documented housing stability outcomes and service utilization for PY2011; these also appear in the Measuring Outcomes report. IHCDA will continue to utilize IDIS to track service delivery, housing stability, and housing placement.

SECTION II.
Housing and Community
Development Activities

SECTION II.

Housing and Community Development Activities

This section of the CAPER reports on how the HUD funds from PY2011 were used to meet the State's housing and community development needs. Homeless and non-homeless special needs activities are discussed in Sections III and IV.

Priority Housing and Community Development Needs

The 2010-2014 Five-year Consolidated Plan contained priorities for both housing and community development needs, in addition to needs by household type. High priority needs for the five-year funding period include the following:

- Solid waste disposal improvements,
- Flood drain improvements,
- Water/sewer improvements,
- Water/sewer/storm water improvement plans,
- Infrastructure development,
- Micro-enterprise assistance,
- Rehabilitation of public or private commercial/industrial property,
- Economic development activities,
- Housing assistance for extremely low income renter households,
- Housing assistance for low income elderly households,
- Housing assistance for low income owners, and
- Housing assistance for special needs populations.

Figures II-1 and II-2 show the prioritization.

**Figure II-1.
High, Medium and Low Priority Needs, 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan**

Priority Community Development Needs	Need Level	Priority Community Development Needs	Need Level
Public Facility Needs		Planning	
Asbestos Removal	Medium	Community Center Studies	Medium
Emergency Services Facilities	Medium	Day Care Center Studies	Medium
Health Facilities	Medium	Downtown Revitalization	Medium
Neighborhood Facilities	Medium	Emergency Services Facilities	Medium
Non-Residential Historic Preservation	Medium	Health Facility Studies	Low
Parking Facilities	Low	Historic Preservation	Medium
Parks and/or Recreation Facilities	Low	Parks/Recreation	Low
Solid Waste Disposal Improvements	High	Senior Center Studies	Medium
Other	Low	Water/Sewer/Stormwater Plans	High
		Youth Center Studies	Medium
Infrastructure		Youth Programs	
Flood Drain Improvements	High	Child Care Centers	Medium
Sidewalks	Low	Child Care Services	Low
Stormwater Improvements	High	Youth Centers	Medium
Street Improvements	Medium	Youth Services	Low
Water/Sewer Improvements	High	Other Youth Programs	Medium
Other Infrastructure Needs	Medium		
Public Service Needs		Economic Development	
Employment Training	Low	CI Infrastructure Development	High
Handicapped Services	Low	ED Technical Assistance	Medium
Health Services	Low	Micro-Enterprise Assistance	High
Substance Abuse Services	Low	Other Commercial/ Industrial Improvements	High
Transportation Services	Low	Rehab of Publicly or Privately-Owned Commercial/Industrial	High
Other Public Service Needs	Low	Other Economic Development	High
Senior Programs		Anti-Crime Programs	
Senior Centers	Medium	Crime Awareness	Low
Senior Services	Medium	Other Anti-Crime Programs	Low
Other Senior Programs	Medium		

Source: State of Indiana 2010-2014 Five-year Consolidated Plan.

**Figure II-2.
Housing Needs,
Priorities for 2010-2014**

Source:
Indiana Housing and Community
Development Authority

Priority Housing Needs	Priority Need Level	
	Percentage	Need Level
Renter:		
Small-related	0-30%	High
	31-50%	Medium
	51-80%	Low
Large-related	0-30%	High
	31-50%	Medium
	51-80%	Medium
Elderly	0-30%	High
	31-50%	High
	51-80%	Medium
All Other	0-30%	High
	31-50%	High
	51-80%	Medium
Owner:		
Owner	0-30%	High
	31-50%	High
	51-80%	Medium
Special Populations	0-80%	High

Use of CDBG and HOME Funds to Meet Identified Needs

CDBG funding (\$29 million in PY2011) is the largest part of the State’s annual HUD funding, making up 62 percent of the \$47 million received from HUD in PY2011. HOME funds (\$15 million) are the second largest source of housing and community development funding at about 37 percent of the total. Clearly, these funding sources play a very important role in meeting the State’s priority needs.

Not all of the funds are expended in one year. Large projects, like public infrastructure improvements, can take more than one year to complete. Hence, it is common for CDBG dollars to be spent over the course of two or more years.

Figure II-3 shows the flow of funds for the past six program years. It also shows the program income received through activities that generate income (e.g., loans that are paid back). As the figure shows, program income can also be an important source for meeting needs.

**Figure II-3.
CDBG and HOME Amounts Allocated,
Committed and Drawn, PY2005 through PY2011**

Fund Type	Grant Year	Amount of Allocation	Suballocated Amount	Committed to Activities	Net Drawn Amount	Available to Commit to Activities	Available to Draw
CDBG:		To Housing					
Entitlement	2005	\$34,933,351	\$5,000,000	\$29,933,351	\$29,933,351	\$0	\$0
	2006	\$31,543,515	\$4,510,720	\$27,032,795	\$27,032,795	\$0	\$0
	2007	\$31,790,913	\$4,291,773	\$27,499,140	\$27,499,140	\$0	\$0
	2008	\$30,866,525	\$4,166,981	\$26,699,544	\$25,472,293	\$0	\$1,227,251
	2009	\$31,331,173	\$4,284,694	\$13,068,994	\$0	\$13,977,485	\$27,046,479
	2010	\$34,059,120	\$4,870,985	\$24,445,771	\$0	\$4,742,364	\$477,484
	2011	\$28,547,816	\$2,253,445	\$22,556,588	\$6,262,923	\$3,737,783	\$20,031,448
Program Income	2005	\$441,641	\$0	\$441,641	\$441,641	\$0	\$0
	2006	\$50,267	\$0	\$50,267	\$50,267	\$0	\$0
	2007	\$2,102,686	\$0	\$2,165,046	\$2,165,046	\$0	(\$62,360)
	2008	\$174,226	\$0	\$133,953	\$129,327	\$25,273	\$44,899
	2009	\$1,896,730	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,896,730
	2010	\$331,820	\$0	\$331,820	\$331,820	\$0	\$0
	2011	\$83,332	\$0	\$83,332	\$0	\$0	\$83,332
HOME:							
Entitlement	2005	\$16,954,640	\$16,954,640	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2006	\$15,818,298	\$15,818,298	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2007	\$15,835,989	\$15,835,989	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2008	\$15,140,034	\$15,140,034	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2009	\$16,710,924	\$13,013,277	\$0	\$0	\$3,697,647	\$3,697,647
	2010	\$16,699,875	\$7,509,963	\$0	(\$2,836)	\$9,189,913	\$9,192,749
	2011	\$14,479,773	N/A	\$8,891,443	\$4,906,174	\$5,588,330	\$9,573,599
Program Income	2007	\$125,787	\$0	\$125,787	\$125,787	\$0	\$0
	2008	\$249,381	\$0	\$249,381	\$249,381	\$0	\$0
	2009	\$656,077	\$0	\$656,077	\$652,688	\$0	\$3,389
	2010	\$271,010	\$0	\$271,010	\$271,010	\$0	\$0
	2011	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Totals	2005	\$52,329,632	\$21,954,640	\$30,374,992	\$30,374,992	\$0	\$0
	2006	\$47,412,080	\$20,329,018	\$27,083,062	\$27,083,062	\$0	\$0
	2007	\$49,855,376	\$20,127,762	\$29,789,974	\$29,789,974	(\$62,360)	(\$62,360)
	2008	\$46,430,166	\$19,307,015	\$27,082,879	\$25,851,001	\$40,273	\$1,272,150
	2009	\$50,594,904	\$17,297,971	\$13,725,071	\$652,688	\$19,571,862	\$32,644,245
	2010	\$51,361,825	\$12,380,948	\$25,048,601	\$599,994	\$13,932,277	\$38,380,884
	2011	\$43,110,921	\$2,253,445	\$31,531,363	\$11,169,097	\$9,326,113	\$29,688,379

Source: Office of Community and Rural Affairs and Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

CDBG. OCRA administers CDBG for the State and allocates a portion of CDBG to IHCDA for housing activities. In 2011, OCRA gave approximately \$2.3 million in CDBG funding to IHCDA for housing rehabilitation activities.

The remainder of CDBG funding is allocated to a variety of housing and community development activities as shown in Figure II-4. This figure matches the IDIS Report C04PR23.

**Figure II-4
Allocation and Amount
Disbursed of CDBG
Program Funds, PY2011**

Source:
Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

	Disbursed in 2011
Acquisition	
<i>Acquisition</i>	\$67,500
<i>Disposition</i>	\$46,500
<i>Clearance and Demolition</i>	\$820,707
Economic Development	
<i>Rehabilitation (public or private)</i>	\$455,331
Housing	
<i>Single Unit Residential Rehabilitation</i>	\$2,269,123
Public Facilities and Improvements	
<i>General Public Facilities</i>	\$1,306,368
<i>Senior Centers</i>	\$499,771
<i>Handicapped Centers</i>	\$440,000
<i>Homeless Facilities</i>	\$310,434
<i>Neighborhood Facilities</i>	\$786,633
<i>Solid Waste Disposal</i>	\$1,288,901
<i>Flood Drainage Improvements</i>	\$4,143,481
<i>Water/Sewer Improvements</i>	\$8,962,320
<i>Street Improvements</i>	\$365,427
<i>Sidewalks</i>	\$313,270
<i>Tree Planting</i>	\$171,583
<i>Fire Station/Equipment</i>	\$3,706,379
<i>Non-Residential Historic Preservation</i>	\$496,259
Planning/Feasibility Studies	\$1,659,826
Technical Assistance to Grantees	\$182,071
CDBG Administration	\$958,847
Total CDBG	\$29,250,731

Housing Activities

This section describes more specifically how the State allocated its resources to affordable housing activities to assist low income renters and owners.

Foster and maintain affordable housing. The overall goal of all of the projects and activities IHCDA funds with HOME and CDBG awards is to foster and maintain affordable housing. These projects and activities are discussed throughout this CAPER.

Eliminate barriers to affordable housing. For low income households, there can be numerous barriers to finding affordable housing. Barriers to homeownership include a lack of resources for a down payment, earnings that are too low to support a conventional mortgage payment and lack of education about homeownership, particularly financing. Barriers to finding safe and decent affordable rental housing include low earnings, need for housing near transit, need for larger units and need for other special accommodations.

In PY2011, IHCDA allocated HOME and CDBG funding to activities and projects that eliminated barriers to affordable housing by:

- Increasing the supply of affordable multi and single family housing through new construction;
- Lowering the cost of rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing to maintain its affordability;
- Educating and counseling potential homeowners about the requirements of homeownership; and
- Assisting providers and developers of affordable housing through awards for needs assessments and feasibility studies.

These projects and activities are more specifically described below.

Homeownership programs. IHCDA's homeownership programs offer below market interest rate mortgages and down payment assistance. These programs are primarily administered through a network of participating lenders in the Homeownership Lending Programs, covering all 92 counties in the State. There are several programs under the homeownership umbrella:

- *First Home*—Provides below market interest rate mortgages to first time low- and moderate-income homebuyers. This program may be used in conjunction with FHA/VA, Fannie Mae, or USDA Rural Development financing.
- *First Home/PLUS*—Offers the First Home special mortgage rate, as well as 6 percent down payment assistance. Capped at \$7,500 with zero interest, this is a program for Hoosiers who do not refinance once they have moved into their new home, and who are also committed to staying in their new home. The Down Payment Assistance funds must be repaid in full once the borrower sells or refinances the home.
- *Mortgage Credit Certificates*—Offers first-time homebuyers a Federal tax credit. The tax credit ranges between 20 and 35 percent of the interest paid on a mortgage each year, depending on the mortgage loan amount. The maximum credit per year is \$2,000.

- *Homeownership Program for Veterans*—IHCDCA is waiving the homeownership program’s first-time time homebuyer requirement just for veterans. This will allow veterans to secure a fixed-rate mortgage that is below the market interest rate on any home they purchase (not only their first home). However, Veterans who are first-time homebuyers may also qualify for down payment assistance through this program. IHCDCA works with qualified lenders on its homeownership programs.
- *Homebuyer Education*—The online First Time Homebuyer Education Course, IHCDCA University, is a free educational course designed to inform Indiana consumers about the basics of purchasing a home so that they are prepared for situations that may arise during the process. The course walks potential buyers through several lessons, including getting ready to buy a home, managing money, understanding credit, and selecting the right mortgage product. Completion of the course satisfies the Homebuyer Education requirement that is necessary for all homebuyers through the Agency’s Single Family purchasing programs.
- *TBRA for ex-offenders*—As part of IHCDCA’s commitment to end chronic homelessness, it identified the Re-entry Problem Solving Court in Lafayette to assist ex-offenders in re-entering society and contributing to their home community.

The Re-entry Problem Solving Court in Tippecanoe County Superior Court takes a comprehensive and evidence based approach to return persons from Department of Correction facilities to Tippecanoe County, their home community. Once transported to the County’s Community Corrections facility, potential participants are assessed with actuarial prediction instruments and clinical interviews to determine the services needed to prevent crime and drug or alcohol relapse.

During a transition week, participants live at the Community Corrections (Work Release) and work to obtain a driver’s license or photo identification, and register to vote. They go through relevant intake processes at Wabash Valley Health, the Community Health Center, the Lafayette Adult Resources Academy, and Family Services, Inc. to determine mental and physical health needs and appropriate drug counseling, educational and employment services, as well as family and financial needs.

Rental assistance is a new tool for the highly successful Re-entry Problem Solving Court. Eligible participants pay 30 percent of their gross monthly wages for rent, for a one year period of time. As the participant’s income increases, rental payments will remain steady. Income increases are managed jointly by the Court and the participant to pay child support, bad debt, and other bills. As a consequence, the Re-entry Problem Solving Court participant can restore his or her credit and become self-sufficient.

Awards for Tenant-Based Rental Assistance. Other than HOPWA and the TBRA described above, TBRA was not used in PY2011.

Indiana Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative. Beginning in 2007, IHCDA and the Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA) spearheaded the Indiana Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative (IPSHI). IPSHI is a collaborative six-year initiative designed to create affordable housing and support services for people affected by mental illness or chemical dependency who are facing long-term homelessness. IPSHI will draw on national best practices while developing supportive housing with local partners to create an emerging Indiana model for permanent supportive housing.

The initiative aims to create at least 1,100 supportive housing units within Indiana by 2014. Demonstration period followed by a larger initiative to build on best practices developed with the Demonstration Project. The IPSHI will be the core component of the growing momentum of the Indiana's Interagency Council on the Homeless and Transformation Work Group to address the needs of Hoosiers facing long-term homelessness. The IPSHI will be a vehicle for state agencies, private foundations and other constituencies to invest in housing and services for families and individuals experiencing long-term homelessness.

Housing Choice Vouchers. IHCDA administers the Housing Choice Voucher Section 8 Program in the established jurisdictions which covers the geographical areas of the state that are not covered by a municipal or a county housing agency, which includes part or all of 80 counties in Indiana. IHCDA administered vouchers help approximately 4,000 families' pay their rent each month.

IHCDA has set forth the following five-year goals:

- Expand and improve housing opportunities
- Pursue additional voucher funding
- Further develop voucher management

IHCDA intends to expand and improve housing opportunities by applying for additional rental vouchers and leveraging private and public funds to create additional housing opportunities. The concentration will be a gamut of family circumstances from homelessness to homeownership and from extremely low to moderate income families.

IHCDA will pursue opportunities for Family Unification Program (FUP) with an emphasis in children aging out of foster care, Mainstream focusing on persons with disabilities, Homeownership, financial literacy, Family Self Sufficiency, Project base with an emphasis on permanent supportive housing with an emphasis on permanent supportive housing and the families experiencing long-term homelessness, as well as other opportunities. All opportunities will be sought with affirmative measures to ensure fair housing for all and accessible housing for persons with disabilities.

IHCDA will further develop voucher management by sustaining the designation of high performer while determinedly improving the administration and compliance in admissions, occupancy, unit inspections, informal reviews/hearings, abatements and terminations.

IHCDA expects to accomplish the aforementioned goals over the next five years.

Foreclosure Prevention. In 2006, IHCDA hosted a series of meetings with government agencies and industry leaders to discuss the issues surrounding foreclosure and potential solutions for reducing foreclosures in Indiana. Out of these meetings came a group known as the Indiana Foreclosure Prevention Network, or IFPN.

The IFPN website (www.877gethope.org) provides information on the options available to assist persons experiencing foreclosure. A certified foreclosure specialist is also available by calling (877) GET-HOPE any day of the week between 8:00am and 8:00pm.

Since its inception, over 90,000 troubled borrowers have been assisted through IFPN efforts. By conservative estimates, these efforts in 2009 saved \$277,682,900 in costs for the homeowner, financial institutions, local government and neighboring homeowners. At a time when the rest of America saw a rise in foreclosure filings, Indiana saw a reduction of nearly 5,000 fewer foreclosure filings in 2009 than the previous year.

Individual Development Accounts. IHCDA funds the IDA program through which participants are eligible to earn match on up to \$1,600 in savings, over a 2-4 year period, at a 3:1 match ratio for Indiana residents saving for homeownership (among other eligible activities). The program, which was started in 1997, will continue serving low income eligible households in the State.

Predevelopment activities. IHCDA understands that the most successful housing programs are those that grow out of careful planning and assessment of the needs of a particular community. For this reason, IHCDA provides funds to finance planning activities related to the development of affordable housing.

Back Home Initiative. IHCDA's strategic plan identifies seniors as an emerging market. By 2025, one in five Hoosiers will be over the age of 65. Recent surveys from AARP found that over 90 percent of seniors would prefer to age in place. In anticipation of this demand, IHCDA has begun targeting resources to seniors so they may live in a community of their choice.

Providing seniors with opportunities to live in communities of their choice also intersects with nursing home care. It is estimated that 5,000 to 6,000 nursing home residents could thrive in a more independent community setting if support services were available and housing options were affordable and accessible. During the first half of 2007, IHCDA and the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration's Division of Aging collaborated to design a program that would provide rental assistance to seniors, on Medicaid, who desire to make this transition.

The Division of Aging committed to contribute \$1 million to the Affordable Housing and Community Development Fund to make rental units in IHCDA's portfolio affordable and accessible for 125-150 nursing home residents.

Originally, the program was designed to provide property owners with a lump sum payment based on unit size in exchange for reducing its allowable AMI rent by 50 percent for a minimum of five years. After soliciting feedback from its partners, IHCDA restructured the rental assistance so that residents would not pay more than 30 percent of their income at the 30 percent AMI rent level for a minimum of three years.

IHCDA will also reimburse property owners for the cost of making the unit accessible based on the needs of the resident as determined by a local Area Agency on Aging case manager. Upon assessment of the individual and an inspection of the desired unit, a list of specific modifications required to make the unit accessible will be submitted to IHCDA and to the property owner. IHCDA will then draft an agreement with the property owner and issue funds for accessibility improvements and the lump-sum rental payment.

This program is currently underutilized. At this time IHCDA is working with the Division on Aging and other partners to discuss how to better serve this important population.

Weatherization Pilots. IHCDA partnered with Citizens Gas and Indianapolis Power & Light to implement a pilot weatherization program that utilizes consumption data to target eligible homes for weatherization in the Indianapolis area. The program began in August of 2009 when IHCDA commissioned a research project to study energy consumption data and to gather the baseline information needed for this type of pilot program. In addition to consumption data, this study included the use of demographic data including age, number of person per household, income and poverty percentage as well as Assessor data including square footage per floor, number of stories and number of fire place openings to target households with the highest use of energy. The final output of the program exceeded the goal of weatherizing 200 owner occupied homes that would benefit most by reducing energy consumption. It yielded energy savings of between 30 to 60 percent for those homes weatherized. IHCDA, Citizens, and IPL are discussing how the program may be taken to scale.

IHCDA has also partnered with Vectren Energy to implement a pilot weatherization program that targets high-consumption Vectren clients who earn between 150-200 percent of the federal poverty level. This partnership was launched in April 2009 with an expected end date of November 30, 2010. This partnership was originally launched with the intent to target the “working poor” those that are often overlooked by federal subsidy. The final output of the program will be the weatherization of more than 100 low-income homes which have a demonstrated need for energy efficiency improvements.

Real Estate Capital Access Program. A community’s Main Street is its front door, the first (and sometimes only) place that many visitors will ever see. During the fall of 2006, IHCDA, OCRA, and the Office of Tourism Development discussed how the three agencies could leverage their respective expertise in community development to encourage investment in Indiana’s Main Streets and commercial nodes.

Indiana’s communities do not lack for lenders willing to provide capital nor developers willing to revitalize real estate. However, lenders are looking for ways to mitigate risk associated with complex ventures, and developers are looking for a stronger equity position. Consequently, the Real Estate Capital Access Program was designed to provide communities with access to predevelopment funds for project soft costs, gap financing for renovation and new construction, and matching grants for facade and beautification improvements.

From 2007 through 2009, IHCDA has invested \$1.6 million from its Affordable Housing and Community Development Fund to revitalize downtown main streets and commercial corridors in 8 rural communities. These communities have utilized RECAP for façade and beautification improvements, predevelopment loans, and gap financing to leverage private and other public funds.

Address worst case needs. The term “worst case needs” is used to characterize those households whose housing needs are very serious. These households are usually renters, have extremely to very low incomes (i.e., less than 30 and 50 percent of the area median income, respectively), pay more than half of their monthly income in rent and utilities, live in substandard housing and may reside in markets that make moving to better conditions prohibitive. Individuals with worst case needs are also likely to be members of special needs populations. These households are often the target of housing programs and require a higher investment of resources because of their needs.

The following activities assisted such households during the 2011 program year.

Housing First is an innovative approach to engage and rapidly house individuals who are homeless into an appropriate housing situation, from quality affordable rentals to permanent supportive housing with intensive and flexible services to stabilize and support housing tenure. Ten percent of available annual Rental Housing Tax Credits will be set aside for Housing First Developments that further the creation of community-based housing that targets the extremely low income (less than 30 percent AMI) with intensive service programs.

Special needs preferences. Due to lower incomes and the need for supportive services, special needs groups are more likely than the general population to encounter difficulty paying for adequate housing and often require enhanced community services. Special needs populations are also more likely than the general population to be underserved by the private market because their housing can be more costly to develop (e.g., units may need to be wheelchair accessible, residents may require on-site services) and information about the housing demand of special needs populations and their housing preferences is often not readily available. As such, housing subsidies are very important to ensure affordable, quality housing for special needs populations.

HOME and CDBG projects are underwritten based upon the strategic priorities of IHCD, the strength of the development team, and the soundness of the financial projections. Aging in place is one of IHCD’s strategic objectives and the catalyst for investing in special need populations.

Developments that agree to target and give housing preferences to 10 percent or more of the units for any combination of the following list of special needs populations:

- Persons with physical or developmental disabilities;
- Persons with mental impairment;
- Persons with addictions;
- Victims of domestic violence and abused children;
- Seniors; and
- Single-parent households.

IHCD individualized the scores of the sections that include rental units (transitional, permanent supportive and permanent rental); homeowner repair and improvement units; emergency shelter, youth shelter and migrant/seasonal farm worker units.

OCRA encourages the use of CDBG funds for infrastructure assistance in affordable housing developments targeting special needs populations.

Applicable to both HOME and CDBG. IHCDCA also gives preference to projects with accessibility features and design of the structure(s) in the development that go above and beyond the requirements of the Fair Housing Act of 1968 as Amended and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 at no additional cost to the tenant.

Finally, IHCDCA and OCRA have and will continue to provide technical assistance to nonprofit organizations to develop housing and support services for special needs groups, by using internal staff resources and funding external technical assistance programs. Reduce lead-based paint hazards. Exposure to lead-based paint represents one of the most significant environmental threats from a housing perspective. It is estimated that about 67 percent of Indiana's housing stock, or 1.8 million housing units, were constructed before 1978 and as such may have some lead-based paint. About 567,000 units, or 21 percent of the housing stock, were built before 1940 and, as such, are likely to have lead-based paint as well.

Lead-based paint activities. During 2011, the State undertook a number of activities to educate recipients about the risks associated with lead-based paint.

Most recently, IHCDCA committed \$107,000 in CDBG funds to the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH) as match for its Lead-based Paint Hazard Control grant application to HUD. Indiana currently has lead-based paint hazard control grants in four high risk counties and one high risk jurisdiction across the state. This grant application proposes that lead-based paint hazard control funds will be provided for the balance of the state ensuring that all Hoosier children would have the opportunity to live in lead-safe housing.

The CDBG award to ISDH will be used to complete the following:

- 108 Hoosier homes will be made lead-safe and receive healthy homes supplies;
- 77 Hoosier homes will receive both lead hazard control and weatherization services;
- 125 lead professionals will be trained in lead-safe work practices;
- 25 Section 3 workers will be trained, certified and considered for employment;
- ISDH and partners will participate in 54 outreach events; and
- 3,000 children will receive blood lead tests.

IHCDCA sits on the Elimination Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) formed by the ISDH. The committee was formed October 2003 and is charged with eliminating lead poisoning in children by 2010, as required by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). A plan to eliminate lead poisoning in children was submitted and approved by the CDC. The plan established measurable goals to be achieved by July 1, 2011. With respect to housing, the goals to be achieved include:

- Dwellings and child-occupied facilities that have poisoned a child will not poison another child. Ninety-five percent of these facilities will be made lead-safe;
- Ninety percent of rental units built before 1940 will be identified and tested for lead;

- Eighty percent of rental units built before 1940 and identified to have lead hazards will be made lead-safe;
- Sixty percent of housing units built before 1960 will be identified and tested for lead; and
- Eighty percent of housing units built before 1960 and identified with lead hazards will be made lead-safe.

Indiana’s Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) is a national leader in the area of assessing lead-based paint risks in client homes. In 2007, 2008, and 2009, IHCDCA purchased 27 X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) units for local Community Action Agencies to be able to test for lead based paint in homes either weatherized or repaired. IHCDCA used LIHEAP funding to purchase this equipment as the total for replacement was in excess of \$375,000. IHCDCA’s weatherization and home repair programs maintain strict adherence to the new Lead Renovation, Repair, and Painting Rule published by the EPA.

Each year, IHCDCA sponsors the Improving Kids Environment’s Lead Safe and Healthy Homes Conference. Over 200 people attend a variety of workshops on topics covering risk assessments, model codes, lead safety and protection, lead certification, weatherization protocol, hazardous substance updates, and outreach in minority communities.

Facilitate PHA participation. The State has continued to communicate to Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) throughout the State about the opportunities to become involved in the Consolidated Planning process. PHAs received notices of all opportunities for public participation in the Consolidated Planning process. PHAs have assisted the State with determining housing and community development needs by distributing citizen surveys to clients and participating in regional forums.

Program beneficiaries. This section provides demographic information on program beneficiaries as available.

Race/ethnicity. For each program year, IHCDCA compares the race, ethnicity and special needs of the proposed beneficiaries listed on award applications with those of actual persons served.

**Figure II-5.
CDBG
(Housing)
and HOME
Household
Beneficiaries,
PY2011**

Source:
Indiana Housing and
Community
Development
Authority.

