

State of Nevada

2016 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the second Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the State of Nevada's 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, a five-year plan addressing the State's housing and community development needs. The CAPER provides a review of the performance of each of the four formula programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the State of Nevada. Following is a summary of the CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs' accomplishments.

CDBG Program

The 2016 allocation from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to the State of Nevada's CDBG program was \$2,434,790. Of that award, \$148,696 was for CDBG program administration and \$24,348 was for training and technical assistance, leaving \$2,261,746 for competitive grant projects. Initial de-obligated funds totaled \$37,552; a later and large project de-obligation precipitated a Round #2 of allocations for PY 2016, raising the total CDBG project funding for 2016 to \$2,487,326.

The total amount drawn down from HUD and disbursed to grantees during Program Year (PY) 2016-17 was \$2,233,897.18. Of the total, \$442,032.86 came from 2014 funds; \$1,058,792.64 came from 2015 funds; \$733,071.68 came from the 2016 HUD allocation. The 2015 grant year is the first year that First In/First Out (FIFO) was eliminated and grants are paid from the grant year of their funding.

All 2014 Administration and Technical Assistance funds had been used by the end of the PY 2016. All 2015 Administration funds had been used; \$3,104.79 remained of the Technical Assistance funds. All 2016 Administration funds had been used; the full \$24,348 remained of the 2016 Technical Assistance funds, as of June 30, 2017.

Projects were funded in two grant cycles. The second round of funding was deemed necessary because of a large de-obligation of a prior year project. Of the total 18 projects selected for CDBG funding:

- **Public Facility Grants:** 5 of 18 applications funded; \$1,549,833 CDBG funds; 62.31 percent of total allocations;
- **Planning & Capacity Building Grants:** 6 of 18 applications funded; \$317,498 CDBG funds; 12.76 percent of total allocations;

- **Public Services Grants:** 4 of 18 applications funded; \$132,914 CDBG funds; 5.34 percent of total allocations;
- **Economic Development Grants:** 1 of 18 applications funded; \$87,075 CDBG funds; 3.50 percent of total allocations;
- **Housing Grants:** 1 of 18 applications funded; \$200,000; 8.04 percent of total allocations;
- **Slum & Blight:** 1 of 18 applications funded; \$200,000; 8.04 percent of the total allocations. This project is to demolish abandoned buildings in an LMI community.

Other than the Slum & Blight project (which is in an LMI-survey small city), the remainder of the 2016 projects fell under the Low – Moderate Income (LMI) National Objective. When all 2016 projects are completed, an estimated 38,593 individuals will benefit. Of the estimated beneficiaries, 25,070 or 65.57 percent are LMI.

The State CDBG Program met its overall objectives for PY 2016-17. Overall, the strategies and activities of the State CDBG Program are having a significant impact on needs identified by rural Nevada communities. Community needs are for public infrastructure, housing rehabilitation, small business development and planning, and capacity building at the local government level.

During the 2016 program year, 22 projects were completed by June 30, 2017: five (5) PY 2014 projects, 15 PY 2015 projects, and two (2) 2016 PY projects. An additional four (4) PY 2014 and 2015 (2 for each PY) projects had expended all funds and were in the process of closing. Five of the 18 projects (28.0 %) were delayed in submitting the first draw within the first nine months: that was 27.78 percent lower than in 2015. The decrease is attributed to ensuring that applicants are project ready when the program year begins. Projects that had delays were the result of: (1) turnover in CDBG Grant Administrators in local jurisdictions and/or new sub-recipients; (2) project delays with environmental reviews involving SHPO and NDOT; (3) and a project that required a single invoice for a vehicle; the delivery date was past the 9-month, March 31st target date.

The Nevada State CDBG program had no staffing changes in PY 2016-17. The CDBG Program Specialist attended the COSCDA Boot Camp Training in 2016 and HUD environmental training in Reno in 2017. She has been with the State of Nevada over 12 years and has prior grant management experience. In 2017, the CDBG program implemented the on-line grant application and review process. Ms. Sanders, the CDBG Program Specialist, was the lead in developing the system set up.

The CDBG Program Administrator remains the same and has been with the program since September of 2011. Prior to working with the CDBG program in Nevada, she was the ESG Program Specialist in Nebraska for six years and was on the board of NeighborWorks, Inc. in Lincoln, NE. That non-profit utilized CDBG funds in neighborhood housing and homebuyer projects. Over the years, Ms. Barrette has attended numerous trainings for HUD programs both in Nebraska and Nevada. Ms. Barrette also is a board member of COSCDA.

In 2016, training of CDBG eligible entities and other prospective applicants took place in Elko on

June 7th and 8th and in Ely on June 28th and 29th. Additional training was conducted to accommodate all eligible entities, as needed, because 2016 was the first year ZoomGrants was implemented for the application and review process. CDBG staff members arrange training that enhances Nevada's CDBG program and attempts to be as flexible as possible in working with CDBG Grant Administrators in 26 eligible cities and counties. Training is an on-going process for CDBG staff members and grantees. CDBG staff members work with grantees in providing technical assistance, guidance in closing grants, and compliance with state and federal regulations. Additionally, the office seeks to streamline policies and procedures because of the reduced number of staff members at State, City and County levels. This is critical as those with institutional memory retire and new grant administrators are hired. Generally, CDBG grant administration is one of many responsibilities for those at the city/county level and streamlined policies and procedures help ensure effective grant management.

HOME Program

The Nevada Housing Division is the largest producer of affordable housing in the State of Nevada. The Division administers the multi-family bond program, the low-income housing tax credit program, single-family bond program, State HOME program, State Account for Low Income Housing (Trust Funds), Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP), and the Emergency Shelter Grant program. The Housing Division allocates HOME funds on a pro-rata basis taking into consideration all HOME funds that are received by the state. The Trust Funds are also allocated on a pro-rata basis.

To ensure the financial feasibility of the bond projects and tax credit projects, HOME funds are usually used in these projects. Without the infusion of HOME or Trust funds, the Division would not be able to produce multi-family housing. Down payment assistance and homeowner rehabilitation are still a big priority in the rural areas of the state and we continue to fund this program on a yearly basis.

The Nevada Housing Division sustained major staffing changes this year within the Federal Grant Programs. This included the departure of two staff members and the hiring a new State and Federal Programs Manager.

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program

In 2016 the Nevada Housing Division (Division) received an allocation of \$420,810.06 in ESG funds, which was an increase from the \$407,797 received in 2015, but was still much less than the \$691,790 received in 2012. As a result, many programs were subsidized using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds. State ESG funds were awarded to local government and non-profit providers located in non-entitlement areas of rural Nevada, with a portion allocated to the City of Reno to support the Community Assistance Center that was funded in part using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds several years ago.

In Nevada, there are very few resources available to offset the cost of operating homeless and

domestic violence shelters, or to pay for motel vouchers in rural communities without shelters, so the maximum allowable amount of State ESG funds were allocated to existing sub-recipients for those expenses. In accordance with ESG regulations, only shelter providers that were current sub-recipients of the old Emergency Shelter Grant program were allocated shelter funding under the Emergency Solutions Grant Program. The allocation was capped at 60% of the annual award.

The remaining allocation was utilized by agencies to pay for costs associated with Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database requirements, and to provide limited financial assistance, along with housing relocation and stabilization services, for homeless prevention and rapid re-housing clients. As stated above, Low-Income Housing Trust funds were also allocated to ESG sub-recipients to provide rental assistance to eligible households who were either homeless, or at imminent risk of homelessness, in rural and northern Nevada so that ESG funds could be used to offset costs of case management services.

A total of \$285,006 for PY 2016 and a total of \$18,554 in remaining 2015 ESG funds were spent this past year to support programs and services allowed under the Emergency Solutions Grant Program.

All totaled 469 adults and 115 children were provided shelter, rental assistance, utility assistance, security deposits, and case management assistance this past year. Of those assisted: 293 were veterans; 377 had at least one mental or physical health condition, including mental illness, alcohol abuse, drug abuse, chronic health condition, developmental disability, physical disability, or other unknown condition; 35 persons served were victims of domestic violence; and 64 persons served were identified as being chronically homeless.

1. OVERVIEW

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides funding for housing and community and economic development through the following grant programs:

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG),
- HOME Investment Partnership (HOME),
- Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and
- Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA).

The Rural Community & Economic Development Division of GOED, the Nevada Housing Division (NHD) of the Department of Business and Industry, and the Nevada Health Division of the Department of Health and Human Services distribute these funds to non-entitlement communities (counties and cities that do not receive direct grant assistance from HUD). In managing these funds, GOED, NHD, and the Health Division are responsible to prepare and submit the following documents:

Five-Year Consolidated Plan. This is a strategic plan for five successive program years. The plan

contains analysis of data from a variety of sources and addresses housing and community development needs through goals and strategies for the five-year period. The current five-year plan for Nevada covers from 2015 through 2019. The report also includes the current Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and actions to implement over the next five years.