Race	CDBG (Housing)		HOME		Total Housing	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
African-American	0	0.0%	266	19.9%	266	18.0%
Asian/Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	127	9.5%	127	8.6%
Native American	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	141	100.0%	910	68.2%	1,051	71.2%
Multi-Racial	0	0.0%	32	2.4%	32	2.2%
Total Households	141	100%	1,335	100%	1,476	100%

As shown in the above Figure, the majority of these persons were White, which is consistent with the racial makeup of nonentitlement areas in the State. Thirty-one, or 2 percent of the above beneficiaries reported their ethnicity as Hispanic. The percentage of African Americans assisted with HOME exceeded the statewide percentage for nonentitlement areas.

The following Figure provides additional detail on households assisted by race and ethnicity by HOME program. As the figure shows, African American and White households were the largest beneficiaries of HOME dollars in PY2011.

**Figure II-6.
HOME Unit Completion by Racial/Ethnic Category, PY2011**

	Rentals		TBRA		First Time Homebuyer		Homeowner Rehabilitation	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Asian	0	0%	0	0%	124	12%	0	0%
Black/African American	37	21%	53	49%	176	17%	0	0%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%
White	135	78%	52	48%	680	67%	34	100%
Other/Multiracial	1	1%	0	0%	10	1%	0	0%
Hispanic	1	1%	3	3%	27	3%	0	0%
Total	174	100%	108	100%	1,019	100%	34	100%

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

Figure II-7 shows the CDBG non-housing beneficiaries (persons, not households) by race and ethnicity. The racial and ethnic categories with the highest numbers and percentages of beneficiaries include White and Hispanic.

**Figure II-7.
CDBG (Non-Housing) Person Beneficiaries, PY2011**

Source:
Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

	Beneficiaries (persons)	
	Number	Percent
Race		
African-American	247	3.0%
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	37	0.4%
Native American	34	0.4%
White	7,586	91.9%
Multi-Racial	351	4.3%
Other	0	0.0%
	8,255	
Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	2,366	28.7%
Total Persons	8,255	100%

Figure II-8 shows beneficiaries by income level. As the Figure shows, almost 100 percent of CDBG and HOME funds were used to benefit low and moderate income residents.

**Figure II-8.
CDBG and HOME Beneficiaries
by Income Level, PY2011**

	Beneficiaries	Percent of Total
CDBG, Non-Housing		
Low /Moderate Income	7,287	97%
Total Persons	7,477	
CDBG, Housing		
Low /Moderate Income	18	100%
Total Households	18	
HOME		
Low /Moderate Income	1,335	100%
Total Households	1,335	

Community Development Activities

The State’s CDBG funds are used to support a variety of housing and community development activities. The programs are described in more detail below.

Community Focus Fund. Community Focus Fund (CFF) awards are allocated to assist Indiana communities with local infrastructure improvements; public facilities development; commercial rehabilitation and downtown revitalization projects; and related community development projects. Award applications are given points for the project’s ability to serve low and moderate income persons and mitigate community distress, as well as the financial impact and local need for the project.

During PY2011, the CFF funded the following improvements in Indiana’s small cities and rural areas, as shown in the Figure II-9.

**Figure II-9.
Community Focus Fund Awards, Location and Beneficiaries, PY2011**

Project Category	Grantee	County	Activity	Proposed Beneficiaries	LMI Beneficiaries	Award Amount
Health and Safety				9,296	4,748	\$ 1,501,995
	Town of Shadeland	Tippecanoe	Clearance	1,682	474	\$ 425,000
	Town of Advance	Boone	Emergency Services	3,689	2,071	\$ 150,000
	Town of Clarks Hill	Tippecanoe	Emergency Services	1,977	1,055	\$ 490,000
	Town of Walkerton	Posey	Emergency Services	1,948	1,148	\$ 436,995
Public Infrastructure				12,647	7,893	\$ 6,277,176
	Town of Atlanta	Hamilton	Infrastructure	775	404	\$ 600,000
	City of Auburn	Dekalb	Infrastructure	534	280	\$ 600,000
	Town of Cloverdale	Putnam	Infrastructure	796	450	\$ 600,000
	Crawford County	Crawford	Infrastructure	1,712	1,227	\$ 600,000
	Greene County	Greene	Infrastructure	118	66	\$ 498,676
	Howard County	Howard	Infrastructure	295	207	\$ 600,000
	City of Lawrence	Marion	Infrastructure	5,058	3,362	\$ 600,000
	Town of Newburgh	Warrick	Infrastructure	324	210	\$ 532,500
	Town of Russellville	Putnam	Infrastructure	349	213	\$ 600,000
	Wabash County	Wabash	Infrastructure	413	269	\$ 500,000
	Town of Orleans	Orange	Infrastructure	2,273	1,205	\$ 546,000
Quality of Life				1,090	559	\$ 1,229,620
	Whitley County	Whitley	Economic Development	14	8	\$ 55,000
	Town of Wolcot	White	Downtown Revitalization	813	345	\$ 250,000
	City of Knox	Starke	Public Facilities	100	100	\$ 424,620
	Randolph County	Randolph	Public Facilities	163	106	\$ 500,000

Source: Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

Planning awards. In 2011, \$1.4 million of CDBG dollars were awarded to complete 31 planning awards and feasibility studies. Planning awards are available to divisions of local government to carry out project-specific planning activities that assist the community in meeting its community development needs. The types of planning awards to which funding was allocated ranged from water and stormwater infrastructure improvement assessments to plans for tourism development to downtown revitalization studies, as shown in Figure II-10.

**Figure II-10.
Planning Awards by Location, PY2011**

Type of Plan	Grantee	County	Project Description	Proposed Beneficiaries	LMI Beneficiaries	Award Amount	
Comprehensive Master Plan	Town of Hope	Bartholomew	Comprehensive Study	2,145	1,233	\$ 47,367	
	Town of Dublin	Wayne	Comprehensive Study	790	462	\$ 50,000	
	City of Angola	Steuben	Comprehensive Study	5,113	3,072	\$ 50,000	
	Tell City	Perry	Comprehensive Study	7,170	4,073	\$ 49,500	
	Town of Glenwood	Rush	Comprehensive Study	186	106	\$ 20,700	
Community Centers	Town of Cromwell	Noble	Community Center Study	520	383	\$ 49,500	
Downtown Revitalization	Town of Southport	Marion	Downtown Façade	1,852	626	\$ 50,000	
	Town of Converse	Miami	Downtown Façade Renovation	1,137	504	\$ 50,000	
	Town of Morocco	Newton	Downtown Revitalization Plan	413	233	\$ 48,600	
	Town of Remington	Jasper	Downtown Revitalization Plan	1,455	791	\$ 48,600	
	Town of Clarksville	Clark	Downtown Revitalization Plan	21,400	9,948	\$ 50,000	
	Town of Gas City	Grant	Downtown Revitalization Plan	5,656	3,219	\$ 50,000	
	Town of Whitestown	Boone	Downtown Revitalization Plan	471	200	\$ 50,000	
	Town of Avilla	Noble	Downtown Revitalization Plan	2,049	713	\$ 42,813	
	Hartford City	Blackford	Façade Renovation Study	6,889	3,250	\$ 50,000	
	Town of North Vernon	Jennings	Façade Study	6,515	2,867	\$ 122,000	
	Public Facilities	Carroll County	Carroll	EMS Study	17,898	9,354	\$ 48,600
Town of Waterloo		Dekalb	Library Improvement Study	3,229	1,920	\$ 29,000	
Town of Ligonier		Noble	Library Study	6,277	4,599	\$ 24,200	
Economic Development	Town of Nashville	Brown	Tourism Development Study	732	428	\$ 48,000	
Water, Storm and Wastewater	Town of Elberfield	Warrick	Master Utility Study	996	542	\$ 50,000	
	Town of Kempton	Tipton	Master Utility Study	380	194	\$ 50,000	
	Town of Versailles	Ripley	Sewer/Drainage Study	1,487	877	\$ 40,000	
	Town of Springport	Henry	Sewer/Storm Water Study	174	91	\$ 40,000	
	Huntertown	Allen	Sewer/Storm Water Study	738	417	\$ 40,000	
	Town of Leavenworth	Crawford	Storm Water Study	269	146	\$ 30,000	
	Town of Richland	Spencer	Storm Water Study	417	245	\$ 30,000	
	Town of Stinesville	Monroe	Storm Water Study	206	127	\$ 30,000	
	Bartholomew County	Bartholomew	Waste Water Study	184	100	\$ 29,160	
	Whitley County	Whitley	Water/Sewer Study	115	69	\$ 44,000	
	Town of Cayuga	Vermillion	Water/Waste Water Study	980	553	\$ 38,160	
	Total				97,843	51,342	\$ 1,400,200

Source: Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

**Figure II-11.
Awards Drawn During PY2011**

Grantee	PY2011 Draw Amount
Advance	\$ 109,170
Alexandria	\$ 84,045
Bainbridge	\$ 505,252
Converse	\$ 30,000
Elberfeld	\$ 30,000
Fortville	\$ 61,280
Fulton	\$ 43,815
Geneva	\$ 203,788
Hartford City	\$ 30,000
Hope	\$ 27,907
Jackson County	\$ 207,648
Jasper	\$ 432,530
Ligonier	\$ 14,520
Lindon	\$ 166,496
Marion	\$ 29,169
Mount Vernon	\$ 277,077
Owen County	\$ 191,367
Patoka	\$ 358,901
Poseyville	\$ 150,000
Remington	\$ 29,160
Richland	\$ 18,000
Rockville	\$ 490,393
South Whitley	\$ 87,147
Southport	\$ 50,000
Springport	\$ 23,760
Tipton	\$ 179,934
Walkerton	\$ 161,740
Waterloo	\$ 29,000
Whitley County	\$ 23,760
Total	\$ 4,045,860

Source:
Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs.

Figure II-11 details the awards that were drawn down during PY2011.

Economic development activities. CDBG funds were used to support a number of economic development activities during PY2011, including rehabilitation of commercial facilities, direct financial assistance for economic development activities and micro-enterprise assistance.

Community Economic Development Fund. The Community Economic Development Fund (CEDF) provides funding for economic development activities and is administered by OCRA. The goal and emphasis of such funding is the creation of employment opportunities for low and moderate income persons. To date, the OCRA has used the CEDF funding to provide infrastructure improvements to new and expanding industries that are creating new employment opportunities for low and moderate income persons statewide. Eligible activities include:

- Construction of infrastructure (public and private) in support of economic development projects; and
- Loans or awards for the purchase of manufacturing equipment, real property or structures, rehabilitation of facilities, purchase and installation of pollution control equipment, mitigation of environmental problems via capital asset purchases.

Projects are evaluated on the following criteria:

- Importance of the project to Indiana's economic development goals;
- Number and quality of new jobs to be created;
- Economic needs of the affected community;
- Economic feasibility of the project and the financial need of the affected firm, and the availability of private resources; and
- The level of private sector investment in the project.

Micro-Enterprise Assistance Program (MAP). The goal of MAP is to encourage rural communities to focus on long-term community development. Eligible projects will be designed to assist micro-enterprise businesses owned by low to-moderate income persons and/or micro-enterprise businesses that will create jobs for low to moderate income persons. This program is currently suspended due to lack of demand.

Neighborhood revitalization. In addition to the neighborhood and downtown revitalization activities (both actual revitalization projects and planning projects), the State utilizes its Neighborhood Assistance Program (NAP) income tax-credit resources to fund various neighborhood revitalization and housing activities. This is a statewide program that was administered by IDOC (now OCRA) from 1984 to 2004; in 2004 the program was then moved to IHCDA. The NAP awards state income tax credits to various eligible community-based nonprofits for projects that benefit low- and moderate-income households.

The NAP provides \$2.5 million in state income tax credits to support a variety of neighborhood revitalization and community development activities conducted by eligible community-based organizations. Tax credits are awarded by IHCDA to eligible community-based organizations. These organizations use the credits to attract contributions from individuals or corporations. Donors receive a 50 percent credit on the total amount contributed, not to exceed \$25,000. Thus, the \$2.5 million allocation of credits leverages \$5 million in donations to support neighborhood programs. This statewide program is administered by IHCDA.

OCRA Capacity building activities. During PY2011, OCRA's capacity building activities consisted of the following.

Regional workshops. A series of regional impact workshops facilitated through a partnership of Indiana's major universities, economic development trade organizations, and the Indiana Economic Development Corporation. A half dozen or more workshops have been held in various regions throughout the state with more events planned. The topic of regionalism and the potential tools to put in place are the main subject matter with featured keynote updates on the state organizations that assist the communities in economic development needs.

IN Home Town Competitiveness. Pilot communities continue to participate throughout the state in the Indiana Home Town Competitiveness program. Indiana Home Town Competitiveness is a comprehensive framework for rural community development. This innovative program emphasizes five key "pillars" to create economic success in rural Indiana communities which include youth engagement, leadership development, entrepreneurship, rural family success, and building community wealth.

IN Main Street. The Indiana Main Street Program will host seven Community Exchanges this year. The Exchanges help build capacity for organizations who are working towards revitalizing the downtown in their community. These exchanges have a variety of topics from Brownfields discussion to developing Business incentives in the downtown area. Indiana Main Street is hosting a state wide conference in October for communities who are building capacity in downtown revitalization and historic preservation. The conference will feature a keynote from Lauren Adkins who was with the National Main Street Center in Washington DC. The Indiana Main Street Program also has a Downtown Enhancement Grant Program, which is a small grant program aimed at helping communities build capacity in their downtown through projects that are permanent in

nature. Projects in the past have included, façade improvement programs, creation of pocket parks, restoration or creation of murals, creation of a revolving loan for business start ups in the downtown, and the list goes on. The grants are a dollar for dollar match, so it also used to show how communities can raise capital for projects that they are working on within the downtown area.

Legislation. OCRA in partnership with the Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC) working under the direction of HEA 1251 (2011) bring together university faculty, students, recent graduates, and community leaders in order to attract entrepreneurial activity with The Young Entrepreneur Program. OCRA, along with the Indiana Small Business Development Lead Center, are in discussions with department heads at all major universities to determine how to best integrate the opportunities into programs and to funnel the best opportunities toward communities. The same team is working with communities to build their capacity to develop custom incentive packages for these student entrepreneurs.

Shovel Ready Certification. OCRA is has provided significant research and development in order to update and expand the Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC)'s Shovel Ready Certification Program. Going forward OCRA will work hand in hand with community leadership to provide technical assistance in certifying their sites as well as working with participating state agencies to expedite approvals.

Housing activities. Since 1991, OCRA has contracted with IHCDA to administer CDBG funds allocated to housing activities. The program has been funded up to \$5 million annually from the State's CDBG allocation. Activities administered by IHCDA are discussed throughout the CAPER and include the following:

- Rehabilitation of owner-occupied units and rental housing for low and moderate income persons;
- Rehabilitation of permanent supportive housing; and
- Planning activities, such as housing needs assessments and site-specific feasibility studies.

National objectives. Programs funded with CDBG dollars must meet one of the following national objectives:

- Benefit low and moderate income persons;
- Prevent or eliminate slums or blight; and
- Meet other community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious or immediate threat to the health or welfare of the communities and other financial resources are not available to meet such needs.

As documented below, the State did not have any failures in fulfilling these national objectives during PY2011. The State's Consolidated Plan certifies that no less than 70 percent of the aggregate funding for those years will accrue to the benefit of low and moderate income persons in keeping with Section 104(b) of the 1992 Housing and Community Development Act (HCDA).

Community development programs. This report demonstrates that Indiana's programs are directed principally toward benefiting low and moderate income persons. By definition, direct beneficiaries must make application for assistance to divisions of local government and must be income-eligible in order to participate in award programs such as housing rehabilitation. Such beneficiaries should be low and moderate income households 100 percent of the time.

For projects which propose an area of indirect benefit, such as certain public facilities projects, indirect beneficiaries were determined at the time of funding and were required to meet the 51 percent low and moderate income threshold in order to be considered for funding. Under the CFF Program, projects with beneficiaries exceeding the 51 percent threshold are given a competitive advantage in the scoring process (i.e., the higher the low and moderate income percentage, the higher the score). Benefit percentages are verified using HUD Census data or by local certified income surveys which meet HUD-promulgated standards. Emphasis upon exceeding the 51 percent threshold in order to gain a competitive advantage in the project rating/scoring process has resulted in the State substantially exceeding a ratio of 51 percent benefit to low and moderate income persons.

Indiana's award programs that focus on economic development and job creation/retention also require compliance with the 51 percent benefit threshold to low and moderate income persons. The State's applicable programs require that a minimum of 51 percent of the jobs to be created or retained be held/made available to persons of low and moderate income. The income characteristics of those persons actually hired, or those who will be retained, must be verified individually (and documented) or be maintained by an agency certified under the federal Workforce Improvement Act (WIA). In the application process, projects that propose to create or retain jobs must describe the process for determining the actual number of jobs taken by, or made available to, persons of low and moderate income. The State also requires a binding job creation agreement between the recipient (division of local government) and the industry to be assisted, which stipulates that a minimum of 51 percent of the jobs to be created and retained will be held by or made available to, persons of low and moderate income.

Staff project monitors of the OCRA's Grant Support division also require documentation of such job creation or retention by local recipients. Additionally, the Grant Support division requires semi-annual reports on all awards that include reporting beneficiary attainment levels respective to project funding.

Housing programs. IHCDA requires set-up reports and closeout reports from CDBG recipients to document attainment levels respective to beneficiaries of project funding. The CDBG housing program administered by IHCDA is in full compliance with the State of Indiana certification that no less than 60 percent of the aggregate funding for fiscal years 1988, 1989 and 1990 will accrue to the benefit of low and moderate income persons, and no less than 70 percent of CDBG expenditures for awards made since November 1990 will benefit persons of low and moderate income.

Actions taken to avoid displacement. As a general policy, IHCDA requires all recipients to take all reasonable steps to minimize displacement as a result of CDBG or HOME assisted housing programs. IHC DA encourages applicants to:

- During development feasibility, consider whether or not displacement will occur;
- Ensure, whenever possible, that residential occupants of buildings to be rehabilitated are offered an opportunity to return;

- Plan rehabilitation projects to include “staging” if it would minimize displacement; and
- Follow notification and advisory service procedures carefully to ensure that families do not leave because they are not informed about plans for the project or their rights.

IHCDA discusses URA and Section 104(d) requirements during group start-up training sessions for all new recipients and during one-on-one technical assistance sessions. IHCDA compliance staff monitors recipient documentation of URA compliance during on-site interim and final monitorings.

OCRA requires all applications to provide a Displacement Plan and a Displacement Assessment. Applicants must provide a site control page as part of their application. This plan identifies all parcels that will be acquired as part of the project. If the project is funded, a Financing, Environmental Review, Engineering, Permits and Site Control (FEEPS) meeting is conducted with the grant administrator and detailed information regarding these parcels are reviewed. The applicant must also receive the approval of the OCRA Acquisition/Relocation Officer prior to release of funds.

Informational notices, appraisals, etc. are required to be completed prior to funding and are reviewed at the FEEPS meeting. If any procedures are not followed or documents are not provided, the grantee is in jeopardy of losing the grant.

During PY2011, there were no projects funded by OCRA where people had to be relocated. In regards to housing activities, the most common type of relocation occurs during the rehabilitation of homes. These are only temporary relocations that are for only a few days while water or electricity is turned off or for some similar reason.

Administrative Funds and Prior Period Adjustments

During PY2011, OCRA allocated \$471,108 to general program administration and \$487,738 to state administration. OCRA had four very small prior period adjustments that were made in PY2011: \$3,625 (grantee, Huntington) from PY2009, \$18,642 (grantee, Mentone) also from PY2009, \$2,715 (grantee, Attica) from PY2010 and \$300 (grantee, Campellsburg) also PY2010.

Activities in Support of Affordable Housing and Community Development

Fill gaps in institutional structure. The State’s most current Five-Year Consolidated Plan discusses the institutions in the State that deliver housing and community development services to citizens. Despite the strengths and effectiveness of these many organizations, and due to funding and labor constraints, gaps still exist in this institutional structure. One of the top-level goals of the State’s current Five-Year Consolidated Plan is to expand and preserve affordable housing opportunities throughout the housing continuum. This goal addresses needs expressed in the forums as well as public comment for continued support (financially and technically) of the State’s housing and community development organizations.

Affordable housing database. IHCDA sponsors an affordable housing website—IndianaHousingNow.org. This is a free website that offers a searchable, online database of rental units located across Indiana.

Capacity building/training and technical assistance. OCRA annually sets aside 1 percent of its CDBG allocation for technical assistance activities. The CDBG Technical Assistance program is designed to provide, through direct OCRA staff resources or by contract, training and technical assistance to divisions of local government, nonprofit and for-profit entities relative to community and economic development initiatives, activities and associated project management requirements.

The purpose of the CHDO Operating Supplement is to strengthen state-certified CHDOs so they can undertake new housing activities that are eligible to receive HOME Program funds under the CHDO set-aside. This program is designed to:

1. Provide reasonable supplemental operating funds to a CHDO with the purpose of expanding its ability to produce housing units. It is not intended to serve as the primary source of funding for the organization. The CHDO should demonstrate the ability to leverage other sources of funds for future operations and to grow into self-sufficiency.
2. Increase the organizational capacity of the recipient so that they can develop a HOME CHDO-eligible activity—transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, rental housing, and homebuyers—within 24 months of receiving the award.
3. Minimize duplication of effort of CHDOs throughout the state.
4. Be flexible enough to respond to changing housing needs throughout the State of Indiana.

Since PY2006, predevelopment and seed money loans have been incorporated into the HOME program/application package. Technical assistance for the CHDO Works, NAP, and CDBG programs are given on a case-by-case basis as requested by potential applicants or having been suggested by staff.

Applicants for HOME funds may request a meeting with staff at any time prior to applying for funding. There are two award workshops tentatively scheduled throughout the year to review the HOME program: one of which is held during IHCDA's Annual Housing and Community Economic Development Conference. These trainings are very general and provided for new organizations that would like a brief program overview.

Once funding decisions have been made, the appropriate Community Development Representative conducts a one-on-one meeting with the awarded organization to review the contents of the Implementation Manual. This technical assistance meeting will review any and/or all compliance components necessary for the applicant's success in completing this activity.

Each IHCDA Community Development Representative conducts a technical assistance/site visit on each HOME application, as this is now a published threshold requirement for this funding source. Although not required, IHCDA encourages applicants to contact staff for technical assistance/site visits for application preparation for all other funding sources and programs.

For PY2010, for example, IHCDA awarded the Indiana Association for Community and Economic Development (IACED) \$991,800 to provide training programs and technical assistance to HOME funds recipients.

The content of the trainings includes:

- Using Data to Make Decisions Leadership Training (4 workshops);
- Executive Director Training Series (4 workshops);
- Comprehensive Community Development/Professional Certification Series (57 total training days);
- Nonprofit Finance Series (14 training days);
- Organizational Development Courses (26 training days).

The technical assistance focuses on organizational management services, strategic planning services, and on-demand customized technical assistance.

Community development representatives. IHCDA’s Community Development department has eight staff members who are available to assist potential applicants as they work toward creating affordable housing programs. Each of the community development representatives are assigned a portion of the State in which they promote the CDBG and HOME programs and provide technical assistance upon request.

IHCDA email list serve. IHCDA provides an email titled “IHCDA Info” that is distributed to their email list serve approximately every week or two. It provides information on current IHCDA programs and events, upcoming housing events, housing tips as well as other events relevant to housing.

Private partnerships. IHCDA continues to encourage the development of public/private partnerships for affordable housing developments. Due to the leverage and match requirements of the CDBG and HOME programs, private lending institutions are frequently involved in providing a portion of the financing necessary to construct a housing development. Additionally, IHCDA has built a strong partnership with lending institutions in the State through the First Home Plus program that links HOME downpayment assistance with Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB)—financed mortgages for low and moderate income buyers.

Subrecipient agreements. During the 1999 program year, IHCDA established “Policies and Guidelines for Applying for HOME Investment Partnerships Program Subrecipient Administration Funds.” This policy governs IHCDA’s acceptance and funding of proposals from nonprofit corporations—as designated under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code—and public agencies. The proposals must be for activities that have a statewide impact and serve to further the Authority’s efforts in one or more of the following areas:

- General management, oversight and coordination of the HOME program;
- Provision of public information to residents and citizen organizations participating in the planning, implementation, or assessment of projects being assisted with HOME funds;
- Activities that affirmatively further fair housing;
- Compilation of data in preparation of the State Consolidated Plan; and
- Compliance with other federal requirements such as affirmative marketing, minority outreach, environmental review, displacement, relocation and acquisition, labor standards, lead-based paint and conflict of interest.

In July 2004, IHCDA announced that the HOME Subrecipient awards would no longer be available on a regular basis. From time-to-time, there may be occasions when there are small amounts of funding that become available with which IHCDA will initiate a Subrecipient Award with an organization to accomplish goals and needs that will have a statewide benefit.

Activities to reduce poverty. The State of Indiana does not have a formally adopted, statewide anti-poverty strategy. In a holistic sense, the entirety of Indiana's Consolidated Plan Strategy and Action Plan is anti-poverty related because a stable living environment is also a service delivery platform. However, many of the strategies developed for the Five-Year Consolidated Plan directly assist individuals who are living in poverty.

Indiana has a history of aggressively pursuing job creation through economic development efforts at the state and local levels. This emphasis on creating employment opportunities is central to a strategy to reduce poverty by providing households below the poverty level with a means of gaining sustainable employment.

Other efforts are also needed to combat poverty. Many of the strategies outlined in the Consolidated Plan are directed at providing services and shelter for those in needs. Once a person has some stability in a housing situation it becomes easier to address related issues of poverty and to provide resources such as childcare, transportation and job training that enables individuals to enter the workforce. Indiana's community action agencies are frontline anti-poverty service providers. They work in close cooperation with state agencies to administer a variety of state and federal programs.

Education and skill development is an important aspect of reducing poverty. Investment in workforce development programs and facilities is an important step to break the cycle of poverty. Finally, there continue to be social and cultural barriers that keep people in poverty. Efforts to eliminate discrimination in all settings are important. In some cases, subsidized housing programs are vital to ensure that citizens have a safe and secure place to live.

In addition, efforts to eliminate discrimination in all settings—which the State actively pursues through fair housing activities and MBE/WBE contracting opportunities—are an important anti-poverty strategy.

Affirmative marketing plans. IHCDA required HOME recipients with five or more HOME-assisted units of transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, rental housing, and homebuyer developments to adopt IHCDA's Affirmative Marketing Procedures.

If the development included five more RHTC, HOME-assisted, or HOME-eligible rental units under common ownership or was developed by a single entity; subsequently, the owner must utilize the following affirmative marketing practices in soliciting renters, determining their eligibility, and concluding all transactions:

- (1) Advertising of vacant units includes the Equal Housing Opportunity logo or slogan or both. (Advertising media may include, but is not limited to, newspapers, radio, television, brochures, leaflets, or an on-site sign);

- (2) Applications for vacant units are solicited from persons in the housing market who are least likely to apply for the RHTC, HOME assisted, and/or HOME-eligible housing without the benefit of special outreach efforts. (In general, persons who are not of the race/ethnicity of the residents of the neighborhood in which the RHTC and/or HOME-assisted unit is located shall be considered those least likely to apply);
- (3) The local housing market has been analyzed to identify those persons who are least likely to apply and then specific marketing techniques have been formulated to reach the persons identified. (Resources for this targeted outreach may include, but are not limited to, community organizations, places of worship, employment centers, fair housing groups, housing counseling agencies, and social service centers);
- (4) The housing market has been re-assessed at least annually to determine persons who are least likely to apply for housing;
- (5) Each year, the marketing techniques utilized in the previous year have been analyzed to determine effectiveness in reaching those persons identified. Based on the annual analysis, marketing efforts have been modified to increase participation from those persons identified as being least likely to apply for housing.
- (6) A file documenting all marketing efforts (i.e., copies of newspaper ads, memos of phone calls, copies of letters, etc.) is being maintained throughout the Development's affordability period, compliance period, and/or extended use period and is available for inspection by IHCD, HUD, and/or the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).
- (7) Each beneficiary of the HOME assistance has been given a fair housing brochure. Documentation of each beneficiary's receipt of the brochure is being maintained throughout the affordability period and is available for inspection by IHCD or HUD.
- (8) A listing is being maintained of all residents of RHTC, HOME-assisted, and/or HOME-eligible units from the time of application submittal through the end of the affordability period, compliance period, and/or extended use period. This list includes but is not limited to each resident's age, race, sex, and income and is available for inspection by IHCD, HUD or the IRS.

Contracting opportunities for MBE/WBEs. The State of Indiana has established a goal that 10 percent of federal awards be contracted to minority-owned business enterprises (MBE) and women-owned business enterprises (WBE) involved in construction, materials supply, consulting and architecture.

CDBG recipients. In order to ensure that the CDBG award recipients have made a good faith effort to reach this 10 percent goal, they are required to solicit at least two MBE/WBE firms (if any firms exist in that category) and to document all actions taken to reach the goal. The award recipient must then forward this information to the recipient's designated Civil Rights Officer before any work has begun on the project. This documentation includes the names of all potential minority and women business owners spoken with, and the reasons owners were not selected for the project, if applicable. The recipient's Civil Rights Officer then forwards said documentation to the State's Civil Rights Specialist.

HOME/CDBG housing recipients. The 10 percent goal is also communicated to all CDBG housing and HOME recipients at start-up training sessions as well as in the Grant Implementation Manual. IHCDCA also provides award recipients with the website address to obtain the resource directory of minority- and women-owned businesses as well as informational materials on compliance with procurement guidelines for MBE/WBE participation. Recipients must document all actions taken to ensure that they have made a good faith effort to solicit MBE/WBE firms. This documentation includes the names of all potential MBE/WBE firms contacted about contracting opportunities and, if the firms were not chosen for participation in the project, the reasons why not.

IHCDCA expects minority participation in its CDBG and HOME programs to reflect the representation of minorities in each funded community's low and moderate income population. Since minorities make up such a small percentage (around 1 percent) of Indiana's non-entitlement cities, such participation can be relatively minor. Minority participation is most concentrated in larger non-entitlement cities as well as in north-central Indiana.

State activities. Due to the importance of Minority Business Enterprises, the State, through its Commission on minority business development, is providing a program to promote, encourage and assist in the development of such enterprises. One means of achieving growth is the publication and use of the *Minority Business Directory*. The web link for this directory (www.state.in.us/idoa/minority) is distributed to Indiana corporations, as well as State agencies to help identify and solicit minority business enterprises, products and services.

In addition, the State is required to submit reports on recipients' efforts in assuring that minority and women-owned business contractors have an opportunity to provide services and goods on CDBG projects.

In 1996, the State instituted a policy allowing a 5 percent rebate of grant awards to communities who successfully complete projects utilizing no less than 5 percent (in dollars of the total award amount) minority participation on IDOC (now OCRA) CDBG projects. The rebate, which is also equal to 5 percent of the award amount, may be spent on any CDBG eligible project of the communities' choice. The community must advise the State prior to the initiation of the minority business' participation of their intent to attempt to achieve this goal.

Monitoring

To ensure that all statutory and regulatory requirements are being met for activities with HUD funds, OCRA and IHCDCA use various monitoring standards and procedures. OCRA and IHCDCA are responsible for ensuring that grantees under the CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA programs carry out projects in accordance with both Federal and State statutory and regulatory requirements. These requirements are set forth in the grant contract executed between the State and the grantee. The State provides maximum feasible delegation of responsibility and authority to grantees under the programs. Whenever possible, deficiencies are rectified through constructive discussion, negotiation and assistance.

CDBG (non-housing) monitoring. OCRA uses the following processes and procedures for monitoring projects receiving HUD funds:

- Evaluation on program progress;
- Compliance monitoring;
- Technical assistance;
- Project status reports;
- Monitoring technical assistance visits;
- Special visits; and
- Continued contact with grantees by program representatives.

OCRA conducts a monitoring of every grant project receiving HUD funds. Two basic types of monitoring are used: off-site, or “desk” monitoring and on-site monitoring.

- Desk monitoring is conducted by staff for non-construction projects. Desk monitoring confirms compliance with national objective, eligible activities, procurement and financial management.
- On-site monitoring is a structured review conducted by OCRA staff at the locations where project activities are being carried out or project records are being maintained. One on-site monitoring visit is normally conducted during the course of a project, unless determined otherwise by OCRA staff.

Grants utilizing a sub-recipient to carry out eligible activities are monitored on-site annually during the 5-year reporting period to confirm continued compliance with national objective and eligible activity requirements.

In addition, if there are findings at the monitoring, the grantee is sent a letter within 3 to 5 days of monitoring visit and is given 30 days to resolve it.

CDBG (housing) monitoring. IHCDA uses the following processes and procedures for monitoring projects receiving CDBG and HOME funds:

- Self monitoring;
- Monitoring reviews (on-site or desk-top);
- Results of monitoring review;
- Determination and responses;
- Clearing issues/findings
- Sanctions;
- Resolution of disagreements; and
- Audits.

IHCDA conducts at least one monitoring of every grant project receiving CDBG and HOME funds. The recipient must ensure that all records relating to the award are available at IHCDA’s monitoring. For those projects determined to need special attention, IHCDA may conduct one or more monitoring visits while award activities are in full progress. Some of the more common factors that would signal special attention include: activity appears behind schedule, previous audit or monitoring findings of recipient or administrative firm, high dollar amount of award, inexperience of recipient or administrative firm, and/or complexity of program. These visits will combine on-site technical assistance with compliance review. However, if the recipient’s systems are found to be nonexistent or are not functioning properly, other actions could be taken by IHCDA, such as suspension of funding until appropriate corrective actions are taken or termination of funding altogether.

During the period of affordability, IHCDA's multi-family department monitors properties annually for owner certification. Income verification and physical inspections are conducted annually, once every two years, or once every three years depending on the size of the project.

Two basic types of monitoring are used: on-site monitoring and desk-top monitoring.

- On-site monitoring review:
 - Real-estate Development Monitor will contact recipient to set-up monitoring based on award expiration and completion/close-out documentation submitted and approved.
 - Recipient will receive a confirmation letter stating date, time, and general monitoring information.
 - On date of monitoring, IHCDA staff will need: files, an area to review files, and a staff person available to answer questions.
 - Before leaving, IHCDA staff will discuss known findings and concerns, along with any areas that are in question.
- Desk-top monitoring review:
 - Real-estate Development Monitor will request information/documentation from award recipient in order to conduct the monitoring. IHCDA staff will give approximately 14 days for this information to be submitted.

IHCDA staff will review the information/documentation submitted and correspond to at least two representatives of the project as identified by the project sponsor or owner.

Shelter Plus Care monitoring. It is the policy of the IHCDA to monitor its Shelter Plus Care sub-recipients on an annual basis. Two types of reviews will be used to monitor sub-recipients: On Site Review and Remote Review. An On Site Review will consist of a complete review of the sub recipient's program and financial records as well as random review of Housing Quality Standard inspections. Remote Reviews will require sub-recipients to submit requested documentation to the IHCDA for review. Remote Reviews will address specific topics, such as participant eligibility, from random files. It is the policy of the IHCDA to perform On-Site Reviews of not less than thirty (30) percent of its sub-recipients annually. The remaining sub-recipients will be engaged in topical Remote Reviews.

The following risk factors will be used in determining which sub-recipients will be selected for On-Site Reviews:

1. Staff turnover;
2. Utilization of grant funds;
3. Claim iteration (deviation from monthly claims);
4. APR performance;
5. Consumer Complaints;
6. Unresolved HUD Finding (including APR Findings);
7. Compliance with terms and conditions of IHCDA S+C Agreement;
8. Time of last On-Site Review.

Each program's past performance will be analyzed and compared against the full spectrum of IHCD's Shelter Plus Care programs. Programs with highest risk will be selected for On-Site Review. Prior to either On Site or Remote Reviews, IHCD will notify sub-recipient in writing of the type and date of the review. IHCD will also provide sub-recipient with specific instructions and an explanation of review process.

Civil Rights Performance Monitoring Activities by the State

Process and standards. OCRA evaluates recipients' and subrecipients' employment practices in order to determine whether or not equal opportunity guidelines are followed in advertising vacancies, such as stating they are an "EEO employer." The State's field monitors review recipients' civil rights files to determine if there have been any EEO complaints filed against a recipient within five years. The field monitors also review records of complaints and responses to complaints, if any, regarding alleged discrimination in the provision of program benefits.

There are numerous procedures that must be followed and policies that must be adhered to for both the recipient and their contractors to assure compliance with these requirements. All policies and procedures must be fully documented to provide adequate record of civil rights compliance. In addition, the recipient must fully document the characteristics of the population of the area in which the project will be implemented in order to determine the specific actions that must be taken to ensure civil rights compliance.

Results of monitoring reviews. Upon completion of the final monitoring visit, a recipient will receive a formal monitoring letter outlining the strengths and weaknesses in project management systems. The letter will list those areas of compliance that were reviewed and detailed results of that review.

State findings. Findings are reported when the review of the recipient's performance reveals specific identifiable violation of a statutory regulatory requirement, about which there is no question. When a finding is issued, the recipient is requested to formally respond within a specified period (typically 30 days) as to those steps the recipient will make to remedy and/or prevent a recurrence of the violation. If specific steps have already been taken to remedy a finding, the field monitor must verify before clearing the finding. Once the review indicates that satisfactory action has taken place, the field monitor will send a letter to the recipient indicating the finding has been resolved.

Leveraging Resources

OCRA requires a 10 percent match overall for all Community Focus Fund (CFF) projects and planning grants. The 10 percent match can consist of 5 percent cash and/or debt and up to 5 percent in-kind or force account. While there is no local match requirement for Community Economic Development Fund (CEDF) projects, OCRA does review the contribution by the applicant (city/town/county) as well as the amount of capital investment made by the decision making company. Additionally, in order to increase philanthropic capital on CDBG projects, OCRA awards bonus points on CFF projects if an applicant receives \$5,000 or 2 percent of the grant request, whichever is greater, from a foundation. The Micro-enterprise Assistance Program (MAP) does not have a match requirement, but again when making decisions about the awards, OCRA reviews the level of commitment the applicant is making in regards to the total micro-enterprise program.

The leveraging requirements of the CDBG and HOME housing programs, administered by IHCD, differ considerably. The following summarizes the match and leverage requirements for the 2011 program year.

The State of Indiana requires a 10 percent leverage requirement for most CDBG funds expended, except for applicants that agree to serve 100 percent of the beneficiaries:

- At or below 60 percent of AMI, the leverage requirement is zero; and
- At or below 80 percent of AMI, the leverage requirement is 5 percent of the CDBG request.

IHCD recipients have used a variety of funding sources to meet this requirement, including Federal Home Loan Bank grants, Rural Development grants, contractor contributions, cash contributions and cash from local government general funds.

The HOME program requires a 25 percent match, which is a federal requirement rather than a state policy. However, IHCD is currently able to meet 15 percent of this match liability. As such, applicants must demonstrate eligible matching funds equal to 10 percent of the amount of HOME funds requested, less administration, environmental review and CHDO operating costs.

If the applicant is proposing to utilize banked match for the activity:

- And it is the applicant's own banked match, the match liability on the previous award for which the match was generated must already be met and documented with IHCD for the match to be eligible as of the application due date. Only HOME-eligible match generated on IHCD awards made in 1999 or later, are eligible to be banked.
- Or, if it is another recipient's match, the applicant must provide an executed agreement with the application verifying that the recipient is willing to donate the match.
 - Only banked match from awards made in 1999 or later that have fully met their match liability are eligible to donate to another applicant. The award must be closed before the agreement to donate match is executed.
- Match cannot be sold or purchased and is provided purely at the discretion of the recipient that granted it.
- Banked leverage generated on a CDBG award cannot be used as match on a future HOME award. Only banked match generated on a HOME award can be used on a future HOME award.

SECTION III.
Homeless Activities

SECTION III.

Homeless Activities

The Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG, now Emergency Solutions Grant) and HOME funds are the primary resources used for funding homeless activities in Indiana. CDBG can also be used for physical improvements to shelters.

ESG may be used for rehabilitation or conversion of buildings into homeless shelters; shelter operating expenses; “essential services” (supportive services concerned with employment, health, substance abuse, and education); homeless prevention activities; and administrative costs. ESG serves persons who are homeless or at high risk of becoming immediately homeless.

The State uses HOME funds for development, rehabilitation and preservation of affordable housing to mitigate the risk of homelessness, and development or rehabilitation of transitional housing. IHEDA administers both ESG and HOME.

During PY2011 the State was entitled to receive \$2.0 million in ESG dollars for nonentitlement communities throughout the State.

This section of the CAPER discusses how these funds were used to mitigate the housing and shelter needs of the State’s homeless population.

Homelessness in Indiana

During the last week of January 2012, according to the statewide count of persons experiencing homelessness, 4213 total households were homeless. This is a 6 percent decrease from 2011. For households with dependent children, there was an increase from 776 to 955, or 23 percent. For the 2011 PIT, households with dependent children decreased in homelessness from the previous 2010 PIT year. This was most likely due to the Homeless Prevention Rapid Re-housing Program that was available to persons who were homeless or at risk of being homeless. It is believed that the 2012 numbers went up due to the fact that this program stabilized and closed out on June 30, 2012.

There was a significant decrease (25%) among the chronic homeless individuals. Of those who were homeless with severe substance abuse there was a decrease of 43 percent and, for severely mentally ill, there was a significant decrease of 50 percent. It is believed that the Indiana Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative, with the goal of developing 1,400 units of supportive housing for households or individuals experiencing homelessness with a disability by 2013, was a big contributor to this decrease. IHEDA opened the doors on many new permanent supportive housing projects that would assist persons who are homeless with disabilities.

Specific data include:

- 6,259 individuals comprising 4,213 households were homeless during the last week in January 2012.
- Of the 6,259 individuals found and identified as experiencing homelessness, 889 were unsheltered and found on the street, and 5,370 were staying in emergency shelters, safe havens or in temporary transitional housing programs.
- 23 percent of households counted, or 955 households were with dependent children.
- 652 of the adults counted were veterans, a decrease of 6 percent from 2011.
- 1,194 of the adults counted were women fleeing from domestic violence.
- 16 percent of the adults counted suffered from a chronic addiction.
- 7 percent of the adults counted identified themselves as having a severe mental illness.
- 7 percent of individuals counted can be characterized as "chronically homeless".

State approach to mitigating homelessness. The State's nonentitlement homeless strategy is carried out through the Continuum of Care (CoC) process. IHCD is the lead agency under the CoC Balance of State (BOS IN-502) structure in Indiana and coordinates the annual point-in-time count and survey. In 2009, IHCD reorganized its Inter-Agency Council into the "Indiana Planning Council on the Homeless" (IPCH). The Council was established as an overall planning body for initiatives aimed at ending homelessness in Indiana, and is committed to using a comprehensive approach to develop, operate, and improve Indiana's continuum of homelessness solutions. The Council operates from a "housing first" philosophy and embraces the proven efficacy of a permanent supportive housing model.

The Indiana BOS (IN-502) CoC has five strategic plan objectives:

- **Objective No. 1. New permanent housing.** The first objective is to create new permanent housing beds for chronically homeless individuals. The Indiana Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative targets creating 1,100 units of PSH by 2013. An additional 400 units are planned to be developed in the next 5 years.
- **Objective No. 2. Increase length of permanent housing stays.** The second objective is to increase percentage of homeless persons staying in permanent housing over 6 months to at least 77 percent. The CoC has implemented several steps to ensure providers reach this goal. Currently, 84 percent of homeless persons in permanent housing have remained for at least six months.
- **Objective No. 3. Increase movements into permanent housing.** Objective 3 is to increase percentage of homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing to at least 65 percent. Currently, 69 percent of homeless persons in transitional housing have moved to permanent housing.

- **Objective No. 4. Increase participant employment.** The fourth objective is to increase the percentage of persons employed at program exit to at least 20 percent. Statewide, the BOS CoC exceeds HUD's goals and has done so for the past 3yrs.
- **Objective No. 5. Decrease homeless households with children.** Objective 5 is to decrease the number of homeless households with children. The BOS CoC has prioritized the development of permanent housing alternatives for unsheltered families.

For PY2011, the Indiana Balance of State was awarded \$9.2 million in one year renewals to 63 different Supportive Housing Programs of 39 different non-profit agencies. Two Shelter Plus Care renewals included in this amount. .

In April 2012, the BOS was notified that their 2011 Balance of State McKinney Vento Application was awarded \$4million for six new projects across the state. The new projects were located in Evansville, Elkhart, Lafayette, Ft. Wayne, Bloomington and Muncie. Three of the projects were Shelter Plus Care Programs. The sponsors of the programs are: Park Center, Meridian Services and Oaklawn Mental Health Center. IHCDA is the grantee for all of the BOS S+C Programs.

In FY2011, IHCDA was the grantee of 18 open S+C awards totaling over \$8.9 million. IHCDA partnered with S+C Sponsors: Aliveness of NWI, Aspire Indiana, Inc., Catholic Charities, Community Action of Northeast Indiana, Community Mental Health Center, Edgewater Systems for Balanced Living, Mental Health Association in Vigo County, Park Center, Porter Starke Services, Regional Mental Health Center, Aurora. The S+C II program contracts with agencies Meridian Services, and Aspire Indiana, Inc, and the S+C III Program contracts with agencies and local governments like the City of Lafayette, Meridian Services and Howard Regional Behavioral Health Care. . New S+C programs that opened this past year were Centerstone in Richmond, Edgewater South Shore Commons in Gary, Oaklawn Mental Health Center (Lincoln West Apartments) in Elkhart, Porter Starke Family Program in Valparaiso, Echo Housing (Lucas Place II) in Evansville and CMHC(Lawrenceburg S+C Program) in Lawrenceburg, Indiana.

In 2011, IHCDA was renewed as the grantee for the Balance of State (BOS) and also as the grantee for the HMIS in Evansville for a total renewal of \$439,316.

Consolidated Plan Goals and Outcomes

ESG, HOME and CDBG are important resources for addressing homelessness in Indiana. IHCDA has developed a "Homeless Initiative," which involves an annual commitment of HOME and CDBG funds to emergency shelter, transitional and permanent supportive housing projects and homeless prevention projects.

The 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan developed many goals specific to preventing and addressing homelessness in the State:

Goal 2. Reduce homelessness and increase housing stability for special needs populations.

- **Objective DH-1.1 (Availability/Accessibility):** Improve the range of housing options for homeless and special needs populations.

DH-1.1 outcomes/goals:

- Support the construction and rehabilitation of **permanent supportive housing** units.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 250 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 50 housing units; \$5,000,000, HOME
 - *Targeted to special needs populations:* 50 housing units
- Provide **tenant based rental assistance** to populations in need.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 1,000 housing units
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 200 housing units; \$1,000,000, HOME
 - *Targeted to special needs populations:* 200 housing units

- **Objective DH-1.2 (Availability/Accessibility):** Support activities to improve the range of housing options for special needs populations and to end chronic homelessness through the **Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)** program by providing operating support to shelters, homelessness prevention activities and case management to persons who are homeless and at risk of homelessness.

DH-1.2 outcomes/goals:

- Operating support—provide shelters with operating support funding.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 83 shelters receiving support; \$5,411,374 over next five years
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 55 shelters; \$1,472,470 ESG
- Homelessness prevention activities—provide contractors with homelessness prevention activity funding.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 550 clients assisted; \$7,547,451 over next five years
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 110 clients assisted; \$68,691 ESG
- Essential services—provide shelters with funding for essential services.
 - *Five year outcome/goal:* 53 shelters; \$2,136,078 over next five years.
 - *2011 outcome/goal:* 80 percent of clients will be provided with such services, for an estimated 16,000 clients assisted annually; \$400,845, ESG
- Anticipated match: Shelters match 100 percent of their rewards.
- Anticipated number of counties assisted: 89 counties annually.

- Anticipated number of clients served over next five years: 150,000 (unduplicated count) with 95,000 assisted with temporary emergency housing.
- Other ESG activities:
 - Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)—Require the use of the HMIS for all residential shelter programs serving homeless individuals and families. HMIS is a secure, confidential electronic data collection system used to determine the nature and extent of homelessness and to report to HUD on an annual basis. This requirement will be met by only funding entities that either currently use HMIS system or commit to using it once awarded. The HMIS must be used on a regular and consistent basis. The ESG Coordinator will periodically check with the HMIS coordinator to monitor utilization. Claim reimbursement is contingent upon participation in and completeness of HMIS data records. Domestic violence shelters are excluded from this requirement in accordance with the Violence Against Women’s Act.
 - Require participation in annual, statewide homeless Point-in-Time Count and submission of this data to IHADA.
 - Strongly encourage ESG grantees to attend their local Regional Planning Council Meetings in their region of the Continuum of Care (IN-502) regularly. The ESG RFP inquires about attendance to and involvement in the meetings. . The response is heavily weighed upon evaluation of the RFP.

PY2011 Awards

This section describes how the State allocated ESG, HOME and CDBG to make progress on meeting the five-year goals and meet PY2011 objectives.

During PY2011, the State of Indiana received approximately \$2.0 million in ESG to use for homeless shelter support, services and operations, homeless prevention activities and limited administrative costs. The following figure shows the dollar amounts of ESG that were allocated, committed and expended.

**Figure III-1.
ESG Allocations and Amount Drawn, PY 2005 through PY2011**

ESG Fund Type	Grant Year	Amount of Allocation	Committed to Activities	Net Drawn Amount	Available to Commit to Activities	Available to Draw
Entitlement	2005	\$1,890,425	\$1,890,425	\$1,890,425	\$0	\$0
	2006	\$1,892,729	\$1,892,729	\$1,892,729	\$0	\$0
	2007	\$1,916,143	\$1,916,143	\$1,916,143	\$0	\$0
	2008	\$1,925,813	\$1,925,813	\$1,925,813	\$0	\$0
	2009	\$1,928,975	\$1,905,412	\$1,770,548	\$0	\$0
	2010	\$1,931,140	\$1,807,871	\$1,707,382	\$0	\$0
	2011	\$2,089,470	\$1,988,619	\$2,042,859	\$0	\$0

Source: ESG CAPER data 2011-12 as of August 27, 2012.

ESG funding in 2011 was used to meet high and medium priority needs of providing housing to households earning between 0 and 30 percent of the median family income (MFI). All types of households—renter, owner, special needs, small and large—were prioritized a “high” in the five-year Consolidated Plan.

As in past years, the State chose to allocate ESG to three primary activities: essential services, operations, and homeless prevention activities, as shown below. In PY2011, \$100,851 (5 percent) of the ESG award was allocated for administration.

**Figure III-2.
ESG Grantee Activity
Summary, PY2011**

Source:
Indiana Housing and Community
Development Authority.

	Budgeted Amount	Spent	Committed for 2011
Essential Services	\$407,764	\$400,825	\$6,938
Operations	\$1,497,947	\$1,472,471	\$25,476
Homeless Prevention	\$82,908	\$68,692	\$14,216
ESG Administration	\$100,851	\$100,851	\$0
Total ESG Funds	\$2,089,470	\$2,042,839	\$46,631

Essential services. In PY2011, about \$350,000 or 18 percent of ESG funds were allocated to essential services. Essential services consist of supportive services provided by shelters for persons who are homeless. These services vary, as they are tailored to client needs. In general, essential services consist of the following:

- Employment services: job placement, job training, and employment counseling;
- Health care services: medical and psychological counseling, nutrition counseling, and substance abuse treatment; and
- Other services: assistance in locating permanent housing and income assistance, childcare and transportation.

Shelter operations. Seventy-three percent of the total ESG dollars funded by the State for PY2011—\$1.4 million—was allocated to shelter operation activities. These funds were used by shelters for operating and maintenance costs, shelter lease costs, capital expenses, payment of utilities, purchases of equipment and furnishings, provision of security, as well as purchase of food.

The State believes that the greatest need of shelters is for operational subsidies. Running a shelter for the homeless is a difficult business: the work is challenging and intense, staff turnover can be high, client needs usually exceed the services available and operational funding is scarce and very competitive.

Homeless prevention. Three percent of 2010-11 ESG funds were expended on homeless prevention activities. These activities include activities or programs designed to prevent the incidence of homeless such as providing financial assistance to families who have received eviction notices or notices of termination of utility services if the inability of the family to make the required payments is due to a sudden reduction in income and the assistance is necessary to avoid the eviction or termination of services.

Additionally, as of August 8, 2011, the State's Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-housing program, a program of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, has provided \$4,998,946.53 or 30 percent of their overall \$16,405,259.85 grant on homeless prevention activities. These activities include housing relocation and stabilization services and financial assistance with rent, utilities, arrears and deposits. The function of these funds is to provide short term assistance to individuals and families who but for the assistance would have become homeless.

Donations. Cash and in-kind donations from private individuals, organizations and other government entities provide another vital source of funding for the State's shelters. These donations came from a variety of sources including foundations and nonprofit organizations, local fund drives and small individual contributions. The majority of the in-kind donations consists of volunteer labor, but may also be made up of tangible goods (e.g., furniture, clothing, equipment)¹.

Figure III-3 shows the level of matching funds received in PY2005 through PY2010 along with a ratio of matching funds to the total amount of award in both years.

Figure III-3.
Cash and In-Kind Funding, ESG PY2005 through 2011

Type of Match	PY2006	PY2007	PY2008	PY2009	PY2010	PY2011
Cash Match	\$799,754	\$1,510,312	\$1,384,071	\$1,404,603	\$1,290,234	\$1,295,274
In-Kind Match	\$1,018,145	\$438,492	\$493,762	\$523,944	\$479,795	\$700,612
Total Match	\$1,817,898	\$1,948,804	\$1,877,834	\$1,928,547	\$1,770,029	\$1,995,887
<i>Cash Match to Total Amount of Awards</i>	0.41	0.73	0.70	0.73	0.67	0.62
<i>Total Match to Total Amount of Awards</i>	0.94	0.94	0.94	1.00	1.00	0.96

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

Matching resources. During the 2010-11 ESG program year, all grantees matched 100 percent of their individual Emergency Shelter Grants. Approximately 27 percent of grantees used in-kind match and 73 percent used cash/grant match.

State method of distribution. Each RFP was reviewed by two reviewers using an Excel-based scoring tool. After initial scoring, the shelters were assigned to the following three categories based upon their shelter type and services provided: Emergency Shelters (including youth and day shelters), Transitional Housing, and Domestic Violence Shelters. The shelters thus competed only against similarly structured shelters. The percentage of total funds available allocated to each of the three shelter program categories was based upon the total number of homeless individuals served in each category. Final award amounts were calculated based a combination of the amount available in each category, the amount requested and the organization's score, which was an average of the two reviewers' scores.

¹ IHCD audits the components of the in-kind donations and calculations used to derive the donation amount during on-site monitoring.

The application scoring and evaluation process evaluated the shelters' organizational capacity, shelter program qualities such as a focus on permanent housing placement, comprehensiveness of services available, as well as the administration of past ESG grants and completeness of proposal submitted.

Compliance and monitoring. IHCD requires that all contracts with shelters be performance based. Based on the type of shelter program funded with ESG (Emergency/Day Shelter or Transitional Housing), each used three objectives specific and relevant to their shelter type. The goals state a minimum required percentage goal to be met by the end of the fiscal year. This year, however, only the six month outcomes were gathered, due to the changes in IDIS. Thus, the following average actual performances reflect the six month outcomes of the shelters and do not necessarily reflect the performance outcomes of the entire fiscal year.

Emergency/Day Shelters performance objectives for 2011-12 program year were the following:

- 50 percent of clients in shelter program will move to transitional or permanent housing upon completion of the program. Average actual performance: 64 percent
- 25 percent of clients in shelter program will maintain or increase their employment income upon exit from the program. Average actual performance: 61 percent
- The average length of stay for clients who move to transitional or permanent housing upon completion of the program will be 45 days or less. Average actual performance: 49 days

Transitional Housing performance objectives for 2011-12 program year were the following:

- 65 percent of clients in transitional housing will increase or maintain their employment or entitlements upon exit from program. Average actual performance: 76 percent
- 69 percent of transitional residents will move from transitional to permanent housing. Average actual performance: 75 percent
- The average length of stay for transitional housing clients who move to permanent housing will be 180 days or less. Average actual performance: 224 days

During ESG site visits, program manager reviews the following components of the ESG program:

- Client eligibility is documented with appropriate homeless documentation.
- Program performance in connecting homeless clients to mainstream resources such as food stamps, Medicaid, SSDI/SSI, TANF, etc.
- Program performance in transitioning homeless clients to permanent housing
- Evaluate organizations' financial accountability
- Review documentation of ESG match source
- Review other issues of organization capacity, volunteer involvement, Board of Director composition and function
- Tour facility and review basic habitability requirements
- Discuss services offered by the facility and elsewhere in the community

- Participation in the regional planning council on the homeless
- Participation in statewide point-in-time count
- Review HMIS utilization or other data tracking methods.

The Emergency Shelter Grant Program Monitor to date has monitored 22 percent of the shelters funded with ESG in the state for the 2011-12 program year. The Program Monitor utilizes a monitoring tool. Monitoring visits occur on average two per month, with the bulk of them occurring during the spring, summer and fall months.

Grant disbursements are completed in a timely fashion. Claim vouchers and supporting documentation is sent by mail to IHCDA and date stamped upon receipt. On the same day of receipt, ESG program assistant reviews claims for errors and completion and requests corrections if needed. Once that is complete, the claim is given to the ESG Program Manager, who reviews for eligible activities and signs and approves claim. Claim is then scanned and saved and given to Accounting Staff. The grantees receive the payments through ACH deposit within 5-7 business days of receipt and final approval of program staff.

The tool covers services provided through essential services, operational services and homeless prevention. The tool and the site visit reviews areas related to mainstream resources, transitioning to permanent housing, client eligibility, financial accountability, ESG match, fees for services, personnel issues, volunteers, facility inspection, services offered by the facility and those services that are referred out to the other collaborative agencies. The tool looks at their participation in the continuum of care meetings, community support, participation in statewide point-in-time count, HMIS usage and any pending issues. The monitor provides technical assistance on overall organizational capacity and ensures that federal requirements pursuant to Emergency Shelter Grant are being met. When standards and processes are found to be deficient, a corrective plan of action is developed and monitored.

Grantee early terminations/modifications. One ESG contract was terminated in PY2011. The Housing Authority of the City of Greencastle closed its doors on September 9, 2011, ceasing all provision of housing and services to homeless individuals. They had communicated to IHCDA that they were hoping to re-open in early 2012. In early February, they informed IHCDA that they would not re-open and their contract was terminated on February 12, 2012. The balance after their award was terminated was \$24,716.26. This amount was reallocated to other shelters in need.

ESG goals for PY2012:

- Continue to provide trainings and intensive technical assistance around the implementation of HEARTH Act in the State of Indiana.
- Encourage grantees to work with local and regional agencies and shelters with rapid re-housing activities.
- Monitor a minimum of 25 percent of the ESG Shelters.

- Assist ESG HMIS users in using Client Track, the new HMIS software system. Promote the system as a case management tool to create a positive experience for case managers. Participate in trainings and work with HMIS staff to ensure data quality is sufficient. Work with DV Shelters in assisting them to acquire a comparable HMIS software system.
- Provide technical assistance and guidance with new online submission of claims.
- Establish new performance objectives for 2012-13 program year that are more consistent with HEARTH Act objectives. These include an overall reduction in homelessness, duration of homeless episodes, reduce recidivism to homelessness and increase outreach to all homeless people.
- Continue to post all ESG documents on IHCDA's Web site. Send regular e-mail updates to grantees communicating training opportunities, grant administration updates and other issues of note.
- Collaborate with members of Performance and Evaluation Committee of Indiana Planning Council on Homeless in developing emergency shelter and transitional housing best practice standards, similar to that of permanent supportive housing standards of quality developed by Corporation for Supportive Housing. Develop a set of standards around shelters will allow us to more objectively measure the quality and effectiveness of shelters.

ESG Grantee & Staff Trainings & Technical Assistance.

- Trainings were made available to ESG Grantees regarding the administration of the Emergency Shelter Grant including trainings about HEARTH.
- ESG Monitor regularly assisted and referred homeless individuals who contacted IHCDA in need assistance. These calls were referred to the ESG Grantee, Township Trustees, 211 Referral Help lines, Community Action Agencies and other local assistance and mainstream resources.
- Technical Assistance was provided to ESG sub recipients on a daily basis regarding ESG claim forms, activity eligibility questions and progress reports.
- Much training continues to be given to ESG subrecipients regarding Client Track, the HMIS system that replaced Foothold in March, 2012.
- ESG Program Staff attended the National Alliance to End Homelessness Conference in Washington D.C. in July 2012 to learn more about the HEARTH Act and Rapid Re-Housing.
- ESG Staff coordinated the 2012 Statewide Point-in-Time Count and worked with ESG sub-recipients to ensure their data was up to date in the HMIS system so that count would be accurate. A clause was added to the 2009-10 ESG agreement that requires all ESG grantees to participate in the count.
- The ESG Program Coordinator provided technical assistance on the Indiana State Planning Council on the Homeless and regional planning council structures by actively encouraging the shelters and transitional housing agencies to attend their local regional planning council meetings and partnering with other local agencies that provide assistance to the homeless population. Participation in the regional planning councils was weighed heavily in the RFP scoring tool.

Discharge coordination policy. The McKinney-Vento Act requires that State and local governments have policies and protocols developed to ensure that persons being discharged from a publicly-funded institution or system of care are not discharged immediately into homelessness. Indiana has implemented formal discharge policies pertaining to persons released from publicly funded institutions and systems of care. IHCDA is involved in many elements of discharge coordination, as discussed below. In addition, IHCDA uses ESG funds to support the programs and facilities which serve households and residents being discharged from foster care, health care institutions and correctional facilities.

- **Foster care.** The Chafee Plan is the basis for Indiana's protocol for implementing the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999. The Planning Council is working with IHCDA and Division of Child Services to create housing options for persons being discharged from the foster care system. A PSH project, Connected by 25, has created 44 units serving youth aging out and youth at risk of homelessness. This project is a statewide demonstration project to develop a model for serving this population and improving discharge protocol. The Planning Council and IHCDA work closely with foster care to monitor data and trends on discharges and work with cases as necessary.
- **Health care.** The Indiana Department of Health (IDH) has a formal discharge plan developing a set of recommendations for an integrated, statewide discharge policy. The CoC, which is coordinated by IHCDA, is currently working locally to develop discharge policies for health care systems. The Planning Council has a long-term goal to create a network of primary care centers who identify people at risk of homelessness and the local CoC housing network. Local trainings are for emergency room workers and social workers on IHOPE to triage clients into the appropriate housing. The Council is working closely with private hospitals to reduce or eliminate those being discharged into homelessness through tools such as IHOPE and hospital involvement in the local CoCs.
- **Mental health.** The Indiana Department of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA) has a formal discharge protocol and provides recommendations to IHCDA, DMHA and IPSHI on creating housing protocols for individuals discharged from State hospitals.
- **Corrections.** The Indiana Department of Corrections (IDOC) has a formal discharge policy. CoCs work closely with IDOC reps to develop protocols so that individuals being released from correctional facilities are not discharged into homelessness. The Housing & Programs committee is working with the IDOC to link their data system with the HMIS system to link people to services and housing to end and prevent homelessness. IDOC is creating demo projects in 3 cities to connect people most at risk of homelessness with the local CoC to do the triage and to provide services while in the prison. Utilizing HOME TBRA funds, IHCDA provides tenant based rental assistance to Aurora in Evansville, to target individuals who are leaving the local corrections. The program provides rental assistance and services to help prevent recidivism and homelessness. .

Self-Evaluation/Challenges. Many shelter programs serving the homeless reported that it was difficult for clients to find jobs due to the current high unemployment rate and consequential lack of job availability. Some emergency shelters also reported finding it challenging to move their clients from the shelter into permanent or transitional housing within the 45 day timeframe, which was the objective. That being said, all performance objectives set were either exceeded or very close to meeting the objective. Transitioning from Foothold to Client Track, overall, went very smoothly. A goal for this next year is to meet the challenge of training all HMIS users to use the system appropriately and thus increase the data quality as well as create a positive experience for the case managers who use it.

ESG Summary

In PY2011, the allocation of ESG led to the following results:

- Approximately 12,000 homeless persons received residential assistance.
- 417 people received homeless prevention rental or utility assistance.
- 25 shelters were funded and expended homeless prevention activity funding.
- An average of 67 percent of all clients housed through the ESG program moved into permanent housing upon discharge. This is a 10 percent increase from the prior year. The Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program likely accounted for some of this increase.

Figure III-4. Summary Statistics, ESG Funding PY2004 through PY2011

	PY2006	PY2007	PY2008	PY2009	PY2010	PY2011
Number of Awards	89	85	90 *	86	82	55
Number Housed	18,975	19,040	20,376	19,780	21,739	12,037
Average Award	\$20,883	\$23,234	\$21,037	\$22,675	\$22,372	\$36,157
Highest Award Amount	\$59,093	\$61,193	\$37,950	\$30,428	\$34,469	\$50,000
Lowest Award Amount	\$2,350	\$4,450	\$5,585	\$11,145	\$6,217	\$5,754

Note: * Three agencies closed during the program year and the contacts were then terminated.
 Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

Figure III-5 shows ESG award amounts by agency, county and CoC region.

Of these awards:

- 43, or \$1,515,426 was allocated to emergency/day shelters; 23 of those shelters primarily served victims of domestic violence; and
- 12, or \$473,193, were allocated to transitional housing providers.

**Figure III-5.
ESG Awards by County, PY2011**

Award Number	ESG Subrecipient	Total Budget	County	RPC
ES-011-051	Vincent Village	\$29,293	Allen	3
ES-011-053	YWCA Northeast Indiana	\$36,011	Allen	3
ES-011-020	Genesis Outreach	\$47,091	Allen	3
ES-011-025	Hope House, Inc	\$49,514	Allen	3
ES-011-030	Interfaith Hospitality Network of Greater Fort Wayne	\$38,434	Allen	3
ES-011-008	Columbus Regional Shelter for Victims of Domestic Violence	\$34,685	Bartholomew	11
ES-011-029	Human Services, Inc	\$40,615	Bartholomew	11
ES-011-024	Heart House Inc	\$41,551	Dearborn	13b
ES-011-001	A Better Way Services, Inc	\$42,243	Delaware	6
ES-011-005	Bridges Community Services	\$49,514	Delaware	6
ES-011-018	Family Services of Elkhart County, Inc dba iFIT	\$16,205	Elkhart	2
ES-011-013	Emerge Ministries, Inc.	\$24,480	Elkhart	2
ES-011-021	Goshen Interfaith Hospitality Network, inc	\$26,536	Elkhart	2
ES-011-048	The Center for Women and Families	\$39,127	Floyd	13a
ES-011-043	St Elizabeth Catholic Charities	\$48,129	Floyd	13a
ES-011-017	Family Service Society	\$41,861	Grant	6
ES-011-022	Hancock Hope House	\$12,050	Hancock	8
ES-011-042	Sheltering Wings Center for Women	\$44,321	Hendricks	8
ES-011-010	Coordinated Assistance Ministries, inc	\$38,088	Howard	5
ES-011-016	Family Service Association of Howard County, Inc	\$42,243	Howard	5
ES-011-004	Anchor House, Inc	\$47,396	Jackson	11
ES-011-038	North Central Indiana Rural Crisis Center	\$20,896	Jasper	1
ES-011-032	Kosciusko County Shelter for Abuse, Inc	\$37,396	Kosciusko	2
ES-011-023	Haven House, Inc	\$19,217	Lake	1a
ES-011-044	St. Jude House	\$34,972	Lake	1a
ES-011-019	Gary Commission for Women	\$39,127	Lake	1a
ES-011-046	Stepping Stone Shelter for Women, Inc	\$45,013	LaPorte	1
ES-011-007	Citizens Concerned for the Homeless	\$50,000	LaPorte	1
ES-011-003	Alternatives Inc of Madison County	\$46,398	Madison	6
ES-011-035	Martha's House	\$31,565	Monroe	10
ES-011-037	Middle Way House, Inc	\$34,279	Monroe	10
ES-011-045	Stepping Stones	\$42,936	Monroe	10
ES-011-009	Community Service Center of Morgan County	\$47,091	Morgan	10
ES-011-047	The Caring Place	\$26,639	Porter	1
ES-011-028	Housing Opportunities	\$40,166	Porter	1
ES-011-027	Housing Authority of the City of Greencastle	\$5,754	Putnam	7
ES-011-041	Safe Passage	\$24,197	Ripley	13b
ES-011-015	Family Promise of Greater Lafayette	\$17,451	Tippecanoe	4
ES-011-049	The Salvation Army	\$41,592	Tippecanoe	4
ES-011-055	YWCA of Greater Lafayette	\$43,628	Tippecanoe	4
ES-011-033	Lafayette Transitional Housing Center Inc	\$50,000	Tippecanoe	4
ES-011-034	Lafayette Urban Ministry	\$50,000	Tippecanoe	4
ES-011-036	Mental Health America of Tippecanoe County	\$50,000	Tippecanoe	4
ES-011-002	Albion Fellows Bacon Center, Inc	\$15,904	Vanderburgh	12

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority..

Figure III-5. (CONTINUED)
ESG Awards by County, PY2011

Award Number	ESG Subrecipient	Total Budget	County	RPC
ES-011-014	Evansville Goodwill Industries, Inc	\$23,718	Vanderburgh	12
ES-011-026	House of Bread and Peace	\$36,560	Vanderburgh	12
ES-011-039	Ozanam Family Shelter Corporation	\$42,193	Vanderburgh	12
ES-011-054	YWCA of Evansville	\$44,667	Vanderburgh	12
ES-011-050	United Caring Shelters	\$46,445	Vanderburgh	12
ES-011-012	ECHO Housing Corporation	\$50,000	Vanderburgh	12
ES-011-011	Council on Domestic Abuse, Inc	\$9,695	Vigo	7
ES-011-006	Catholic Charities Terre Haute	\$33,240	Vigo	7
ES-011-040	Prisoner and Community Together	\$36,790	Washington	13a
ES-011-052	YWCA of Richmond	\$23,476	Wayne	9
ES-011-031	Interfaith Mission, Inc dba The Lighthouse	\$38,227	Whitley	3
Total Awarded		\$1,988,619		

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

SECTION IV.
Activities to Assist
Persons Living with HIV/AIDS

SECTION IV.

Activities to Assist Persons Living with HIV/AIDS

IHCDA administers the State's allocation of HOPWA. The HOPWA grant is one of the primary resources used for funding activities which benefit persons with HIV/AIDS in Indiana.

The purpose of HOPWA is to provide states and localities with the resources and incentives to devise long-term comprehensive strategies for meeting the housing and support services needs of low income persons and families of persons with AIDS and HIV-related diseases.

A broad range of housing-related activities may be funded under HOPWA, including, but not limited to: project or tenant based rental assistance; housing information and placement services; supportive services; short-term rent or mortgage payments to prevent homelessness; and technical assistance or funding for establishing/operating a community residence. Other supportive service funding allows individuals and families to access the resources needed to increase skills and income leading to independence and self-sufficiency and resulting moving people out of homelessness while also preventing it.

As a HOPWA formula grantee, IHCDA received \$1,113,823 for the 2011 program year. IHCDA contracts with HIV/AIDS care sites to administer the HOPWA program statewide.

Figure IV-1.
HOPWA Amounts Allocated, Committed and Drawn, PY2005-2011

HOPWA Fund Type	Grant Year	Amount of Allocation	Allocated to Administration	Committed to Activities	Net Drawn Amount	Available to Commit to Activities	Available to Draw
Entitlement	2005	\$806,000	\$67,707	\$738,293	\$738,293	\$0	\$0
	2006	\$818,000	\$64,370	\$753,630	\$753,630	\$0	\$0
	2007	\$822,000	\$1,758	\$820,242	\$820,242	\$0	\$0
	2008	\$863,000	\$115,240	\$747,760	\$747,760	\$0	\$0
	2009	\$892,730	\$26,781	\$843,415	\$791,039	\$22,534	\$74,910
	2010	\$971,314	\$29,139	\$942,175	\$917,262	\$0	\$24,913
	2011	\$1,113,823	\$29,139	\$1,084,684	\$924,143	\$0	\$160,541

Note: IDIS CO4PR01.

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

This section of the CAPER discusses how these funds were used to mitigate the housing, shelter and supportive service needs of the State's population with HIV/AIDS.

Geographic distribution. The State HOPWA grant covers all areas of the State except the counties of Boone, Hendricks, Johnson, Marion, Morgan, and Shelby counties; these counties receive their HOPWA allocations from the City of Indianapolis.

HIV/AIDS in Indiana

Total population. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), among the 50 States and the District of Columbia, Indiana ranked 23rd in total number of persons living with HIV (not AIDS) or AIDS at the end of 2007. Indiana’s estimated rate of persons living with HIV or AIDS was 75.2 per 100,000 people for HIV (not AIDS) and 76.9 per 100,000 for AIDS in 2007.

The Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH) also collects data on the number of HIV and AIDS cases reported and presumed living to monitor trends in the HIV/AIDS epidemic by processing HIV/AIDS case reports and conducting research. According to the 2010 semi-annual report HIV/STD Program Annual Report, there were 9,629 known persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) in Indiana at the end of 2010, a 4 percent increase over the number in 2008 (9,253). Additionally, ISDH reported 544 new HIV and AIDS cases were reported in Indiana during 2010.

The State has divided its service areas for people with HIV/AIDS into 12 geographic regions. As of December 2008, Region 1 (Gary) and Region 7 (Indianapolis) accounted for almost 60 percent of people living with HIV in Indiana. Figure IV-2 presents the number of people living with HIV by region as of December 2008.

**Figure IV-2.
Number Diagnosed
Persons with
HIV/AIDS by
Indiana County of
Residence at Time
of Report, 2008**

Source:
Indiana State Department of
Health, 2008 HIV/AIDS
Epidemiologic Data, Indiana.

Region	Number Diagnosed	Percent
1 Lake, LaPorte, Porter	1,344	14%
2 Elkhart, Fulton, Marshall, Pulaski, St. Joseph, Starke	636	7%
3 Adams, Allen, DeKalb, Huntington, Kosciusko, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben, Wabash, Wells, Whitley	617	7%
4 Benton, Carroll, Clinton, Fountain, Jasper, Montgomery, Newton, Tippecanoe, Warren, White	214	2%
5 Blackford, Delaware, Grant, Jay, Randolph	194	2%
6 Cass, Hamilton, Hancock, Howard, Madison, Miami, Tipton	547	6%
7 Boone, Hendricks, Johnson, Marion, Morgan, Shelby	4,107	44%
8 Clay, Parke, Putnam, Sullivan, Vermillion, Vigo	308	3%
9 Dearborn, Decatur, Fayette, Franklin, Henry, Ohio, Ripley, Rush, Union, Wayne	139	1%
10 Bartholomew, Brown, Greene, Lawrence, Monroe, Owen	295	3%
11 Clark, Crawford, Floyd, Harrison, Jackson, Jefferson, Jennings, Orange, Scott, Switzerland,	433	5%
12 Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Knox, Martin, Perry, Pike, Posey, Spencer, Vanderburgh, Warrick	422	5%
Total	9,282	100%

According to the 2008 HIV/AIDS Epidemiologic Data for Indiana, the majority of diagnosed persons are in the groups between 30 to 59 years of age. Additionally, the highest prevalence rates for HIV/AIDS are found for males among all racial and ethnic population groups. Among the diagnosed male population, Black males continue to be disproportionately represented. Their prevalence rate is five times the rate of White males, and almost three times the Hispanic male prevalence rate.

According to the *Indiana HIV/AIDS Housing Plan*, although AIDS originated in the metropolitan areas, the epidemic is quickly spreading to rural areas with constrained resources and often a lack of knowledge. In 1999, 6 percent of all new AIDS-related cases were in rural areas.

Outstanding need. Part of the *Indiana HIV/AIDS Housing Plan* study completed in 2003 included focus groups of people living with HIV/AIDS in Indiana. These focus groups cited housing affordability as the primary housing challenge. Other concerns noted by the focus group participants included the quality of housing that is affordable to them, the desire to live independently and confidentiality when accessing services. AIDS Housing of Washington also conducted a survey of 418 people living with HIV/AIDS throughout the State. Survey findings were as follows:

- Survey respondents had very low incomes;
- Many survey respondents received some housing assistance, but most still pay a large portion of their income for housing;
- Consistent with the preferences expressed, the majority of respondents lived alone and rented their homes;
- Behavioral health issues, such as mental health and substance abuse, affected a small but considerable percentage of people living with HIV/AIDS; and
- Many respondents had experienced homelessness.

The survey also collected income and cost burden data of respondents. Figure IV-3 summarizes median income, median housing costs and the cost burden of respondents by region.

**Figure IV-3.
Income and Cost
Burden of HIV/AIDS Survey
Respondents, 2001-2002**

Source:
AIDS Housing of Washington, Indiana
HIV/AIDS Housing Plan, February 2003.

Region	Median Income	Median Housing Costs	Cost Burden
Region 1 (Gary)	\$665	\$415	52%
Region 2 (South Bend)	\$597	\$371	54%
Region 3 (Fort Wayne)	\$601	\$398	52%
Region 4 (Lafayette)	\$653	\$309	52%
Region 5 (Muncie)	\$595	\$500	53%
Region 6 (Anderson)	\$787	\$467	38%
Region 7 (Indianapolis)	\$591	\$413	44%
Region 8 (Terre Haute)	\$551	\$513	78%
Region 9 (Richmond)	\$635	\$314	37%
Region 10 (Bloomington)	\$764	\$453	50%
Region 11 (Jeffersonville)	\$617	\$293	45%
Region 12 (Evansville)	\$598	\$350	43%

The *Indiana HIV/AIDS Housing Plan* reported there were 143 existing housing units for persons with HIV/AIDS in 2001 and 190 persons receiving long-term rental assistance with HOPWA dollars. Assuming the total number of persons with HIV/AIDS and a need for housing assistance is 2,276 (30 percent of the State's HIV/AIDS population), the State faces an outstanding need of over 2,086 housing units for persons with HIV and AIDS. Surveys indicate that among persons living with HIV/AIDS, most desire to live in single-family homes rather than apartments. The most desired types of housing subsidies are mortgage or rental assistance, followed by subsidized housing and units with some supportive services.

A report entitled *2008 Epidemiological Profile for HIV/AIDS in Indiana* completed for ISDH included results from a 2005 HIV Services Needs Assessment Survey conducted of clients receiving HIV services in Indiana. Respondents indicated which of the top five needs ISDH identified for people living with HIV was most important to them. Most respondents indicated that "Access to HIV Medications" and "Basic HIV Medical Care" were most important. Respondents also indicated other needs that are important to them; "Access to Specialty Services" and "Housing" were indicated as most important.

According to the Indiana Statewide Coordinated Statement of Need for FY 2009-2012, ISDH has recognized the following priority service areas: Outpatient and Ambulatory Health Services, AIDS Drug Assistance Program Treatments, Oral Health Care, Medical Case Management, Including Treatment and Adherence Services, Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse Outpatient Care, Emergency Financial Assistance, Housing, and Medical Transportation. These correspond with the core service areas established by the HRSA prior to the 2006 Ryan White reauthorization. ISDH also notes the importance of Transportation and Housing services.

Additionally the ISDH also calculates the approximate number of persons who are aware of their HIV-positive status but are not actively engaged in care. In 2008, approximately 40 percent of persons living with HIV/AIDS, or 3,544 persons, were not receiving care.

The co-occurrence of other special needs problems with HIV/AIDS can make some individuals even more difficult to house. For example, 10 percent of *Indiana HIV/AIDS Housing Plan* survey respondents indicated alcohol or drug use. Approximately 12 percent of HIV/AIDS survey respondents indicated mental health or psychiatric disability. Among people with mental illness, a high rate of infection is attributed to several factors such as social circumstances, psychopathology, medications and substance abuse. Persons with serious mental illness tend to cycle in and out of homelessness, affecting behaviors in ways not completely understood. Because of the frequent concurrence of substance abuse and mental illness with HIV/AIDS and the need for health care and other supportive services, many of those with HIV/AIDS can be very difficult to serve.¹

¹ *HIV, Homelessness, and Severe Mental Illness: Implications for Policy and Practice*, National Resource Center on Homelessness and Mental Illness.

Additionally, the study's Housing Plan Steering Committee, consumers, providers of HIV/AIDS services and survey respondents identified the following barriers to achieving and maintaining housing stability:

- Poor credit;
- Recent criminal history;
- Poor rental history, including prior eviction and money owed to property managers; and
- Active substance abuse.

According to the various caseworkers at the serving this population, these specific barriers have been reported to parallel to the challenges faced by the individuals they are serving. Many of the issues that HOPWA clients experience closely resemble the issues that those in poverty experience, but those with HIV/AIDS are facing additional health medical expense barriers.

HOPWA Program Accomplishments

This section discusses how HOPWA funds were allocated and the projects that were funded during the PY2011 in which IHCDA administered the grant.

Allocation of funds. As a HOPWA formula grantee, IHCDA received \$1,113,823 for the 2011 program year. IHCDA contracts with HIV/AIDS care sites to administer the HOPWA program statewide. Applications for HOPWA funds are accomplished via submission of an "Annual Plan" that details how respective care sites will administer the HOPWA program. IHCDA reserves the right and shall have the power to allocate funds irrespective of the annual plan submission, if such intended allocation is:

- In compliance with the applicable statutes;
- In furtherance of promoting affordable housing and homeless outreach; and
- Determined by IHCDA's Board of Directors to be in the interests of the citizens of the state of Indiana.

In order to ensure statewide access to HOPWA funds, IHCDA utilizes the ISDH HIV Care Coordination Regions. IHCDA has assigned a maximum funding amount available in each of the eleven regions of the state served by the Indiana HOPWA funds. HOPWA funds are allocated to the HOPWA Care Coordination Regions on a formula basis assigned by utilizing ISDH's most current epidemiological data showing the current number of reported HIV/AIDS cases in each county. Each Care Coordination Region receives their applicable amount of HOPWA funding based on the total number of reported HIV/AIDS cases in their service.

The following Figure lists the 2011 program year HOPWA funding amounts for each CoC Region.

**Figure IV-4.
HOPWA Funding Allocations by Regions, PY2011**

Region	Formula Allocation	Region	Formula Allocation
Region 1 Lake, LaPorte, Porter	\$256,986	Region 8 Clay, Parke, Sullivan, Vermillion, Vigo	\$47,326
Region 2 Elkhart, Fulton, Marshall, Pulaski, St. Joseph, Starke	\$120,400	Region 9* Decatur, Fayette, Henry, Ripley, Rush, Union,	
Region 3 Adams, Allen, DeKalb, Huntington, Kosciusko, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben, Wabash, Wells, Whitley	\$200,000	Region 10 Bartholomew, Greene, Lawrence, Monroe, Owen	\$96,986
Region 4* Benton, Carroll, Clinton, Fountain, Jasper, Montgomery, Newton, Tippecanoe, Warren, White		Region 11 Crawford, Jackson, Jefferson, Jennings, Orange, Switzerland	\$25,000
Region 5* Blackford, Delaware, Grant, Jay, Randolph		Region 12 Davies, Dubois, Gibson, Knox, Martin, Perry, Pike, Posey, Spencer, Vanderburgh, Warrick	\$182,000
Region 6* Cass, Howard, Madison, Miami, Tipton		*Regions 4, 5, 6, 9	\$ 155,986
		Total	\$1,084,684

Note: CO4PR02. The difference from the \$1.1 million allocated and the total in the chart above is \$29,000 of administrative funding.

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

For the 2011 HOPWA program year, a sponsor agency was selected in each of these regions, excluding Region 7 which receives their own direct HOPWA allocation. Of the 12 sponsor agencies selected, 9 were Care Coordination Sites which IHCDA hoped would increase the access of the clients enrolled in Care Coordination to HOPWA housing assistance and in turn connect clients enrolled in HOPWA assistance to Care Coordination Services and Medical Services. Of the three other sponsor agencies selected all worked closely with the Care Coordination Site for their Region, and one sponsor agency was selected to act as Short Term Supportive Housing.

IHCDA's goal for the HOPWA program is to reduce homelessness and increase housing stability for people living with HIV/AIDS and their families. Prospective project sponsors for the 2011 program year provided information on each program's ability to support this goal via submission of the annual plan.

Eligible activities — formula HOPWA allocation:

- Housing Information and Placement
- Rental Assistance (Tenant-Based Rental Assistance)
- Rental Assistance Program Delivery
- Long and Short-term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance
- Long and Short-term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance Program Delivery
- Supportive Services
- Operating Costs
- Technical Assistance
- Administration

Eligible applicants for 2011 HOPWA funds. HUD determines the composition of the Indiana EMSA for HOPWA. In PY2011, Indiana continued to work with the Cities of Indianapolis, Cincinnati and Louisville to ensure access for clients in all 92 counties.

Eligible sponsor applicants are nonprofit organization that meet following:

- Applicants must be a 501 (c) 3 or 501(c) 4 nonprofit agency and must include documentation of nonprofit status.
- Applicants do not have any unresolved IHCDA or HUD findings against the agency.
- Applicants have not had any state funds recaptured in the past.
- Any agency on the IHCDA Suspended List will not be awarded.
- All Grantees must have Internet access with e-mail availability.
- All Grantees must sign a contract/agreement with IHCDA.

Eligible beneficiaries:

- A person with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) or related diseases who is a low income individual as defined in 24 CFR Part 574.3, and the person's family.
- Beneficiaries must provide documentation of HIV/AIDS and low-income status prior to receiving HOPWA assistance.
- Beneficiaries must reside in Indiana.
- Services must be provided in Indiana

HOPWA assistance was used closely with referrals from local Continuum of Care Regional Housing Councils which was a direct result of the HOPWA agencies attending council meetings. Another result from the sponsors attending local council meetings has been the development of HOPWA Housing Coordinator position at three sponsor agencies whose main job functions are to be directly involved with the local council, emergency shelters, emergency rooms, jails and other places where the positive population enters the emergency systems that exist in our local communities.

HOPWA funds and expenditures. During PY2011, approximately \$924,142, or 83 percent, of the funded HOPWA awards were drawn. The following Figure reports the HOPWA funds that were available and the expenditures by type of activity for 2011.

IHCDA allocated 85 percent of the HOPWA program award to housing activities. For program year, the 2011 dollar amount and percentages by activity are shown in the following Figure.

**Figure IV-5.
HOPWA Funded Amounts
by Activity, PY2011**

Note:
IDIS CO4PR02.

Source:
Indiana Housing and Community Development
Authority.

	Activities Funded	Percent of Total
Long Term Rental Assistance	\$414,325	37%
Short-Term Rent, Mortgage & Utility Assistance	\$241,929	22%
Facility Operations	\$63,280	6%
Housing Information	\$209,380	19%
Short Term Supported Housing	\$52,380	5%
Permanent Housing Placement	\$31,900	3%
Long/Short Term Program Delivery	\$2,400	0%
Administration	\$98,228	9%
HOPWA Award Funding	\$1,113,822	100%

In order to ensure statewide access to HOPWA funds, IHCDA utilized ISDH HIV Care Coordination Regions. HOPWA funds were assigned by using ISDH's most current epidemiological data showing the number of reported HIV/AIDS cases in each county. The total number of cases per county was assigned a percentage in relation to the total number of reported HIV/AIDS cases in all of the counties served by the state EMSA. Each care coordination region received a percentage of the overall HOPWA allocation directly based upon the percentage of those living with HIV/AIDS in that region. The 2011 HOPWA funds were focused upon the provision of housing and housing related services to low income individuals with HIV/AIDS; the HOPWA fund distribution for all projects reflects this focus.

Figure IV-6 shows the counties served during the 2011 program year by HOPWA awards.

**Figure IV-6.
Counties Served by
HOPWA Awards, PY2011**

Source:
Indiana Housing and Community
Development Authority.

Counties — 74 counties served				
Adams	Elkhart	Knox	Owen	Switzerland
Allen	Fayette	Kosciusko	Parke	Tippecanoe
Bartholomew	Fountain	LaGrange	Perry	Tipton
Benton	Fulton	Lake	Pike	Union
Blackford	Gibson	LaPorte	Porter	Vanderburgh
Carroll	Grant	Lawrence	Posey	Vermillion
Cass	Greene	Madison	Pulaski	Vigo
Clay	Henry	Marshall	Randolph	Wabash
Clinton	Howard	Martin	Ripley	Warren
Crawford	Huntington	Miami	Rush	Warrick
Daviess	Jackson	Monroe	Spencer	Wayne
Decatur	Jasper	Montgomery	St. Joseph	Wells
DeKalb	Jay	Newton	Starke	White
Delaware	Jefferson	Noble	Steuben	Whitley
Dubois	Jennings	Orange	Sullivan	

Accomplishments. Indiana is divided into 12 HIV Care Coordination Regions covering all of Indiana's 92 counties. For the 2011 HOPWA program year a sponsor agency was selected in each of these regions, excluding Region 7 which receives their own direct HOPWA allocation. Of the 12 sponsor agencies selected, nine were Care Coordination Sites which IHCDA hoped would increase the access of the clients enrolled in Care Coordination to HOPWA housing assistance and in turn connect clients enrolled in HOPWA assistance to Care Coordination Services and Medical Services. Of the three other sponsor agencies selected all worked closely with the Care Coordination Site for their Region, and one sponsor agency was selected to act as Short Term Supportive Housing.

HOPWA assistance was used closely with referrals from local Continuum of Care Regional Housing Councils which was a direct result of the HOPWA agencies attending council meetings. Another result from the sponsors attending local council meetings has been the development of HOPWA Housing Coordinator position at three sponsor agencies whose main job functions are to be directly involved with the local council, emergency shelters, emergency rooms, jails and other places where the positive population enters the emergency systems that exist in our local communities.

Generally, HOPWA project sponsors met the overall goals and objectives outlined in the Consolidated Plan for the State of Indiana, as shown in the HOPWA Performance Planned Goal and Actual Outputs table, which appears at the end of this section.

Figure IV-7, on the following page, shows the awards made for PY2011.

**Figure IV-7.
HOPWA Funded Awards, PY2011**

Region	Grantee	Total Award Amount	Short-Term Supported Housing		Long-Term Rental Assistance		Short-Term Rent, Mortgage and/or Utility		Long and Short Term Program Delivery		Facility-Based Operations		Housing Information		Permanent Housing Placement		Administrative Funding	
			Award	Percent of Award	Award	Percent of Award	Award	Percent of Award	Award	Percent of Award	Awarded	Percent of Award	Award	Percent of Award	Award	Percent of Award	Awarded	Percent of Award
1	Aliveness Project	\$ 219,366	\$ 52,380	24%	\$ 116,584	53%	\$ 18,400	8%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 20,602	9%	\$ 3,000	1%	\$ 8,400	4%
1	Brothers Uplifting Brothers	\$ 37,620	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 27,720	74%	\$ 3,600	##	\$ 6,300	##
2	AIDS Ministries	\$ 120,400	\$ -	0%	\$ 46,950	39%	\$ 15,650	13%	\$ -	0%	\$ 25,280	21%	\$ 24,100	20%	\$ -	0%	\$ 8,420	7%
3	AIDS Task Force	\$ 200,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 70,000	35%	\$ 28,000	14%	\$ -	0%	\$ 38,000	19%	\$ 40,000	20%	\$ 10,000	5%	\$ 14,000	7%
8	Housing Authority of Terre Haute	\$ 47,326	\$ -	0%	\$ 18,745	40%	\$ 22,981	49%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 800	2%	\$ 2,000	4%	\$ 2,800	6%
10	Positive Link	\$ 96,986	\$ -	0%	\$ 31,559	33%	\$ 41,227	43%	\$ 2,400	2%	\$ -	0%	\$ 12,000	12%	\$ 5,300	5%	\$ 4,500	5%
11	Hoosier Hills AIDS Coalition	\$ 25,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 20,014	80%	\$ 3,236	13%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,750	7%
12	AIDS Resource Group	\$ 182,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 62,500	34%	\$ 48,500	27%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 51,000	28%	\$ 8,000	4%	\$ 12,000	7%
4, 5, 6, 9	Aspire	\$ 155,986	\$ -	0%	\$ 47,973	31%	\$ 63,936	41%		0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 33,158	21%	\$ -	0%	\$ 10,919	7%
	Total	\$ 1,084,684	\$ 52,380	5%	\$ 414,325	38%	\$ 241,930	22%	\$ 2,400	0%	\$ 63,280	6%	\$ 209,380	19%	\$ 31,900	3%	\$ 69,089	6%

Source: Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority.

Housing activities. As demonstrated in Figure IV-7, the activities receiving the most funding included long-term rental assistance, short-term assistance and housing information services. Together these activities account for about 80 percent of the PY2011 allocation.

HUD sets national housing stability program targets to be that 80 percent of HOPWA clients maintain housing stability, avoid homelessness and access care each year. Of the 220 clients who were assisted with short-term housing subsidies, just 28 (13%) were in “unstable” housing arrangements: that is, they were unsheltered, in a correctional facility or disconnected.

Other accomplishments. Indiana’s Technical assistance need is central to Housing Case Management. Agencies need assistance working with their care coordinators who are also tackling housing assistance to create good stable housing plans and provide housing case management in addition to the traditional case management.

During the program year, IHCDA provided oversight through on-site technical assistance visits, desktop technical assistance via telephone and e-mail. IHCDA also communicated policy changes and clarifications to project sponsors via HOPWA program memos. IHCDA’s website also contained a section on HOPWA and project sponsors were directed to visit the website for information.

Coordination

During the 2011 HOPWA program year, IHCDA maintained relationships with the Indiana HIV/AIDS community through involvement in the planning and the evaluation of activities, and of how well the State is meeting the needs of those persons living with HIV/AIDS.

IHCDA attended bi-monthly meetings of the Indiana Comprehensive HIV Services & Planning Advisory Council as well as participating in the evaluation committee.

IHCDA maintained relationships with the following organizations to continue to build access to mainstream housing and supportive service resources:

- Indiana AIDS Fund
- Indiana State Department of Health, Division of HIV/STD
- Indiana Planning Council on the Homeless
- Indiana Division of Mental Health and Addiction

As stated above, IHCDA has required all HOPWA sponsor agencies to be involved in their local planning council on the homeless and has invited any interested agencies to participate on the Statewide level. Agencies also had the opportunity to attend training on GoSection8 to register all assisted units on the database. In addition, agencies were invited to attend a SOAR train the trainer provided by Indiana Division of Mental Health and Addiction held at IHCDA’s offices.

Compliance

During the 2011 HOPWA program year, site visits were completed for four project sponsors and file monitorings were completed for two project sponsors, two thirds of the HOPWA project sponsors in the state. The future goal is to complete site monitoring of 80 percent of the project sponsors per program year. In addition, all project sponsors were monitored monthly.

All HOPWA program sponsors that are also Care Coordination sites were monitored during the 2011 program year by ISDH for the administration of Ryan White monies.

Barriers to Housing Choice

Barriers that were encountered by HOPWA project sponsors during the 2010 program year remained in the 2011 program year and consisted of the following:

- Discrimination/Confidentiality;
- Supportive services;
- Housing affordability;
- Credit history;
- Housing availability; and
- Rental history.

Specific examples of these barriers include:²

Discrimination/Confidentiality:

- We have had issues on this subject with our potential and current housing clients with some landlords. Whether the landlord found out accidentally or intentionally, including through someone the client knew, it lead in some cases to the client's name and HIV status being spread to other tenants in the rental apartments. In one case it lead to the landlord evicting a client.
- The primary concern for ARG clients is confidentiality and discrimination based on being HIV-positive. Clients are fearful that landlords and other tenants will find out their HIV status, and therefore deny them residency or out their status to others living nearby, including family members and other loved ones who are not aware of their status. It is for this reason that ARG staff must be discrete in all contact with clients in the program in order to maintain confidentiality.
- Region 8 still has discrimination and confidentiality issues that the clients face for employment and housing. This is addressed by working to educate the community agencies in understanding transmission of the disease and education on testing. THHA care coordination works with the local CAG and the PATH (Testing and Prevention Education.

Supportive Services:

- Because there are limited funds available for Supportive Services, and Aspire believes that the HOPWA program should follow a "housing first" operation, we have made applications to other funding sources to help meet the needs under this category. RFPs were submitted to Indiana AIDS Fund DEFA and MAC AIDS Fund food/nutrition programming. We are currently awaiting these award announcements. We plan to continue to search for other small community grants to help meet this need.

Housing Affordability:

- Housing affordability is another concern for clients seeking HOPWA subsidies. Although many clients are able to afford their portion of the rent while on subsidies, limited income (SSI, SSDI, unemployment or part-time work) may not be adequate for clients to maintain housing once

² This input from project sponsors was gathered during PY2010, but still remain current.

the subsidy ends. In addition, finding housing with utilities included is limited in southwestern Indiana, particularly outside of the Evansville metro area.

- Clients engaging in housing services with our agency statistically are comprised of individuals with very low income. Because of this low income along with other risk factors the clientele often have poor rental history as well as a criminal justice history. These two factors bring limitations to other public subsidy programs as well as other supportive services causing various financial strains on the household. Because of these limitations in access the HOPWA program becomes a mainstay of assistance possibilities for some clients.
- It is exceptionally difficult to obtain housing at or below FMR in our region due to increased rental cost as a result of the competition with university students for housing and very high utility allowance. It would be wonderful if we were able to utilize rent reasonableness.

Housing Availability:

- We continue to see a lack of safe and decent housing that will pass HQS inspections. They might be affordable under HOPWA FMRs and guidelines, but they will not pass the inspections. Conversely, it is not difficult to find housing that will pass the inspection, but, unfortunately they will be over FMRs and not affordable to our potential housing clients.

Rental History:

- Concerning the area of poor rental histories, every effort is made to ensure that clients have a clear understanding of the importance of following all leases and maintaining healthy relationship with landlords.

Trends in community. The trends that affect the needs of a person living with HIV/AIDS being able to have access to services and adequate housing, remains the burden placed on the agency when trying to explain to a landlord about federal subsidy without disclosing the status. IHCDA has also seen several organizations struggle with landlords whose corporations will not allow them to execute lease addendums or other accompanying paperwork.

A large trend IHCDA is seeing is with the undocumented population needing housing assistance and qualifying for HOPWA up to the point where they reveal to their care coordinator that they do not have adequate documentation. This is a barrier for these families and for the agencies trying to assist the clients.

Performance Measures

Please see the attached “HOPWA CAPER Measuring Performance Outcomes” form, which is required by HUD and provides additional detail about the HOPWA allocation and outcomes in PY2011.



Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (**CAPER**) Measuring Performance Outcomes

Final Released 1/12/12

OMB Number 2506-0133 (Expiration Date: 10/31/2014)

The CAPER report for HOPWA formula grantees provides annual information on program accomplishments that supports program evaluation and the ability to measure program beneficiary outcomes as related to: maintain housing stability; prevent homelessness; and improve access to care and support. This information is also covered under the Consolidated Plan Management Process (CPMP) report and includes Narrative Responses and Performance Charts required under the Consolidated Planning regulations. The public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 42 hours per manual response, or less if an automated data collection and retrieval system is in use, along with 60 hours for record keeping, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Grantees are required to report on the activities undertaken only, thus there may be components of these reporting requirements that may not be applicable. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number.

Overview. The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) provides annual performance reporting on client outputs and outcomes that enables an assessment of grantee performance in achieving the housing stability outcome measure. The CAPER, in conjunction with the Integrated Disbursement Information System (IDIS), fulfills statutory and regulatory program reporting requirements and provides the grantee and HUD with the necessary information to assess the overall program performance and accomplishments against planned goals and objectives.

HOPWA formula grantees are required to submit a CAPER, and complete annual performance information for all activities undertaken during each program year in the IDIS, demonstrating coordination with other Consolidated Plan resources. HUD uses the CAPER and IDIS data to obtain essential information on grant activities, project sponsors, Subrecipient organizations, housing sites, units and households, and beneficiaries (which includes racial and ethnic data on program participants). The Consolidated Plan Management Process tool (CPMP) provides an optional tool to integrate the reporting of HOPWA specific activities with other planning and reporting on Consolidated Plan activities.

Table of Contents

PART 1: Grantee Executive Summary

1. Grantee Information
2. Project Sponsor Information
3. Administrative Subrecipient Information
4. Program Subrecipient Information
5. Grantee Narrative and Performance Assessment
 - a. Grantee and Community Overview
 - b. Annual Performance under the Action Plan
 - c. Barriers or Trends Overview
 - d. Assessment of Unmet Housing Needs

PART 2: Sources of Leveraging and Program Income

1. Sources of Leveraging
2. Program Income and Resident Rent Payments

PART 3: Accomplishment Data: Planned Goals and Actual Outputs

PART 4: Summary of Performance Outcomes

1. Housing Stability: Permanent Housing and Related Facilities
2. Prevention of Homelessness: Short-Term Housing Payments
3. Access to Care and Support: Housing Subsidy Assistance with Supportive Services

PART 5: Worksheet - Determining Housing Stability Outcomes

PART 6: Annual Certification of Continued Use for HOPWA Facility-Based Stewardship Units (Only)

PART 7: Summary Overview of Grant Activities

- A. Information on Individuals, Beneficiaries and Households Receiving HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance (TBRA, STRMU, PHP, Facility Based Units, Master Leased Units ONLY)
- B. Facility-Based Housing Assistance

Continued Use Periods. Grantees that received HOPWA funding for new construction, acquisition, or substantial rehabilitations are required to operate their facilities for HOPWA-eligible beneficiaries for a ten (10) years period. If no further HOPWA funds are used to support the facility, in place of completing Section 7B of the CAPER, the grantee must submit an Annual Certification of Continued Project Operation throughout the required use periods. This certification is included in Part 6 in CAPER. The required use period is three (3) years if the rehabilitation is non-substantial.

In connection with the development of the Department’s standards for Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS), universal data elements are being collected for clients of HOPWA-funded homeless assistance projects. These project sponsor/subrecipient records would include: Name, Social Security Number, Date of Birth, Ethnicity and Race, Gender, Veteran Status, Disabling Conditions, Residence Prior to Program Entry, Zip Code of Last Permanent Address, Housing Status, Program Entry Date, Program Exit Date, Personal Identification Number, and Household Identification Number. These are intended to match the elements under HMIS. The HOPWA program-level data elements include: Income and Sources, Non-Cash Benefits, HIV/AIDS Status, Services Provided, and Housing Status or Destination at the end of the operating year. Other suggested but optional elements are: Physical Disability, Developmental Disability, Chronic Health Condition, Mental Health, Substance Abuse, Domestic Violence, Date of Contact, Date of Engagement, Financial Assistance, Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services, Employment, Education, General Health Status, , Pregnancy Status, Reasons for Leaving,

Veteran’s Information, and Children’s Education. Other HOPWA projects sponsors may also benefit from collecting these data elements.

Final Assembly of Report. After the entire report is assembled, please number each page sequentially.

Filing Requirements. Within 90 days of the completion of each program year, grantees must submit their completed CAPER to the CPD Director in the grantee’s State or Local HUD Field Office, and to the HOPWA Program Office: at HOPWA@hud.gov. Electronic submission to HOPWA Program office is preferred; however, if electronic submission is not possible, hard copies can be mailed to: Office of HIV/AIDS Housing, Room 7212, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C.

Record Keeping. Names and other individual information must be kept confidential, as required by 24 CFR 574.440. However, HUD reserves the right to review the information used to complete this report for grants management oversight purposes, except for recording any names and other identifying information. **In the case that HUD must review client level data, no client names or identifying information will be retained or recorded. Information is reported in aggregate to HUD without personal identification. Do not submit client or personal information in data systems to HUD.**

Definitions

Adjustment for Duplication: Enables the calculation of unduplicated output totals by accounting for the total number of households or units that received more than one type of HOPWA assistance in a given service category such as HOPWA Subsidy Assistance or Supportive Services. For example, if a client household received both TBRA and STRMU during the operating year, report that household in the category of HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance in Part 3, Chart 1, Column [1b] in the following manner:

HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance		[1] Outputs: Number of Households
1.	Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	1
2a.	Permanent Housing Facilities: Received Operating Subsidies/Leased units	
2b.	Transitional/Short-term Facilities: Received Operating Subsidies	
3a.	Permanent Housing Facilities: Capital Development Projects placed in service during the operating year	
3b.	Transitional/Short-term Facilities: Capital Development Projects placed in service during the operating year	
4.	Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility Assistance	1
5.	Adjustment for duplication (subtract)	1
6.	TOTAL Housing Subsidy Assistance (Sum of Rows 1-4 minus Row 5)	1

Administrative Costs: Costs for general management, oversight, coordination, evaluation, and reporting. By statute, grantee administrative costs are limited to 3% of total grant award, to be expended over the life of the grant. Project sponsor administrative costs are limited to 7% of the portion of the grant amount they receive.

Beneficiary(ies): All members of a household who received HOPWA assistance during the operating year including the one individual who qualified the household for HOPWA assistance as well as any other members of the household (with or without HIV) who benefitted from the assistance.

Central Contractor Registration (CCR): The primary registrant database for the U.S. Federal Government. CCR collects, validates, stores, and disseminates data in support of agency acquisition missions, including Federal agency contract and assistance awards. Both current and potential federal government registrants (**grantees**) are required to register in CCR in order to be awarded contracts by the federal government. Registrants must update or renew their registration at least once per year to maintain an active status. Although recipients of direct federal contracts and grant awards have been required to be registered with CCR since 2003, this requirement is now being extended to indirect recipients of federal funds with the passage of ARRA (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act). Per ARRA and FFATA (Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act) federal regulations, all **grantees** and sub-grantees or subcontractors receiving federal grant awards or contracts must have a DUNS (Data Universal Numbering System) Number.

Chronically Homeless Person: An individual or family who : (i) is homeless and lives or resides individual or family who: (i) Is homeless and lives or resides in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter; (ii) has been homeless and living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter continuously for at least 1 year or on at least 4 separate occasions in the last 3 years; and (iii) has an adult head of household (or a minor head of household if no adult is present in the household) with a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability (as defined in section 102 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002)), post traumatic stress disorder, cognitive impairments resulting from a brain injury, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of 2 or more of those conditions. Additionally, the statutory definition includes as chronically homeless a person who currently lives or resides in an institutional care facility, including a jail, substance abuse or mental health treatment facility, hospital or other similar facility, and has resided there for fewer than 90 days if such person met the other criteria for homeless prior to entering that facility. (See 42 U.S.C. 11360(2)) This does not include doubled-up or overcrowding situations.

Disabling Condition: Evidencing a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, chronic physical illness, or disability, including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions. In addition, a disabling condition may limit an individual's ability to work or perform one or more activities of daily living. An HIV/AIDS diagnosis is considered a disabling condition.

Facility-Based Housing Assistance: All eligible HOPWA Housing expenditures for or associated with supporting facilities including community residences, SRO dwellings, short-term facilities, project-based rental units, master leased units, and other housing facilities approved by HUD.

Faith-Based Organization: Religious organizations of three types: (1) congregations; (2) national networks, which include national denominations, their social service arms (for example, Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services), and networks of related organizations (such as YMCA and YWCA); and (3) freestanding religious organizations, which are incorporated separately from congregations and national networks.

Grassroots Organization: An organization headquartered in the local community where it provides services; has a social services budget of \$300,000 or less annually, and six or fewer full-time equivalent employees. Local affiliates of national organizations are not considered "grassroots."

HOPWA Eligible Individual: The one (1) low-income person with HIV/AIDS who qualifies a household for HOPWA assistance. This person may be considered "Head of Household." When the CAPER asks for information on eligible individuals, report on this individual person only. Where there is more than one person with HIV/AIDS in the household, the additional PWH/A(s), would be considered a beneficiary(s).

HOPWA Housing Information Services: Services dedicated to helping persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families to identify, locate, and acquire housing. This may also include fair housing counseling for eligible persons who may encounter discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, familial status, or handicap/disability.

HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance Total: The unduplicated number of households receiving housing subsidies (TBRA, STRMU, Permanent Housing Placement services and Master Leasing) and/or residing in units of facilities dedicated to persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families and supported with HOPWA funds during the operating year.

Household: A single individual or a family composed of two or more persons for which household incomes are used to determine eligibility and for calculation of the resident rent payment. The term is used for collecting data on changes in income, changes in access to services, receipt of housing information services, and outcomes on achieving housing stability. Live-In Aides (see definition for Live-In Aide) and non-beneficiaries (e.g. a shared housing arrangement with a roommate) who resided in the unit are not reported on in the CAPER.

Housing Stability: The degree to which the HOPWA project assisted beneficiaries to remain in stable housing during the operating year. See *Part 5: Determining Housing Stability Outcomes* for definitions of stable and unstable housing situations.

In-kind Leveraged Resources: These involve additional types of support provided to assist HOPWA beneficiaries such as volunteer services, materials, use of equipment and building space. The actual value of the support can be the contribution of professional services, based on customary rates for this specialized support, or actual costs contributed from other leveraged resources. In determining a rate for the contribution of volunteer time and services, use the rate established in HUD notices, such as the rate of ten dollars per hour. The value of any donated material, equipment, building, or lease should be based on the fair market value at time of donation. Related documentation can be from recent bills of sales, advertised prices, appraisals, or other information for comparable property similarly situated.

Leveraged Funds: The amount of funds expended during the operating year from non-HOPWA federal, state, local, and private sources by grantees or sponsors in dedicating assistance to this client population. Leveraged funds or other assistance are used directly in or in support of HOPWA program delivery.

Live-In Aide: A person who resides with the HOPWA Eligible Individual and who meets the following criteria: (1) is essential to the care and well-being of the person; (2) is not obligated for the support of the person; and (3) would not be living in the unit except to provide the necessary supportive services. See *the Code of Federal Regulations Title 24, Part 5.403 and the HOPWA Grantee Oversight Resource Guide for additional reference.*

Master Leasing: Applies to a nonprofit or public agency that leases units of housing (scattered-sites or entire buildings) from a landlord, and subleases the units to homeless or low-income tenants. By assuming the tenancy burden, the agency facilitates housing of clients who may not be able to maintain a lease on their own due to poor credit, evictions, or lack of sufficient income.

Operating Costs: Applies to facility-based housing only, for facilities that are currently open. Operating costs can include day-to-day housing function and operation costs like utilities, maintenance, equipment, insurance, security, furnishings, supplies and salary for staff costs directly

related to the housing project but not staff costs for delivering services.

Outcome: The degree to which the HOPWA assisted household has been enabled to establish or maintain a stable living environment in housing that is safe, decent, and sanitary, (per the regulations at 24 CFR 574.310(b)) and to reduce the risks of homelessness, and improve access to HIV treatment and other health care and support.

Output: The number of units of housing or households that receive HOPWA assistance during the operating year.

Permanent Housing Placement: A supportive housing service that helps establish the household in the housing unit, including but not limited to reasonable costs for security deposits not to exceed two months of rent costs.

Program Income: Gross income directly generated from the use of HOPWA funds, including repayments. See grant administration requirements on program income for state and local governments at 24 CFR 85.25, or for non-profits at 24 CFR 84.24.

Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA): A rental subsidy program that is tied to specific facilities or units owned or controlled by a project sponsor or Subrecipient. Assistance is tied directly to the properties and is not portable or transferable.

Project Sponsor Organizations: Any nonprofit organization or governmental housing agency that receives funds under a contract with the grantee to provide eligible housing and other support services or administrative services as defined in 24 CFR 574.300. Project Sponsor organizations are required to provide performance data on households served and funds expended. Funding flows to a project sponsor as follows:

HUD Funding → Grantee → Project Sponsor

Short-Term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility (STRMU) Assistance: A time-limited, housing subsidy assistance designed to prevent homelessness and increase housing stability. Grantees may provide assistance for up to 21 weeks in any 52 week period. The amount of assistance varies per client depending on funds available, tenant need and program guidelines.

Stewardship Units: Units developed with HOPWA, where HOPWA funds were used for acquisition, new construction and rehabilitation that no longer receive operating subsidies from HOPWA. Report information for the units is subject to the three-year use agreement if rehabilitation is non-substantial and to the ten-year use agreement if rehabilitation is substantial.

Subrecipient Organization: Any organization that receives funds from a project sponsor to provide eligible housing and other support services and/or administrative services as defined in 24 CFR 574.300. If a subrecipient organization provides housing and/or other supportive services directly to clients, the subrecipient organization must provide performance data on household served and funds expended. Funding flows to subrecipients as follows:

HUD Funding → Grantee → Project Sponsor → Subrecipient

Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA): TBRA is a rental subsidy program similar to the Housing Choice Voucher program that grantees can provide to help low-income households access affordable housing. The TBRA voucher is not tied to a specific unit, so tenants may move to a different unit without losing their assistance, subject to individual program rules. The subsidy amount is determined in part based on household income and rental costs associated with the tenant's lease.

Transgender: Transgender is defined as a person who identifies with, or presents as, a gender that is different from his/her gender at birth.

Veteran: A veteran is someone who has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States. This does not include inactive military reserves or the National Guard unless the person was called up to active duty.

Housing Opportunities for Person with AIDS (HOPWA) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) Measuring Performance Outputs and Outcomes

OMB Number 2506-0133 (Expiration Date: 10/31/2014)

Part 1: Grantee Executive Summary

As applicable, complete the charts below to provide more detailed information about the agencies and organizations responsible for the administration and implementation of the HOPWA program. Chart 1 requests general Grantee Information and Chart 2 is to be completed for each organization selected or designated as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. In Chart 3, indicate each subrecipient organization with a contract/agreement of \$25,000 or greater that assists grantees or project sponsors carrying out their administrative or evaluation activities. In Chart 4, indicate each subrecipient organization with a contract/agreement to provide HOPWA-funded services to client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Funding and Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definition section for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A. Do not leave any section blank.

1. Grantee Information

HUD Grant Number INH11F999		Operating Year for this report <i>From (mm/dd/yy)</i> 07/01/2011 <i>To (mm/dd/yy)</i> 06/30/2012		
Grantee Name Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority				
Business Address		30 S Meridian St, Ste 1000		
City, County, State, Zip		Indianapolis	Marion	IN 46204
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)		35-1485172		
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):		086870479	Central Contractor Registration (CCR): Is the grantee's CCR status currently active? x Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, provide CCR Number: 086870479	
*Congressional District of Grantee's Business Address		7		
*Congressional District of Primary Service Area(s)		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9		
*City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)		Cities: All		Counties: All
Organization's Website Address http://www.in.gov/ihcda		Is there a waiting list(s) for HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance Services in the Grantee service Area? x Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section what services maintain a waiting list and how this list is administered. Wait list is operated on a first-come, first-serve basis as long as clients are eligible to receive the assistance for which the waiting list is maintained. Other subsidies such as Shelter + Care or other partnerships are used whenever possible to house individuals who are waiting to receive HOPWA assistance.		

* Service delivery area information only needed for program activities being directly carried out by the grantee.

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name AIDS Ministries/AIDS Assist of North Indiana		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency	Leeah Hopper, Director of Client Services		
Email Address	lhopper@aidsministries.org		
Business Address	201 S William St		
City, County, State, Zip,	South Bend, St. Joseph, IN 46601		
Phone Number (with area code)	574-234-2870		
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	35-1902136	Fax Number (with area code) 574-232-2872	
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNS):	793023276		
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address	2		
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)	2		
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)	Cities: South Bend, Elkhart, Plymouth, Mishawaka, Knox	Counties: St. Joseph, Elkhart, Marshall, Starke, Pulaski, Fulton	
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year	\$120,400.00		
Organization's Website Address	http://www.aidsministries.org		
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered. AIDS ministries in Region 2 gave priority to allow literally homeless or imminently homeless individuals to move to the top of the waiting list. Other subsidies such as Shelter + Care or other partnerships were used whenever possible to house individuals who were waiting to receive HOPWA assistance.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and sub recipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name AIDS Resource Group		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency		Brian Revalee, Executive Director	
Email Address		brevalee@argevansville.org	
Business Address		201 NW Fourth St, Ste B7	
City, County, State, Zip,		Evansville, Vanderburgh, IN 47708	
Phone Number (with area code)		812-421-0059	
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)		35-1834665	Fax Number (with area code) 812-424-9059
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):		827745647	
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address		8	
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)		8, 9	
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)		Cities: Evansville, Tell City, Vincennes, Jasper, Mount Vernon, Loogootee	Counties: Posey, Vanderburgh, Warrick, Spencer, Perry, Clinton, Pike, DuBois, Martin, Daviess, Knox
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year		\$182,000.00	
Organization's Website Address http://www.argevansville.org			
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Please check if yes and a faith-based organization. <input type="checkbox"/> Please check if yes and a grassroots organization. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered. Wait list is operated on a first-come, first-serve basis as long as clients are eligible to receive the assistance for which the waiting list is maintained. Other subsidies such as Shelter + Care or other partnerships are used whenever possible to house individuals who are waiting to receive HOPWA assistance.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name AIDS Task Force, Inc		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency	Sara Siefert, Housing Coordinator		
Email Address	sara@aidsfortwayne.org		
Business Address	525 Oxford St		
City, County, State, Zip,	Fort Wayne, Allen, IN 46806		
Phone Number (with area code)	260-744-1144		
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	31-1191147	Fax Number (with area code) 260-745-0978	
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):	196314459		
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address	3		
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)	3, 5, 6		
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)	Cities: Fort Wayne, Warsaw, Wabash, Huntington, Auburn, Angola	Counties: Allen, Adams, Wells, Huntington, Wabash, Kosciusko, Noble, DeKalb, Steuben, LaGrange, Whitley	
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year	\$200,000.00		
Organization's Website Address	http://www.aidsfortwayne.org		
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name AIDS Task Force of Laporte & Porter, Inc		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency	Tammy Morris, Executive Director		
Email Address	tmorrisap@aol.com		
Business Address	5490 Broadway, Ste L3		
City, County, State, Zip,	Merrillville, Lake, IN 46410		
Phone Number (with area code)	219-985-6150		
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	351785024	Fax Number (with area code) 219-985-6097	
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):	800678740		
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address	1		
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)	1, 2		
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)	Cities: Gary, Merrillville, Hammond, East Chicago, Valparaiso, Michigan City	Counties: Lake, LaPorte, Porter	
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year	\$166,986.00		
Organization's Website Address	N/A		
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered. Wait list is operated on a first-come, first-serve basis as long as clients are eligible to receive the assistance for which the waiting list is maintained. Other subsidies such as Shelter + Care or other partnerships are used whenever possible to house individuals who are waiting to receive HOPWA assistance.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name Brothers Uplifting Brothers		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency		Anthony Gillespie, Executive Director	
Email Address		tgillespie@bubnwi.com	
Business Address		6111 Harrison St, Ste 346	
City, County, State, Zip,		Merrillville, Lake, IN 46410	
Phone Number (with area code)		219-985-2008	
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)		35-2086892	Fax Number (with area code) 219-887-1518
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):		65841822	
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address		1	
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)		1	
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)		Cities: Gary, Merrillville	Counties: Lake
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year		\$90,000.00	
Organization's Website Address		http://www.bubnwi.com	
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered. Wait list is operated on a first-come, first-serve basis as long as clients are eligible to receive the assistance for which the waiting list is maintained. Other subsidies such as Shelter + Care or other partnerships are used whenever possible to house individuals who are waiting to receive HOPWA assistance.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name Aspire Indiana		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency	Melissa Stayton, Director of Strategic Initiatives		
Email Address	Melissa.stayton@aspireindiana.org		
Business Address	9615 E 148 th St, Ste 1		
City, County, State, Zip,	Noblesville, Hamilton, IN 46060		
Phone Number (with area code)	317-587-0512		
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	35-13341204	Fax Number (with area code) 765-552-8347	
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):	121585822		
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address	5		
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)	4, 5, 6		
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)	Cities: Lafayette, Anderson, Muncie, Richmond	Counties: Tippecanoe, Madison, Delaware, Wayne	
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year	\$155,986.04		
Organization's Website Address	http://www.aspireindiana.org		
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name Hoosier Hills AIDS Coalition		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency	Dorothy Waterhouse, Treasurer		
Email Address	dwaterhouse@cchdaids.win.net		
Business Address	1301 Akers Ave		
City, County, State, Zip,	Jeffersonville, Clark, IN 47130		
Phone Number (with area code)	812-288-2706		
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	35-1987528	Fax Number (with area code) 812-288-1474	
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):	5376940		
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address	9		
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)	9		
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)	Cities: Paoli, Seymour, Scottsburg, Madison	Counties: Orange, Jackson, Jennings, Crawford, Scott, Jefferson	
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year	\$25,000.00		
Organization's Website Address	N/A		
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name Housing Authority of the City of Terre Haute		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency		Kelli Fuller, Resident and Community Services Coordinator	
Email Address		kfuller@terrehautehousing.org	
Business Address		PO Box 3086	
City, County, State, Zip,		Terre Haute, Vigo, IN 47903	
Phone Number (with area code)		812-232-1381	
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)		35-6007274	Fax Number (with area code) 812-234-2386
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):		50349430	
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address		8	
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)		8	
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)		Cities: Terre Haute, Brazil, Clinton, Sullivan, Rockville	Counties: Vigo, Clay, Sullivan, Vermillion, Parke
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year		\$47,326.00	
Organization's Website Address http://www.terrehautehousing.org			
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/>		Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered.	

2. Project Sponsor Information

Please complete Chart 2 for each organization designated or selected to serve as a project sponsor, as defined by CFR 574.3. Use this section to report on organizations involved in the direct delivery of services for client households. These elements address requirements in the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Project Sponsor Agency Name Indiana University Health Positive Link		Parent Company Name, if applicable N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Project Sponsor Agency	Jill Stowers, Clinical Lead Manager		
Email Address	jstowers@iuhealth.org		
Business Address	333 E Miller Dr		
City, County, State, Zip,	Bloomington, Monroe, IN 47401		
Phone Number (with area code)	812-353-3250		
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	35-1720796	Fax Number (with area code) 812-353-3226	
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):	072052137		
Congressional District of Project Sponsor's Business Address	9		
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area(s)	4, 8, 9		
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area(s)	Cities: Bloomington, Columbus, Bedford, Spencer	Counties: Monroe, Owen, Lawrence, Bartholomew, Greene	
Total HOPWA contract amount for this Organization for the operating year	\$96,986.09		
Organization's Website Address	http://www.iuhealthbloomington.org		
Is the sponsor a nonprofit organization? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Please check if yes and a faith-based organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please check if yes and a grassroots organization.</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	Does your organization maintain a waiting list? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, explain in the narrative section how this list is administered.		

3. Administrative Subrecipient Information

Use Chart 3 to provide the following information for each subrecipient with a contract/agreement of \$25,000 or greater that assists project sponsors to carry out their administrative services but no services directly to client households. Agreements include: grants, subgrants, loans, awards, cooperative agreements, and other forms of financial assistance; and contracts, subcontracts, purchase orders, task orders, and delivery orders. (Organizations listed may have contracts with project sponsors) These elements address requirements in the Federal Funding and Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Note: Please see the definitions for distinctions between project sponsor and subrecipient.

Note: If any information does not apply to your organization, please enter N/A.

Subrecipient Name	N/A			Parent Company Name, if applicable
	N/A			
Name and Title of Contact at Subrecipient	N/A			
Email Address	N/A			
Business Address	N/A			
City, State, Zip, County	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Phone Number (with area code)	N/A			Fax Number (include area code)
	N/A			
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	N/A			
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs):	N/A			
North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code	N/A			
Congressional District of Subrecipient's Business Address	N/A			
Congressional District of Primary Service Area	N/A			
City (ies) and County (ies) of Primary Service Area(s)	Cities: N/A			Counties: N/A
Total HOPWA Subcontract Amount of this Organization for the operating year	N/A			

4. Program Subrecipient Information

Complete the following information for each subrecipient organization providing HOPWA-funded services to client households. These organizations would hold a contract/agreement with a project sponsor(s) to provide these services. For example, a subrecipient organization may receive funds from a project sponsor to provide nutritional services for clients residing within a HOPWA facility-based housing program. Please note that subrecipients who work directly with client households must provide performance data for the grantee to include in Parts 2-7 of the CAPER.

Note: Please see the definition of a subrecipient for more information.

Note: Types of contracts/agreements may include: grants, sub-grants, loans, awards, cooperative agreements, and other forms of financial assistance; and contracts, subcontracts, purchase orders, task orders, and delivery orders.

Note: If any information is not applicable to the organization, please report N/A in the appropriate box. Do not leave boxes blank.

Sub-recipient Name	N/A		Parent Company Name, if applicable	
			N/A	
Name and Title of Contact at Contractor/ Sub-contractor Agency	N/A			
Email Address	N/A			
Business Address	N/A			
City, County, State, Zip	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Phone Number (included area code)	N/A		Fax Number (include area code)	
			N/A	
Employer Identification Number (EIN) or Tax Identification Number (TIN)	N/A			
DUN & Bradstreet Number (DUNs)	N/A			
North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code	N/A			
Congressional District of the Sub-recipient's Business Address	N/A			
Congressional District(s) of Primary Service Area	N/A			
City(ies) and County(ies) of Primary Service Area	Cities: N/A		Counties: N/A	
Total HOPWA Subcontract Amount of this Organization for the operating year	N/A			

5. Grantee Narrative and Performance Assessment

a. Grantee and Community Overview

Provide a one to three page narrative summarizing major achievements and highlights that were proposed and completed during the program year. Include a brief description of the grant organization, area of service, the name(s) of the program contact(s), and an overview of the range/type of housing activities provided. This overview may be used for public information, including posting on HUD's website. *Note: Text fields are expandable.*

The Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority (IHCDA) is the HOPWA grantee for an area known as the "balance of state" in Indiana. The state is divided into 12 HIV care coordination regions by the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH), and HOPWA funds are distributed by IHCDA to sponsor agencies within those regions to ensure that all areas of the state have HOPWA assistance available to them. Each HOPWA sponsor is also an ISDH HIV care coordination site. Sponsors were selected by a request for proposals process that solicited applications from care coordination sites. HOPWA awards were determined by a combination of the application's requested budget and proposed activities, ISDH-published HIV/AIDS epidemiology reports, and IHCDA's discretion. Activities that were funded by IHCDA in 2011-2012 included long-term rental assistance; short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance; facility-based housing assistance; permanent housing placement services; housing information services; and administration.

A summary of each region and its sponsor agency is listed below. Please note that Region 7, consisting of Boone, Hendricks, Morgan, Marion, Johnson, and Shelby counties, and its sponsor agencies do not receive HOPWA funds from IHCDA and instead receive them from the City of Indianapolis.

REGION 1

Counties Served: Lake, Porter, LaPorte

Sponsor Agency: AIDS Task Force of Porter and LaPorte County, Inc, dba The Aliveness Project

2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$166,986.00

Sponsor Agency: Brothers Uplifting Brothers (ceased operations 1/31/2012)

2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$90,000.00

REGION 2

Counties Served: St. Joseph, Elkhart, Starke, Marshall, Pulaski, Fulton

Sponsor Agency: AIDS Ministries/AIDS Assist of North Indiana, Inc

2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$120,400.00

REGION 3

Counties Served: LaGrange, Steuben, Kosciusko, Noble, DeKalb, Whitley, Allen, Wabash, Huntington, Wells, Adams

Sponsor Agency: AIDS Task Force, Inc.

2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$200,000.00

REGIONS 4, 5, 6, and 9

Counties Served (Region 4): Newton, Jasper, Benton, White, Carroll, Warren, Tippecanoe, Clinton, Fountain, Montgomery

Counties Served (Region 5): Grant, Blackford, Jay, Delaware, Randolph

Counties Served (Region 6): Cass, Miami, Howard, Tipton, Hamilton, Madison, Hancock

Counties Served (Region 9): Henry, Wayne, Rush, Fayette, Union, Decatur, Franklin, Ripley, Dearborn, Ohio

Sponsor Agency: Aspire Indiana

2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$155,986.04

REGION 8

Counties Served: Vermillion, Parke, Putnam, Vigo, Clay, Sullivan
Sponsor Agency: Housing Authority of the City of Terre Haute
2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$47,326.00

REGION 10

Counties Served: Owen, Greene, Monroe, Lawrence, Brown, Bartholomew
Sponsor Agency: Indiana University Health Positive Link
2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$96,986.09

REGION 11

Counties Served: Jackson, Jennings, Orange, Washington, Scott, Jefferson, Switzerland, Crawford, Harrison, Floyd, Clark
Sponsor Agency: Hoosier Hills AIDS Coalition
2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$25,000.00

REGION 12

Counties Served: Knox, Daviess, Martin, Gibson, Pike, Dubois, Posey, Vanderburgh, Warrick, Spencer, Perry
Sponsor Agency: AIDS Resource Group, Inc.
2011-2012 HOPWA Award: \$182,000.00

b. Annual Performance under the Action Plan

Provide a narrative addressing each of the following four items:

1. Outputs Reported. Describe significant accomplishments or challenges in achieving the number of housing units supported and the number households assisted with HOPWA funds during this operating year compared to plans for this assistance, as approved in the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan. Describe how HOPWA funds were distributed during your program year among different categories of housing and geographic areas to address needs throughout the grant service area, consistent with approved plans.

In 2011-2012, IHCDA HOPWA sponsors assisted 369 individual households with housing subsidy assistance, of which 110 received tenant-based rental assistance; 15 received permanent housing facility-based assistance; 16 received transitional housing facility-based assistance; 220 received short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance; and 30 received permanent housing placement services. 22 households received two or more of these services. Additionally, 343 households received housing information services. Funds spent totaled \$361,603.15 on tenant-based rental assistance; \$27,301.67 on permanent housing facility-based assistance; \$33,784.04 on transitional housing facility-based assistance; \$211,311.32 on short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance; and \$17,408.00 on permanent housing placement services. \$182,995.46 was spent on housing information services, \$63,517.56 was spent by sponsors for program administration, and \$26,221.33 was spent by IHCDA for program administration.

2. Outcomes Assessed. Assess your program's success in enabling HOPWA beneficiaries to establish and/or better maintain a stable living environment in housing that is safe, decent, and sanitary, and improve access to care. Compare current year results to baseline results for clients. Describe how program activities/projects contributed to meeting stated goals. If program did not achieve expected targets, please describe how your program plans to address challenges in program implementation and the steps currently being taken to achieve goals in next operating year. If your program exceeded program targets, please describe strategies the program utilized and how those contributed to program successes.

Of all households assisted with housing subsidy assistance, only a very small number exited the program into unstable arrangements. For those receiving tenant-based rental assistance, only 4 individuals exited

into unstable arrangements. For those receiving short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance, 28 exited the program into unstable arrangements. For those receiving facility-based housing assistance, 0 exited into unstable arrangements. Additionally, two HOPWA sponsors participated in a pilot program to promote greater housing stability: AIDS Task Force (ATF) of Region 3 and AIDS Resource Group (ARG) of Region 12. This pilot program allowed the use of housing information services funds to provide a dedicated staff member to assist HOPWA-eligible persons in finding and maintaining quality stable housing.

ATF had no recipients of any kind of housing subsidy assistance exit their program into unstable arrangements and only 2 of their long-term rental assistance recipients exited into temporarily stable conditions. ARG had 2 tenants exit long-term rental assistance into unstable arrangements, however, every other person who was assisted in all programs exited into stable arrangements. It will take more time to see if this pilot program allows more stable arrangements for those exiting the HOPWA program, but at first glance, the program seems to be effective.

3. Coordination. Report on program coordination with other mainstream housing and supportive services resources, including the use of committed leveraging from other public and private sources that helped to address needs for eligible persons identified in the Consolidated Plan/Strategic Plan.

In 2011-2012, HOPWA sponsors leveraged \$1,734,110.40, which is over 100% of HOPWA assistance. The most significant source of assistance came from the Ryan White program, with sponsors receiving \$430,000 in funds to administer case management to HOPWA recipients. This in combination with a variety of other programs and grants enabled sponsors to provide necessary support to IHCD's budgeted HOPWA activities. Because IHCD did not fund supportive services, they were provided by leveraged sources.

4. Technical Assistance. Describe any program technical assistance needs and how they would benefit program beneficiaries.

Only one sponsor reported a need for technical assistance, and this was reported as needing information on "changes to the program." IHCD provided a webinar for all sponsors on June 25th, 2012 to provide updates on the minor organizational and programming changes that occurred from the 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 grant years.

c. Barriers and Trends Overview

Provide a narrative addressing items 1 through 3. Explain how barriers and trends affected your program's ability to achieve the objectives and outcomes discussed in the previous section.

1. Describe any barriers (including regulatory and non-regulatory) encountered in the administration or implementation of the HOPWA program, how they affected your program's ability to achieve the objectives and outcomes discussed, and, actions taken in response to barriers, and recommendations for program improvement. Provide an explanation for each barrier selected.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HOPWA/HUD Regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Availability | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rent Determination and Fair Market Rents |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discrimination/Confidentiality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple Diagnoses | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eligibility | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Assistance or Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit History | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rental History | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criminal Justice History |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Affordability | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography/Rural Access | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please explain further | |

The primary barrier listed by most sponsor organizations was continued stigmatization and discrimination of the HIV/AIDS affected population. Several sponsors explained that landlords often don't want to rent to this population for any reason. Additionally, some sponsors expressed concern over landlord discrimination

regarding other things such as criminal history and drug use. Poor credit or rental histories further limited landlords' willingness to rent to the HOPWA population.

A lack of supplemental supportive services was identified as the second-most important barrier in terms of helping recipients maintain their housing. Many organizations cited that the unemployment or SSI benefits that their clients received were a sole source of income and inadequate to sustain housing stability without other services. These needed services most often included transportation, food, and additional housing subsidies. Because of this concern, IHCDCA has and will continue to look into funding Supportive Services with HOPWA funds. Supportive Services used to be funded by IHCDCA, but was discontinued due to abuses.

The next most reported barrier was the availability of housing. In rural areas, this was reported as a basic lack of available rental housing. In urban areas, a lack of affordable rental housing was reported. Finally, only one organization reported that paperwork and regulations were a significant barrier in that staff time was not plentiful enough to give clients all the help they needed as well as complete required reports and trainings.

2. Describe any trends in the community that may affect the way in which the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS are being addressed, and provide any other information important to the future provision of services to this population.

IHCDCA has not identified any trends in the community that affect the way the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS are being addressed. However, it is apparent that supportive services are of need to HOPWA recipients, and IHCDCA is currently exploring ways in which these services can be provided by the program. Providing gas cards or grocery certificates caused abuse and exploitation of these resources in the past, but sponsors have indicated that these services are still necessary.

3. Identify any evaluations, studies, or other assessments of the HOPWA program that are available to the public.

IHCDCA has not identified any evaluations, studies, or assessments of the HOPWA program that are available to the public.

d. Unmet Housing Needs: An Assessment of Unmet Housing Needs

In Chart 1, provide an assessment of the number of HOPWA-eligible households that require HOPWA housing subsidy assistance but are not currently served by any HOPWA-funded housing subsidy assistance in this service area.

In Row 1, report the total unmet need of the geographical service area, as reported in *Unmet Needs for Persons with HIV/AIDS*, Chart 1B of the Consolidated or Annual Plan(s), or as reported under HOPWA worksheet in the Needs Workbook of the Consolidated Planning Management Process (CPMP) tool.

Note: Report most current data available, through Consolidated or Annual Plan(s), and account for local housing issues, or changes in HIV/AIDS cases, by using combination of one or more of the sources in Chart 2.

If data is collected on the type of housing that is needed in Rows a. through c., enter the number of HOPWA-eligible households by type of housing subsidy assistance needed. For an approximate breakdown of overall unmet need by type of housing subsidy assistance refer to the Consolidated or Annual Plan (s), CPMP tool or local distribution of funds. Do not include clients who are already receiving HOPWA-funded housing subsidy assistance.

Refer to Chart 2, and check all sources consulted to calculate unmet need. Reference any data from neighboring states' or municipalities' Consolidated Plan or other planning efforts that informed the assessment of Unmet Need in your service area.

Note: In order to ensure that the unmet need assessment for the region is comprehensive, HOPWA formula grantees should include those unmet needs assessed by HOPWA competitive grantees operating within the service area.

1. Planning Estimate of Area's Unmet Needs for HOPWA-Eligible Households

1. Total number of households that have unmet housing subsidy assistance need.	635
2. From the total reported in Row 1, identify the number of households with unmet housing needs by type of housing subsidy assistance:	200
a. Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	
b. Short-Term Rent, Mortgage and Utility payments (STRMU)	300
• Assistance with rental costs	100
• Assistance with mortgage payments	100
• Assistance with utility costs.	100
c. Housing Facilities, such as community residences, SRO dwellings, other housing facilities	135

2. Recommended Data Sources for Assessing Unmet Need (check all sources used)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Data as reported in the area Consolidated Plan, e.g. Table 1B, CPMP charts, and related narratives
<input type="checkbox"/> = Data established by area HIV/AIDS housing planning and coordination efforts, e.g. Continuum of Care
<input type="checkbox"/> = Data from client information provided in Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS)
<input type="checkbox"/> = Data from project sponsors or housing providers, including waiting lists for assistance or other assessments on need including those completed by HOPWA competitive grantees operating in the region.
<input type="checkbox"/> = Data from prisons or jails on persons being discharged with HIV/AIDS, if mandatory testing is conducted
<input type="checkbox"/> = Data from local Ryan White Planning Councils or reported in CARE Act Data Reports, e.g. number of clients with permanent housing
<input type="checkbox"/> = Data collected for HIV/AIDS surveillance reporting or other health assessments, e.g. local health department or CDC surveillance data

End of PART 1

PART 2: Sources of Leveraging and Program Income

1. Sources of Leveraging

Report the source(s) of cash or in-kind leveraged federal, state, local or private resources identified in the Consolidated or Annual Plan and used in the delivery of the HOPWA program and the amount of leveraged dollars. In Column [1], identify the type of leveraging. Some common sources of leveraged funds have been provided as a reference point. You may add Rows as necessary to report all sources of leveraged funds. Include Resident Rent payments paid by clients directly to private landlords. Do NOT include rents paid directly to a HOPWA program as this will be reported in the next section. In Column [2] report the amount of leveraged funds expended during the operating year. Use Column [3] to provide some detail about the type of leveraged contribution (e.g., case management services or clothing donations). In Column [4], check the appropriate box to indicate whether the leveraged contribution was a housing subsidy assistance or another form of support.

Note: Be sure to report on the number of households supported with these leveraged funds in Part 3, Chart 1, Column d.

A. Source of Leveraging Chart

[1] Source of Leveraging	[2] Amount of Leveraged Funds	[3] Type of Contribution	[4] Housing Subsidy Assistance or Other Support
Public Funding			
Ryan White-Housing Assistance			<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Ryan White-Other	\$430,000.00	Case management	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Housing Choice Voucher Program			<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Low Income Housing Tax Credit			<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
HOME			<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Shelter Plus Care			<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Emergency Solutions Grant	\$15,135.00	Utilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Public: Supportive Housing Program	\$67,336.00	Rent/Utility	x <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Public: Community Block Grant	\$10,000.00	Case Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Public: Indiana State Department of Health	\$349,000.00	Case Management, supportive services	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Public: Unspecified	\$426,316.00	Care coord, prev, risk consel, subst. abuse counsel	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Public:			<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Private Funding			
Grants	\$274,770.40	Rent/utility	x <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
In-kind Resources	\$9,700.00	Rent, travel	x <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Private: Indiana AIDS Fund	\$17,000.00	Financial Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Private: MAC AIDS Fund	\$8,000.00	Food pantry	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Other Funding			
Grantee/Project Sponsor/Subrecipient (Agency) Cash	\$84,285.00	Misc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Subsidy Assistance x <input type="checkbox"/> Other Support
Resident Rent Payments by Client to Private Landlord	\$42,568.00		
TOTAL (Sum of all Rows)	\$1,734,110.40		

2. Program Income and Resident Rent Payments

In Section 2, Chart A., report the total amount of program income and resident rent payments directly generated from the use of HOPWA funds, including repayments. Include resident rent payments collected or paid directly to the HOPWA program. Do NOT include payments made directly from a client household to a private landlord.

Note: Please see report directions section for definition of program income. (Additional information on program income is available in the HOPWA Grantee Oversight Resource Guide).

A. Total Amount Program Income and Resident Rent Payment Collected During the Operating Year

Program Income and Resident Rent Payments Collected		Total Amount of Program Income (for this operating year)
1.	Program income (e.g. repayments)	\$34,935.00
2.	Resident Rent Payments made directly to HOPWA Program	\$0.00
3.	Total Program Income and Resident Rent Payments (Sum of Rows 1 and 2)	\$34,935.00

B. Program Income and Resident Rent Payments Expended To Assist HOPWA Households

In Chart B, report on the total program income and resident rent payments (as reported above in Chart A) expended during the operating year. Use Row 1 to report Program Income and Resident Rent Payments expended on Housing Subsidy Assistance Programs (i.e., TBRA, STRMU, PHP, Master Leased Units, and Facility-Based Housing). Use Row 2 to report on the Program Income and Resident Rent Payment expended on Supportive Services and other non-direct Housing Costs.

Program Income and Resident Rent Payment Expended on HOPWA programs		Total Amount of Program Income Expended (for this operating year)
1.	Program Income and Resident Rent Payment Expended on Housing Subsidy Assistance costs	\$25,207.00
2.	Program Income and Resident Rent Payment Expended on Supportive Services and other non-direct housing costs	\$6,000.00
3.	Total Program Income Expended (Sum of Rows 1 and 2)	\$31,207.00

End of PART 2

PART 3: Accomplishment Data Planned Goal and Actual Outputs

In Chart 1, enter performance information (goals and actual outputs) for all activities undertaken during the operating year supported with HOPWA funds. Performance is measured by the number of households and units of housing that were supported with HOPWA or other federal, state, local, or private funds for the purposes of providing housing assistance and support to persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.

Note: The total households assisted with HOPWA funds and reported in PART 3 of the CAPER should be the same as reported in the annual year-end IDIS data, and goals reported should be consistent with the Annual Plan information. Any discrepancies or deviations should be explained in the narrative section of PART 1.

1. HOPWA Performance Planned Goal and Actual Outputs

HOPWA Performance Planned Goal and Actual		[1] Output: Households				[2] Output: Funding	
		HOPWA Assistance		Leveraged Households		HOPWA Funds	
		a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	HOPWA Budget	HOPWA Actual
HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance		[1] Output: Households				[2] Output: Funding	
1.	Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	200	110	29		\$415,725.39	\$361,603.15
2a.	Permanent Housing Facilities: Received Operating Subsidies/Leased units (Households Served)	35	15	3		\$38,000.00	\$27,301.67
2b.	Transitional/Short-term Facilities: Received Operating Subsidies/Leased units (Households Served)	100	16	9		\$77,660.00	\$33,784.04
3a.	Permanent Housing Facilities: Capital Development Projects placed in service during the operating year (Households Served)	0	0	0	0	0	0
3b.	Transitional/Short-term Facilities: Capital Development Projects placed in service during the operating year (Households Served)	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	Short-Term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance	300	220	116		\$242,929.74	\$210,669.51
5.	Permanent Housing Placement Services	30	30	13		\$31,900.00	\$17,408.00
6.	Adjustments for duplication (subtract)		22	7			
7.	Total HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance (Columns a. – d. equal the sum of Rows 1-5 minus Row 6; Columns e. and f. equal the sum of Rows 1-5)		369	163		\$806,215.13	\$650,766.37
Housing Development (Construction and Stewardship of facility based housing)		[1] Output: Housing Units				[2] Output: Funding	
8.	Facility-based units; Capital Development Projects not yet opened (Housing Units)	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Stewardship Units subject to 3 or 10 year use agreements	0	15				
10.	Total Housing Developed (Sum of Rows 78 & 9)		15	0	0	0	0
Supportive Services		[1] Output Households				[2] Output: Funding	
11a.	Supportive Services provided by project sponsors/subrecipient that also delivered HOPWA housing subsidy assistance	0	0			0	0
11b.	Supportive Services provided by project sponsors/subrecipient that only provided supportive services.	0	0			0	0
12.	Adjustment for duplication (subtract)	0	0			0	0
13.	Total Supportive Services (Columns a. – d. equal the sum of Rows 11 a. & b. minus Row 12; Columns e. and f. equal the sum of Rows 11a. & 11b.)	0	0			0	0
Housing Information Services		[1] Output Households				[2] Output: Funding	
14.	Housing Information Services	343	343			\$209,380.00	\$182,995.46
15.	Total Housing Information Services		343			\$209,380.00	\$182,995.46

Grant Administration and Other Activities		[1] Output Households		[2] Output: Funding	
16.	Resource Identification to establish, coordinate and develop housing assistance resources			0	0
17.	Technical Assistance (if approved in grant agreement)			0	0
18.	Grantee Administration (maximum 3% of total HOPWA grant)			\$29,139.00	\$26,221.33
19.	Project Sponsor Administration (maximum 7% of portion of HOPWA grant awarded)			\$69,089.00	\$63,517.56
20.	Total Grant Administration and Other Activities (Sum of Rows 16 – 19)			\$98,228.00	\$89,738.89
Total Expended				[2] Outputs: HOPWA Funds Expended	
				Budget	Actual
21.	Total Expenditures for program year (Sum of Rows 7, 10, 13, 15, and 20)			1,113,823.13	\$923,500.72

2. Listing of Supportive Services

Report on the households served and use of HOPWA funds for all supportive services. Do NOT report on supportive services leveraged with non-HOPWA funds.

Data check: Total unduplicated households and expenditures reported in Row 17 equal totals reported in Part 3, Chart 1, Row 13.

Supportive Services		[1] Output: Number of <u>Households</u>	[2] Output: Amount of HOPWA Funds Expended
1.	Adult day care and personal assistance	N/A	N/A
2.	Alcohol and drug abuse services	N/A	N/A
3.	Case management	N/A	N/A
4.	Child care and other child services	N/A	N/A
5.	Education	N/A	N/A
6.	Employment assistance and training	N/A	N/A
7.	Health/medical/intensive care services, if approved Note: Client records must conform with 24 CFR §574.310	N/A	N/A
8.	Legal services	N/A	N/A
9.	Life skills management (outside of case management)	N/A	N/A
10.	Meals/nutritional services	N/A	N/A
11.	Mental health services	N/A	N/A
12.	Outreach	N/A	N/A
13.	Transportation	N/A	N/A
14.	Other Activity (if approved in grant agreement). Specify:	N/A	N/A
15.	Sub-Total Households receiving Supportive Services (Sum of Rows 1-14)		
16.	Adjustment for Duplication (subtract)	N/A	
17.	TOTAL Unduplicated Households receiving Supportive Services (Column [1] equals Row 15 minus Row 16; Column [2] equals sum of Rows 1-14)	N/A	N/A

3. Short-Term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance (STRMU) Summary

In Row a., enter the total number of households served and the amount of HOPWA funds expended on Short-Term Rent, Mortgage and Utility (STRMU) Assistance. In Row b., enter the total number of STRMU-assisted households that received assistance with mortgage costs only (no utility costs) and the amount expended assisting these households. In Row c., enter the total number of STRMU-assisted households that received assistance with both mortgage and utility costs and the amount expended assisting these households. In Row d., enter the total number of STRMU-assisted households that received assistance with rental costs only (no utility costs) and the amount expended assisting these households. In Row e., enter the total number of STRMU-assisted households that received assistance with both rental and utility costs and the amount expended assisting these households. In Row f., enter the total number of STRMU-assisted households that received assistance with utility costs only (not including rent or mortgage costs) and the amount expended assisting these households. In row g., report the amount of STRMU funds expended to support direct program costs such as program operation staff.

Data Check: The total households reported as served with STRMU in Row a., column [1] and the total amount of HOPWA funds reported as expended in Row a., column [2] equals the household and expenditure total reported for STRMU in Part 3, Chart 1, Row 4, Columns b. and f., respectively.

Data Check: The total number of households reported in Column [1], Rows b., c., d., e., and f. equal the total number of STRMU households reported in Column [1], Row a. The total amount reported as expended in Column [2], Rows b., c., d., e., f., and g. equal the total amount of STRMU expenditures reported in Column [2], Row a.

Housing Subsidy Assistance Categories (STRMU)		[1] Output: Number of Households Served	[2] Output: Total HOPWA Funds Expended on STRMU during Operating Year
a.	Total Short-term mortgage, rent and/or utility (STRMU) assistance	220	\$210,669.51
b.	Of the total STRMU reported on Row a, total who received assistance with mortgage costs ONLY.	20	\$28,068.13
c.	Of the total STRMU reported on Row a, total who received assistance with mortgage and utility costs.	6	\$4,221.93
d.	Of the total STRMU reported on Row a, total who received assistance with rental costs ONLY.	106	\$115,022.22
e.	Of the total STRMU reported on Row a, total who received assistance with rental and utility costs.	33	\$40,863.90
f.	Of the total STRMU reported on Row a, total who received assistance with utility costs ONLY.	55	\$20,301.98
g.	Direct program delivery costs (e.g., program operations staff time)		\$2,191.35

End of PART 3

Part 4: Summary of Performance Outcomes

In Column [1], report the total number of eligible households that received HOPWA housing subsidy assistance, by type. In Column [2], enter the number of households that continued to access each type of housing subsidy assistance into next operating year. In Column [3], report the housing status of all households that exited the program.

Data Check: The sum of Columns [2] (Number of Households Continuing) and [3] (Exited Households) equals the total reported in Column[1].

Note: Refer to the housing stability codes that appear in Part 5: Worksheet - Determining Housing Stability Outcomes.

Section 1. Housing Stability: Assessment of Client Outcomes on Maintaining Housing Stability (Permanent Housing and Related Facilities)

A. Permanent Housing Subsidy Assistance

	[1] Output: Total Number of Households Served	[2] Assessment: Number of Households that Continued Receiving HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance into the Next Operating Year	[3] Assessment: Number of Households that exited this HOPWA Program; their Housing Status after Exiting		[4] HOPWA Client Outcomes
Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	110	57	1 Emergency Shelter/Streets	0	<i>Unstable Arrangements</i>
			2 Temporary Housing	4	<i>Temporarily Stable, with Reduced Risk of Homelessness</i>
			3 Private Housing	29	<i>Stable/Permanent Housing (PH)</i>
			4 Other HOPWA	2	
			5 Other Subsidy	12	
			6 Institution	1	
			7 Jail/Prison	2	<i>Unstable Arrangements</i>
			8 Disconnected/Unknown	2	
			9 Death	1	
Permanent Supportive Housing Facilities/ Units	15	12	1 Emergency Shelter/Streets	0	<i>Unstable Arrangements</i>
			2 Temporary Housing	0	<i>Temporarily Stable, with Reduced Risk of Homelessness</i>
			3 Private Housing	2	<i>Stable/Permanent Housing (PH)</i>
			4 Other HOPWA	0	
			5 Other Subsidy	1	
			6 Institution	0	
			7 Jail/Prison	0	<i>Unstable Arrangements</i>
			8 Disconnected/Unknown	0	
			9 Death	0	

B. Transitional Housing Assistance

	[1] Output: Total Number of Households Served	[2] Assessment: Number of Households that Continued Receiving HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance into the Next Operating Year	[3] Assessment: Number of Households that exited this HOPWA Program; their Housing Status after Exiting		[4] HOPWA Client Outcomes
Transitional/ Short-Term Housing Facilities/ Units	16	3	1 Emergency Shelter/Streets	1	<i>Unstable Arrangements</i>
			2 Temporary Housing	0	<i>Temporarily Stable with Reduced Risk of Homelessness</i>
			3 Private Housing	1	<i>Stable/Permanent Housing (PH)</i>
			4 Other HOPWA	0	
			5 Other Subsidy	8	
			6 Institution	1	
			7 Jail/Prison	0	<i>Unstable Arrangements</i>
			8 Disconnected/unknown	0	
			9 Death	0	
B1: Total number of households receiving transitional/short-term housing assistance whose tenure exceeded 24 months			0		

Section 2. Prevention of Homelessness: Assessment of Client Outcomes on Reduced Risks of Homelessness (Short-Term Housing Subsidy Assistance)

Report the total number of households that received STRMU assistance in Column [1].

In Column [2], identify the outcomes of the households reported in Column [1] either at the time that they were known to have left the STRMU program or through the project sponsor or subrecipient’s best assessment for stability at the end of the operating year.

Information in Column [3] provides a description of housing outcomes; therefore, data is not required.

At the bottom of the chart:

- In Row 1a., report those households that received STRMU assistance during the operating year of this report, and the prior operating year.
- In Row 1b., report those households that received STRMU assistance during the operating year of this report, and the two prior operating years.

Data Check: The total households reported as served with STRMU in Column [1] equals the total reported in Part 3, Chart 1, Row 4, Column b.

Data Check: The sum of Column [2] should equal the number of households reported in Column [1].

Assessment of Households that Received STRMU Assistance

[1] Output: Total number of households	[2] Assessment of Housing Status		[3] HOPWA Client Outcomes
220	Maintain Private Housing without subsidy <i>(e.g. Assistance provided/completed and client is stable, not likely to seek additional support)</i>	74	<i>Stable/Permanent Housing (PH)</i>
	Other Private Housing without subsidy <i>(e.g. client switched housing units and is now stable, not likely to seek additional support)</i>	9	
	Other HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance	15	
	Other Housing Subsidy (PH)	8	
	Institution <i>(e.g. residential and long-term care)</i>	1	
	Likely that additional STRMU is needed to maintain current housing arrangements	80	<i>Temporarily Stable, with Reduced Risk of Homelessness</i>
	Transitional Facilities/Short-term <i>(e.g. temporary or transitional arrangement)</i>	2	
	Temporary/Non-Permanent Housing arrangement <i>(e.g. gave up lease, and moved in with family or friends but expects to live there less than 90 days)</i>	1	
	Emergency Shelter/street	1	<i>Unstable Arrangements</i>
	Jail/Prison	3	
Disconnected	24		
Death	2	<i>Life Event</i>	
1a. Total number of those households that received STRMU Assistance in the operating year of this report that also received STRMU assistance in the prior operating year (e.g. households that received STRMU assistance in two consecutive operating years).			102
1b. Total number of those households that received STRMU Assistance in the operating year of this report that also received STRMU assistance in the two prior operating years (e.g. households that received STRMU assistance in three consecutive operating years).			40

Section 3. HOPWA Outcomes on Access to Care and Support

1a. Total Number of Households

Line [1]: For project sponsors/subrecipients that provided HOPWA housing subsidy assistance during the operating year identify in the appropriate row the number of households that received HOPWA housing subsidy assistance (TBRA, STRMU, Facility-Based, PHP and Master Leasing) and HOPWA funded case management services. Use Row c. to adjust for duplication among the service categories and Row d. to provide an unduplicated household total.

Line [2]: For project sponsors/subrecipients that did NOT provide HOPWA housing subsidy assistance identify in the appropriate row the number of households that received HOPWA funded case management services.

Note: These numbers will help you to determine which clients to report Access to Care and Support Outcomes for and will be used by HUD as a basis for analyzing the percentage of households who demonstrated or maintained connections to care and support as identified in Chart 1b. below.

Total Number of Households	
1. For Project Sponsors/Subrecipients that provided HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance: Identify the total number of households that received the following HOPWA-funded services:	
a. Housing Subsidy Assistance (duplicated)-TBRA, STRMU, PHP, Facility-Based Housing, and Master Leasing	391
b. Case Management	0
c. Adjustment for duplication (subtraction)	22
d. Total Households Served by Project Sponsors/Subrecipients with Housing Subsidy Assistance (Sum of Rows a.b. minus Row c.)	369
2. For Project Sponsors/Subrecipients did NOT provide HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance: Identify the total number of households that received the following HOPWA-funded service:	
a. HOPWA Case Management	n/a
b. Total Households Served by Project Sponsors/Subrecipients without Housing Subsidy Assistance	n/a

1b. Status of Households Accessing Care and Support

Column [1]: Of the households identified as receiving services from project sponsors/subrecipients that provided HOPWA housing subsidy assistance as identified in Chart 1a., Row 1d. above, report the number of households that demonstrated access or maintained connections to care and support within the program year.

Column [2]: Of the households identified as receiving services from project sponsors/subrecipients that did NOT provide HOPWA housing subsidy assistance as reported in Chart 1a., Row 2b., report the number of households that demonstrated improved access or maintained connections to care and support within the program year.

Note: For information on types and sources of income and medical insurance/assistance, refer to Charts below.

Categories of Services Accessed	[1] For project sponsors/subrecipients that provided HOPWA housing subsidy assistance, identify the households who demonstrated the following:	[2] For project sponsors/subrecipients that did NOT provide HOPWA housing subsidy assistance, identify the households who demonstrated the following:	Outcome Indicator
1. Has a housing plan for maintaining or establishing stable on-going housing	345	n/a	<i>Support for Stable Housing</i>
2. Had contact with case manager/benefits counselor consistent with the schedule specified in client's individual service plan (may include leveraged services such as Ryan White Medical Case Management)	359	n/a	<i>Access to Support</i>
3. Had contact with a primary health care provider consistent with the schedule specified in client's individual service plan	347	n/a	<i>Access to Health Care</i>
4. Accessed and maintained medical insurance/assistance	348	n/a	<i>Access to Health Care</i>
5. Successfully accessed or maintained qualification for sources of income	262	n/a	<i>Sources of Income</i>

Chart 1b., Line 4: Sources of Medical Insurance and Assistance include, but are not limited to the following (Reference only)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEDICAID Health Insurance Program, or use local program name • MEDICARE Health Insurance Program, or use local program name 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veterans Affairs Medical Services • AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) • State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), or use local program name 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan White-funded Medical or Dental Assistance
--	--	--

Chart 1b., Row 5: Sources of Income include, but are not limited to the following (Reference only)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned Income • Veteran’s Pension • Unemployment Insurance • Pension from Former Job • Supplemental Security Income (SSI) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child Support • Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) • Alimony or other Spousal Support • Veteran’s Disability Payment • Retirement Income from Social Security • Worker’s Compensation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Assistance (GA), or use local program name • Private Disability Insurance • Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) • Other Income Sources
---	--	--

1c. Households that Obtained Employment

Column [1]: Of the households identified as receiving services from project sponsors/subrecipients that provided HOPWA housing subsidy assistance as identified in Chart 1a., Row 1d. above, report on the number of households that include persons who obtained an income-producing job during the operating year that resulted from HOPWA-funded Job training, employment assistance, education or related case management/counseling services.

Column [2]: Of the households identified as receiving services from project sponsors/subrecipients that did NOT provide HOPWA housing subsidy assistance as reported in Chart 1a., Row 2b., report on the number of households that include persons who obtained an income-producing job during the operating year that resulted from HOPWA-funded Job training, employment assistance, education or case management/counseling services.

Note: This includes jobs created by this project sponsor/subrecipients or obtained outside this agency.

Note: Do not include jobs that resulted from leveraged job training, employment assistance, education or case management/counseling services.

Categories of Services Accessed	[1] For project sponsors/subrecipients that provided HOPWA housing subsidy assistance, identify the households who demonstrated the following:	[2] For project sponsors/subrecipients that did NOT provide HOPWA housing subsidy assistance, identify the households who demonstrated the following:
Total number of households that obtained an income-producing job	47	15

End of PART 4

PART 5: Worksheet - Determining Housing Stability Outcomes (optional)

1. This chart is designed to assess program results based on the information reported in Part 4 and to help Grantees determine overall program performance. Completion of this worksheet is optional.

Permanent Housing Subsidy Assistance	Stable Housing (# of households remaining in program plus 3+4+5+6)	Temporary Housing (2)	Unstable Arrangements (1+7+8)	Life Event (9)
Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected
Permanent Facility-based Housing Assistance/Units	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected
Transitional/Short-Term Facility-based Housing Assistance/Units	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected
Total Permanent HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected
Reduced Risk of Homelessness: Short-Term Assistance	Stable/Permanent Housing	Temporarily Stable, with Reduced Risk of Homelessness	Unstable Arrangements	Life Events
Short-Term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility Assistance (STRMU)	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected
Total HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected

Background on HOPWA Housing Stability Codes
Stable Permanent Housing/Ongoing Participation

- 3 = Private Housing in the private rental or home ownership market (without known subsidy, including permanent placement with families or other self-sufficient arrangements) with reasonable expectation that additional support is not needed.
- 4 = Other HOPWA-funded housing subsidy assistance (not STRMU), e.g. TBRA or Facility-Based Assistance.
- 5 = Other subsidized house or apartment (non-HOPWA sources, e.g., Section 8, HOME, public housing).
- 6 = Institutional setting with greater support and continued residence expected (e.g., residential or long-term care facility).

Temporary Housing

2 = Temporary housing - moved in with family/friends or other short-term arrangement, such as Ryan White subsidy, transitional housing for homeless, or temporary placement in institution (e.g., hospital, psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility, substance abuse treatment facility or detox center).

Unstable Arrangements

- 1 = Emergency shelter or no housing destination such as places not meant for habitation (e.g., a vehicle, an abandoned building, bus/train/subway station, or anywhere outside).
- 7 = Jail /prison.
- 8 = Disconnected or disappeared from project support, unknown destination or no assessments of housing needs were undertaken.

Life Event

9 = Death, i.e., remained in housing until death. This characteristic is not factored into the housing stability equation.

Tenant-based Rental Assistance: Stable Housing is the sum of the number of households that (i) remain in the housing and (ii) those that left the assistance as reported under: 3, 4, 5, and 6. Temporary Housing is the number of households that accessed assistance, and left their current housing for a non-permanent housing arrangement, as reported under item: 2. Unstable Situations is the sum of numbers reported under items: 1, 7, and 8.

Permanent Facility-Based Housing Assistance: Stable Housing is the sum of the number of households that (i) remain in the housing and (ii) those that left the assistance as shown as items: 3, 4, 5, and 6. Temporary Housing is the number of households that accessed assistance, and left their current housing for a non-permanent housing arrangement, as reported under item 2. Unstable Situations is the sum of numbers reported under items: 1, 7, and 8.

Transitional/Short-Term Facility-Based Housing Assistance: Stable Housing is the sum of the number of households that (i) continue in the residences (ii) those that left the assistance as shown as items: 3, 4, 5, and 6. Other Temporary Housing is the number of households that accessed assistance, and left their current housing for a non-permanent housing arrangement, as reported under item 2. Unstable Situations is the sum of numbers reported under items: 1, 7, and 8.

Tenure Assessment. A baseline of households in transitional/short-term facilities for assessment purposes, indicate the number of households whose tenure exceeded 24 months.

STRMU Assistance: Stable Housing is the sum of the number of households that accessed assistance for some portion of the permitted 21-week period and there is reasonable expectation that additional support is not needed in order to maintain permanent housing living situation (as this is a time-limited form of housing support) as reported under housing status: Maintain Private Housing with subsidy; Other Private with Subsidy; Other HOPWA support; Other Housing Subsidy; and Institution. Temporarily Stable, with Reduced Risk of Homelessness is the sum of the number of households that accessed assistance for some portion of the permitted 21-week period or left their current housing arrangement for a transitional facility or other temporary/non-permanent housing arrangement and there is reasonable expectation additional support will be needed to maintain housing arrangements in the next year, as reported under housing status: Likely to maintain current housing arrangements, with additional STRMU assistance; Transitional Facilities/Short-term; and Temporary/Non-Permanent Housing arrangements. Unstable Situation is the sum of number of households reported under housing status: Emergency Shelter; Jail/Prison; and Disconnected.

End of PART 5

PART 6: Annual Certification of Continued Usage for HOPWA Facility-Based Stewardship Units (ONLY)

The Annual Certification of Usage for HOPWA Facility-Based Stewardship Units is to be used in place of Part 7B of the CAPER if the facility was originally acquired, rehabilitated or constructed/developed in part with HOPWA funds but no HOPWA funds were expended during the operating year. Scattered site units may be grouped together on one page.

Grantees that used HOPWA funding for new construction, acquisition, or substantial rehabilitation are required to operate their facilities for HOPWA eligible individuals for at least ten (10) years. If non-substantial rehabilitation funds were used they are required to operate for at least three (3) years. Stewardship begins once the facility is put into operation.

Note: See definition of Stewardship Units.

1. General information

HUD Grant Number(s) INH10F999	Operating Year for this report From (mm/dd/yy) To (mm/dd/yy) <input type="checkbox"/> Final Yr <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 1; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 2; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 3; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 4; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yr 5; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 6; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 7; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 8; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 9; <input type="checkbox"/> Yr 10;
Grantee Name AIDS Task Force	Date Facility Began Operations (mm/dd/yy) 12/01/2006

2. Number of Units and Non-HOPWA Expenditures

Facility Name: N/A	Number of Stewardship Units Developed with HOPWA funds	Amount of Non-HOPWA Funds Expended in Support of the Stewardship Units during the Operating Year
Total Stewardship Units (subject to 3- or 10- year use periods)	15	N/A

3. Details of Project Site

Project Sites: Name of HOPWA-funded project	Jack Ryan House
Site Information: Project Zip Code(s)	46802
Site Information: Congressional District(s)	3
Is the address of the project site confidential?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, protect information; do not list <input type="checkbox"/> Not confidential; information can be made available to the public
If the site is not confidential: Please provide the contact information, phone, email address/location, if business address is different from facility address	N/A

I certify that the facility that received assistance for acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction from the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program has operated as a facility to assist HOPWA-eligible persons from the date shown above. I also certify that the grant is still serving the planned number of HOPWA-eligible households at this facility through leveraged resources and all other requirements of the grant agreement are being satisfied.

I hereby certify that all the information stated herein, as well as any information provided in the accompaniment herewith, is true and accurate.

Name & Title of Authorized Official of the organization that continues to operate the facility: Sara Seifert, Housing Coordinator	Signature & Date (mm/dd/yy) Sara Seifert, 09/21/2012
Name & Title of Contact at Grantee Agency <i>(person who can answer questions about the report and program)</i> Greg Majewski, Real Estate Production Analyst	Contact Phone (with area code) 317-233-1817

End of PART 6

Part 7: Summary Overview of Grant Activities

A. Information on Individuals, Beneficiaries, and Households Receiving HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance (TBRA, STRMU, Facility-Based Units, Permanent Housing Placement and Master Leased Units ONLY)

Note: Reporting for this section should include ONLY those individuals, beneficiaries, or households that received and/or resided in a household that received HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance as reported in Part 3, Chart 1, Row 7, Column b. (e.g., do not include households that received HOPWA supportive services ONLY).

Section 1. HOPWA-Eligible Individuals who Received HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance

a. Total HOPWA Eligible Individuals Living with HIV/AIDS

In Chart a., provide the total number of eligible (and unduplicated) low-income individuals living with HIV/AIDS who qualified their household to receive HOPWA housing subsidy assistance during the operating year. This total should include only the individual who qualified the household for HOPWA assistance, NOT all HIV positive individuals in the household.

Individuals Served with Housing Subsidy Assistance	Total
Number of individuals with HIV/AIDS who qualified their household to receive HOPWA housing subsidy assistance.	369

Chart b. Prior Living Situation

In Chart b., report the prior living situations for all Eligible Individuals reported in Chart a. In Row 1, report the total number of individuals who continued to receive HOPWA housing subsidy assistance from the prior operating year into this operating year. In Rows 2 through 17, indicate the prior living arrangements for all new HOPWA housing subsidy assistance recipients during the operating year.

Data Check: The total number of eligible individuals served in Row 18 equals the total number of individuals served through housing subsidy assistance reported in Chart a. above.

Category	Total HOPWA Eligible Individuals Receiving Housing Subsidy Assistance
1. Continuing to receive HOPWA support from the prior operating year	131
New Individuals who received HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance support during Operating Year	
2. Place not meant for human habitation (such as a vehicle, abandoned building, bus/train/subway station/airport, or outside)	9
3. Emergency shelter (including hotel, motel, or campground paid for with emergency shelter voucher)	2
4. Transitional housing for homeless persons	1
5. Total number of new Eligible Individuals who received HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance with a Prior Living Situation that meets HUD definition of homelessness (Sum of Rows 2 – 4)	12
6. Permanent housing for formerly homeless persons (such as Shelter Plus Care, SHP, or SRO Mod Rehab)	0
7. Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility	1
8. Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center	1
9. Hospital (non-psychiatric facility)	2
10. Foster care home or foster care group home	0
11. Jail, prison or juvenile detention facility	1
12. Rented room, apartment, or house	154
13. House you own	32
14. Staying or living in someone else’s (family and friends) room, apartment, or house	32
15. Hotel or motel paid for without emergency shelter voucher	3
16. Other	0
17. Don’t Know or Refused	0
18. TOTAL Number of HOPWA Eligible Individuals (sum of Rows 1 and 5-17)	369

c. Homeless Individual Summary

In Chart c., indicate the number of eligible individuals reported in Chart b., Row 5 as homeless who also are homeless Veterans and/or meet the definition for Chronically Homeless (See Definition section of CAPER). The totals in Chart c. do not need to equal the total in Chart b., Row 5.

Category	Number of Homeless Veteran(s)	Number of Chronically Homeless
HOPWA eligible individuals served with HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance	1	13

Section 2. Beneficiaries

In Chart a., report the total number of HOPWA eligible individuals living with HIV/AIDS who received HOPWA housing subsidy assistance (*as reported in Part 7A, Section 1, Chart a.*), and all associated members of their household who benefitted from receiving HOPWA housing subsidy assistance (resided with HOPWA eligible individuals).

Note: See definition of HOPWA Eligible Individual

Note: See definition of Transgender.

Note: See definition of Beneficiaries.

Data Check: The sum of each of the Charts b. & c. on the following two pages equals the total number of beneficiaries served with HOPWA housing subsidy assistance as determined in Chart a., Row 4 below.

a. Total Number of Beneficiaries Served with HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance

Individuals and Families Served with HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance	Total Number
1. Number of individuals with HIV/AIDS who qualified the household to receive HOPWA housing subsidy assistance (equals the number of HOPWA Eligible Individuals reported in Part 7A, Section 1, Chart a.)	369
2. Number of ALL other persons diagnosed as HIV positive who reside with the HOPWA eligible individuals identified in Row 1 and who benefitted from the HOPWA housing subsidy assistance	31
3. Number of ALL other persons NOT diagnosed as HIV positive who reside with the HOPWA eligible individual identified in Row 1 and who benefited from the HOPWA housing subsidy	204
4. TOTAL number of ALL <u>beneficiaries</u> served with Housing Subsidy Assistance (Sum of Rows 1,2, & 3)	604

b. Age and Gender

In Chart b., indicate the Age and Gender of all beneficiaries as reported in Chart a. directly above. Report the Age and Gender of all HOPWA Eligible Individuals (those reported in Chart a., Row 1) using Rows 1-5 below and the Age and Gender of all other beneficiaries (those reported in Chart a., Rows 2 and 3) using Rows 6-10 below. The number of individuals reported in Row 11, Column E. equals the total number of beneficiaries reported in Part 7, Section 2, Chart a., Row 4.

HOPWA Eligible Individuals (Chart a, Row 1)						
		A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
		Male	Female	Transgender M to F	Transgender F to M	TOTAL (Sum of Columns A-D)
1.	Under 18	0	0	0	0	0
2.	18 to 30 years	33	17	0	0	50
3.	31 to 50 years	177	72	3	0	252
4.	51 years and Older	51	16	0	0	67
5.	Subtotal (Sum of Rows 1-4)	261	105	3	0	369
All Other Beneficiaries (Chart a, Rows 2 and 3)						
		A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
		Male	Female	Transgender M to F	Transgender F to M	TOTAL (Sum of Columns A-D)
6.	Under 18	67	66	0	0	133
7.	18 to 30 years	14	15	0	0	29
8.	31 to 50 years	31	23	0	0	54
9.	51 years and Older	13	6	0	0	19
10.	Subtotal (Sum of Rows 6-9)	125	110	0	0	235
Total Beneficiaries (Chart a, Row 4)						
11.	TOTAL (Sum of Rows 5 & 10)	386	215	3	0	604

c. Race and Ethnicity*

In Chart c., indicate the Race and Ethnicity of all beneficiaries receiving HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance as reported in Section 2, Chart a., Row 4. Report the race of all HOPWA eligible individuals in Column [A]. Report the ethnicity of all HOPWA eligible individuals in column [B]. Report the race of all other individuals who benefitted from the HOPWA housing subsidy assistance in column [C]. Report the ethnicity of all other individuals who benefitted from the HOPWA housing subsidy assistance in column [D]. The summed total of columns [A] and [C] equals the total number of beneficiaries reported above in Section 2, Chart a., Row 4.

Category		HOPWA Eligible Individuals		All Other Beneficiaries	
		[A] Race [all individuals reported in Section 2, Chart a., Row 1]	[B] Ethnicity [Also identified as Hispanic or Latino]	[C] Race [total of individuals reported in Section 2, Chart a., Rows 2 & 3]	[D] Ethnicity [Also identified as Hispanic or Latino]
1.	American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	1	0	0
2.	Asian	0	0	0	0
3.	Black/African American	103	0	69	0
4.	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
5.	White	245	11	139	11
6.	American Indian/Alaskan Native & White	0	0	0	0
7.	Asian & White	0	0	0	0
8.	Black/African American & White	0	0	5	0
9.	American Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American	0	0	0	0
10.	Other Multi-Racial	20	10	22	10
11.	Column Totals (Sum of Rows 1-10)	369	22	235	21
Data Check: Sum of Row 11 Column A and Row 11 Column C equals the total number HOPWA Beneficiaries reported in Part 3A, Section 2, Chart a., Row 4.					

*Reference (data requested consistent with Form HUD-27061 Race and Ethnic Data Reporting Form)

Section 3. Households

Household Area Median Income

Report the area median income(s) for all households served with HOPWA housing subsidy assistance.

Data Check: The total number of households served with HOPWA housing subsidy assistance should equal Part 3C, Row 7, Column b and Part 7A, Section 1, Chart a. (Total HOPWA Eligible Individuals Served with HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance).

Note: Refer to http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/il/il2010/select_Geography_mfi.odn for information on area median income in your community.

Percentage of Area Median Income		Households Served with HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance
1.	0-30% of area median income (extremely low)	246
2.	31-50% of area median income (very low)	104
3.	51-80% of area median income (low)	19
4.	Total (Sum of Rows 1-3)	369

Part 7: Summary Overview of Grant Activities

B. Facility-Based Housing Assistance

Complete one Part 7B for each facility developed or supported through HOPWA funds.

Do not complete this Section for programs originally developed with HOPWA funds but no longer supported with HOPWA funds. If a facility was developed with HOPWA funds (subject to ten years of operation for acquisition, new construction and substantial rehabilitation costs of stewardship units, or three years for non-substantial rehabilitation costs), but HOPWA funds are no longer used to support the facility, the project sponsor or subrecipient should complete Part 6: Annual Certification of Continued Usage for HOPWA Facility-Based Stewardship Units (ONLY).

Complete Charts 2a., Project Site Information, and 2b., Type of HOPWA Capital Development Project Units, for all Development Projects, including facilities that were past development projects, but continued to receive HOPWA operating dollars this reporting year.

1. Project Sponsor/Subrecipient Agency Name (Required)

AIDS Task Force

2. Capital Development

2a. Project Site Information for HOPWA Capital Development of Projects (For Current or Past Capital Development Projects that receive HOPWA Operating Costs this reporting year)

Note: If units are scattered-sites, report on them as a group and under type of Facility write "Scattered Sites."

Type of Development this operating year	HOPWA Funds Expended this operating year (if applicable)	Non-HOPWA funds Expended (if applicable)	Name of Facility: Jack Ryan House
<input type="checkbox"/> New construction	\$	\$	Type of Facility [Check <u>only one</u> box.] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permanent housing <input type="checkbox"/> Short-term Shelter or Transitional housing <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive services only facility
<input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation	\$	\$	
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition	\$	\$	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operating	\$27,301.67	\$	
a.	Purchase/lease of property:		Date (mm/dd/yy): 02/13/96
b.	Rehabilitation/Construction Dates:		Date started: _____ Date Completed: 11/17/06
c.	Operation dates: 07/01/11 – 06/30/12		Date residents began to occupy: 12/01/06 <input type="checkbox"/> Not yet occupied
d.	Date supportive services began:		Date started: 12/01/06 <input type="checkbox"/> Not yet providing services
e.	Number of units in the facility:		HOPWA-funded units = 15 Total Units = 15
f.	Is a waiting list maintained for the facility?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, number of participants on the list at the end of operating year</i>
g.	What is the address of the facility (if different from business address)?		415 E Wayne St, Fort Wayne, IN 46802
h.	Is the address of the project site confidential?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, protect information; do not publish list <input type="checkbox"/> No, can be made available to the public

2b. Number and Type of HOPWA Capital Development Project Units (For Current or Past Capital Development Projects that receive HOPWA Operating Costs this Reporting Year)

For units entered above in 2a. please list the number of HOPWA units that fulfill the following criteria:

	Number Designated for the Chronically Homeless	Number Designated to Assist the Homeless	Number Energy-Star Compliant	Number 504 Accessible
Rental units constructed (new) and/or acquired with or without rehab	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rental units rehabbed	0	0	0	0
Homeownership units constructed (if approved)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

3. Units Assisted in Types of Housing Facility/Units Leased by Project Sponsor or Subrecipient

Charts 3a., 3b. and 4 are required for each facility. In Charts 3a. and 3b., indicate the type and number of housing units in the facility, including master leased units, project-based or other scattered site units leased by the organization, categorized by the number of bedrooms per unit.

Note: The number units may not equal the total number of households served.

Please complete separate charts for each housing facility assisted. Scattered site units may be grouped together.

3a. Check one only

- Permanent Supportive Housing Facility/Units
 Short-term Shelter or Transitional Supportive Housing Facility/Units

3b. Type of Facility

Complete the following Chart for all facilities leased, master leased, project-based, or operated with HOPWA funds during the reporting year.

Name of Project Sponsor/Agency Operating the Facility/Leased Units:

Type of housing facility operated by the project sponsor/subrecipient	Total Number of Units in use during the Operating Year Categorized by the Number of Bedrooms per Units					
	SRO/Studio/0 bdrm	1 bdrm	2 bdrm	3 bdrm	4 bdrm	5+bdrm
a. Single room occupancy dwelling						
b. Community residence						
c. Project-based rental assistance units or leased units	4	11				
d. Other housing facility <u>Specify:</u>						

4. Households and Housing Expenditures

Enter the total number of households served and the amount of HOPWA funds expended by the project sponsor/subrecipient on subsidies for housing involving the use of facilities, master leased units, project based or other scattered site units leased by the organization.

Housing Assistance Category: Facility Based Housing	Output: Number of Households	Output: Total HOPWA Funds Expended during Operating Year by Project Sponsor/subrecipient
a. Leasing Costs		
b. Operating Costs	15	\$27,301.67
c. Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA) or other leased units		
d. Other Activity (if approved in grant agreement) <u>Specify:</u>		
e. Adjustment to eliminate duplication (subtract)		
f. TOTAL Facility-Based Housing Assistance (Sum Rows a. through d. minus Row e.)	15	\$27,301.67

Part 7: Summary Overview of Grant Activities

B. Facility-Based Housing Assistance

Complete one Part 7B for each facility developed or supported through HOPWA funds.

Do not complete this Section for programs originally developed with HOPWA funds but no longer supported with HOPWA funds. If a facility was developed with HOPWA funds (subject to ten years of operation for acquisition, new construction and substantial rehabilitation costs of stewardship units, or three years for non-substantial rehabilitation costs), but HOPWA funds are no longer used to support the facility, the project sponsor or subrecipient should complete Part 6: Annual Certification of Continued Usage for HOPWA Facility-Based Stewardship Units (ONLY).

Complete Charts 2a., Project Site Information, and 2b., Type of HOPWA Capital Development Project Units, for all Development Projects, including facilities that were past development projects, but continued to receive HOPWA operating dollars this reporting year.

1. Project Sponsor/Subrecipient Agency Name (Required)

AIDS Ministries/AIDS Assist of North Indiana, Inc

2. Capital Development

2a. Project Site Information for HOPWA Capital Development of Projects (For Current or Past Capital Development Projects that receive HOPWA Operating Costs this reporting year)

Note: If units are scattered-sites, report on them as a group and under type of Facility write "Scattered Sites."

Type of Development this operating year	HOPWA Funds Expended this operating year (if applicable)	Non-HOPWA funds Expended (if applicable)	Name of Facility: 219/222 William St
<input type="checkbox"/> New construction	\$	\$	Type of Facility [Check <u>only one</u> box.] <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent housing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-term Shelter or Transitional housing <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive services only facility
<input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation	\$	\$	
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition	\$	\$	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operating	\$25,016.31	\$23,248.09	
a.	Purchase/lease of property:		Date (mm/dd/yy):
b.	Rehabilitation/Construction Dates:		Date started: _____ Date Completed: _____
c.	Operation dates:		Date residents began to occupy: <input type="checkbox"/> Not yet occupied
d.	Date supportive services began:		Date started: <input type="checkbox"/> Not yet providing services
e.	Number of units in the facility:		HOPWA-funded units = 9 Total Units = 9
f.	Is a waiting list maintained for the facility?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, number of participants on the list at the end of operating year 8
g.	What is the address of the facility (if different from business address)?		219 William St, South Bend, IN 46601
h.	Is the address of the project site confidential?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, protect information; do not publish list <input type="checkbox"/> No, can be made available to the public

2b. Number and Type of HOPWA Capital Development Project Units (For Current or Past Capital Development Projects that receive HOPWA Operating Costs this Reporting Year)

For units entered above in 2a. please list the number of HOPWA units that fulfill the following criteria:

	Number Designated for the Chronically Homeless	Number Designated to Assist the Homeless	Number Energy-Star Compliant	Number 504 Accessible
Rental units constructed (new) and/or acquired with or without rehab	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rental units rehabbed	9	9	9	1
Homeownership units constructed (if approved)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

3. Units Assisted in Types of Housing Facility/Units Leased by Project Sponsor or Subrecipient

Charts 3a., 3b. and 4 are required for each facility. In Charts 3a. and 3b., indicate the type and number of housing units in the facility, including master leased units, project-based or other scattered site units leased by the organization, categorized by the number of bedrooms per unit.

Note: The number units may not equal the total number of households served.

Please complete separate charts for each housing facility assisted. Scattered site units may be grouped together.

3a. Check one only

- Permanent Supportive Housing Facility/Units
 Short-term Shelter or Transitional Supportive Housing Facility/Units

3b. Type of Facility

Complete the following Chart for all facilities leased, master leased, project-based, or operated with HOPWA funds during the reporting year.

Name of Project Sponsor/Agency Operating the Facility/Leased Units:

Type of housing facility operated by the project sponsor/subrecipient		Total Number of Units in use during the Operating Year Categorized by the Number of Bedrooms per Units				
		SRO/Studio/0 bdrm	1 bdrm	2 bdrm	3 bdrm	4 bdrm
a.	Single room occupancy dwelling					
b.	Community residence					
c.	Project-based rental assistance units or leased units	0	5	4		
d.	Other housing facility <u>Specify:</u>					

4. Households and Housing Expenditures

Enter the total number of households served and the amount of HOPWA funds expended by the project sponsor/subrecipient on subsidies for housing involving the use of facilities, master leased units, project based or other scattered site units leased by the organization.

Housing Assistance Category: Facility Based Housing		Output: Number of Households	Output: Total HOPWA Funds Expended during Operating Year by Project Sponsor/subrecipient
a.	Leasing Costs		
b.	Operating Costs	9	\$25,016.31
c.	Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA) or other leased units		
d.	Other Activity (if approved in grant agreement) <u>Specify:</u>		
e.	Adjustment to eliminate duplication (subtract)		
f.	TOTAL Facility-Based Housing Assistance (Sum Rows a. through d. minus Row e.)	9	\$25,016.31

Part 7: Summary Overview of Grant Activities

B. Facility-Based Housing Assistance

Complete one Part 7B for each facility developed or supported through HOPWA funds.

Do not complete this Section for programs originally developed with HOPWA funds but no longer supported with HOPWA funds. If a facility was developed with HOPWA funds (subject to ten years of operation for acquisition, new construction and substantial rehabilitation costs of stewardship units, or three years for non-substantial rehabilitation costs), but HOPWA funds are no longer used to support the facility, the project sponsor or subrecipient should complete Part 6: Annual Certification of Continued Usage for HOPWA Facility-Based Stewardship Units (ONLY).

Complete Charts 2a., Project Site Information, and 2b., Type of HOPWA Capital Development Project Units, for all Development Projects, including facilities that were past development projects, but continued to receive HOPWA operating dollars this reporting year.

1. Project Sponsor/Subrecipient Agency Name (Required)

Brothers Uplifting Brothers

2. Capital Development

2a. Project Site Information for HOPWA Capital Development of Projects (For Current or Past Capital Development Projects that receive HOPWA Operating Costs this reporting year)

Note: If units are scattered-sites, report on them as a group and under type of Facility write "Scattered Sites."

Type of Development this operating year	HOPWA Funds Expended this operating year (if applicable)	Non-HOPWA funds Expended (if applicable)	Name of Facility: Hope House
<input type="checkbox"/> New construction	\$	\$	Type of Facility [Check <u>only one</u> box.] <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent housing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-term Shelter or Transitional housing <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive services only facility
<input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation	\$	\$	
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition	\$	\$	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operating	\$8,767.69	\$8,767.69	
a.	Purchase/lease of property:		Date (mm/dd/yy):
b.	Rehabilitation/Construction Dates:		Date started: _____ Date Completed: _____
c.	Operation dates: 07/01/2011 – 01/31/2012		Date residents began to occupy: <input type="checkbox"/> Not yet occupied
d.	Date supportive services began:		Date started: <input type="checkbox"/> Not yet providing services
e.	Number of units in the facility:		HOPWA-funded units = 3 Total Units = 3
f.	Is a waiting list maintained for the facility?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, number of participants on the list at the end of operating year 0</i>
g.	What is the address of the facility (if different from business address)?		No longer operational
h.	Is the address of the project site confidential?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, protect information; do not publish list <input type="checkbox"/> No, can be made available to the public

2b. Number and Type of HOPWA Capital Development Project Units (For Current or Past Capital Development Projects that receive HOPWA Operating Costs this Reporting Year)

For units entered above in 2a. please list the number of HOPWA units that fulfill the following criteria:

	Number Designated for the Chronically Homeless	Number Designated to Assist the Homeless	Number Energy-Star Compliant	Number 504 Accessible
Rental units constructed (new) and/or acquired with or without rehab	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rental units rehabbed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Homeownership units constructed (if approved)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

3. Units Assisted in Types of Housing Facility/Units Leased by Project Sponsor or Subrecipient

Charts 3a., 3b. and 4 are required for each facility. In Charts 3a. and 3b., indicate the type and number of housing units in the facility, including master leased units, project-based or other scattered site units leased by the organization, categorized by the number of bedrooms per unit.

Note: The number units may not equal the total number of households served.

Please complete separate charts for each housing facility assisted. Scattered site units may be grouped together.

3a. Check one only

- Permanent Supportive Housing Facility/Units
 Short-term Shelter or Transitional Supportive Housing Facility/Units

3b. Type of Facility

Complete the following Chart for all facilities leased, master leased, project-based, or operated with HOPWA funds during the reporting year.

Name of Project Sponsor/Agency Operating the Facility/Leased Units: Brothers Uplifting Brothers

Type of housing facility operated by the project sponsor/subrecipient	Total Number of Units in use during the Operating Year Categorized by the Number of Bedrooms per Units					
	SRO/Studio/0 bdrm	1 bdrm	2 bdrm	3 bdrm	4 bdrm	5+bdrm
a. Single room occupancy dwelling						
b. Community residence	3					
c. Project-based rental assistance units or leased units						
d. Other housing facility Specify:						

4. Households and Housing Expenditures

Enter the total number of households served and the amount of HOPWA funds expended by the project sponsor/subrecipient on subsidies for housing involving the use of facilities, master leased units, project based or other scattered site units leased by the organization.

Housing Assistance Category: Facility Based Housing	Output: Number of Households	Output: Total HOPWA Funds Expended during Operating Year by Project Sponsor/subrecipient
a. Leasing Costs		
b. Operating Costs	7	\$8,767.69
c. Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA) or other leased units		
d. Other Activity (if approved in grant agreement) Specify:		
e. Adjustment to eliminate duplication (subtract)		
f. TOTAL Facility-Based Housing Assistance (Sum Rows a. through d. minus Row e.)	7	\$8,767.69

APPENDIX A.
Public Comments

APPENDIX A.

Public Comments

The 2011 CAPER was available for public review between September 13, 2012 and September 28, 2012. Public comments were encouraged and accepted during this period. A hard copy of the CAPER was on file with the Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs and electronic copies are available to download on agency websites. The public notice announcing the availability of the CAPER was published in several newspapers throughout Indiana prior to its availability for public comment.