Annual Action Plan. This plan specifies actions for each grant program for the program year July 1 through June 30. The annual plan contains updates or modifications to the Consolidated Plan and describes the proposed use of Federal and State funds in the upcoming year. The five-year plan includes an integrated action plan with project goals for the first year of the Consolidated Plan (2015).

Annual Action Plans have been submitted through the IDIS e-Con Planning Suite since 2013; a hard copy, with State and Program Certifications and SF-424 forms for each year, has been submitted to the HUD San Francisco office each year.

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). This report reviews progress for the program year ending June 30th, 2017. The CAPER provides information on the activities projected in the 2016 Annual Action Plan and describes the performance of the State of Nevada in administering the HUD Community Planning and Development (CPD) programs.

The State of Nevada and the Housing Division, uses HUD resources in combination with other programs. This report includes reference to the following additional resources to provide a complete picture of the State's performance July 1 through June 30 each year:

- Mortgage Revenue Bonds
- Low Income Housing Tax Credits
- Account for Low-Income Housing (Trust Funds)
- Weatherization Program

2. RESOURCES

2.1 RESOURCES AVAILABLE

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) makes funds available each year to four programs: CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA. The assessment of how the funds have been used and how the State of Nevada is meeting its affordable housing and community and development goals are reported each year in this report: the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).

In addition to CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds received from HUD, the State uses other funds to meet its housing and community development objectives. These additional resources are shown in Table A and are included in this report to provide a complete picture of the State's available resources in PY 2016.

During PY 2016, \$25,037,289 was available and utilized for affordable housing development activities and community improvements. Of this amount, \$6,191,680 or 24.72 percent was provided by HUD to the four formula programs of CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA (Table A). The Section 8 housing is funded and operated separately from the formula programs and figures could not be attained for the 2016 program year. Formula program resources were managed respectively by the Governor’s Office of Economic Development (GOED), the Nevada Housing Division (NHD), the Nevada Health Division. This table does not include dollars leveraged by the units of local government (UGLGs). Leveraged and matching funds are reported in Section 2.2 and in the individual program sections.

Table A: Summary of Resources from HUD and Other Sources FY 2016-17

Administrative Agency	Program	FY 2016 Funding (\$)
GOED	CDBG	\$2,434,790
Nevada Housing Division	HOME	\$3,023,348
Nevada Housing Division	ESG	\$420,810
Nevada Health Division	HOPWA	\$312,732
Nevada Housing Division	Low Income Housing Tax Credits 4%	Not available
Nevada Housing Division	Low Income Housing Tax Credits 9%	\$6,793,485
Nevada Housing Division	State Housing Trust Fund	\$7,000,000
Nevada Housing Division	Weatherization	\$4,979,009
Nevada Housing Division	Single Family Mortgage Bond Program	0
Nevada Housing Division	Multi-Family Mortgage Revenue Bond Program	\$73,115
Nevada Rural Housing Authority	HAP/Section 8	Not available
Nevada Rural Housing Authority	VASH vouchers	Not available
Total Funding		\$25,037,289

In addition to funding for the State-run programs and the Nevada Rural Housing Authority listed in Table A, Nevada has several entitlement entities that receive program funding directly from HUD. These jurisdictions are Clark and Washoe County Consortiums, the City of Las Vegas, and the City of Henderson. During the year, the Nevada Housing Division (NHD) worked closely with these entities to optimize the use of the available funds. The NHD also provided assistance to other agencies to apply directly for funding from the Federal government.

2.2. LEVERAGED AND MATCH RESOURCES

The State continues to be very successful in leveraging its resources. Regarding housing, the NHD has six major programs in one Division and can ensure that all types of funds are used in projects. The State of Nevada ranks number one in its leveraging resources when it comes to the HOME program. The reason for this is that when HOME funds are expended in tax credit and multi-family bond projects, the project is granted a tax exemption from the county in which it resides. This decreases the amount of HOME funds needed for this project to be affordable. NHD also leverages the majority of its down payment assistance funds with USDA Rural

Development, which also increases the leveraging capacity by ensuring that the best interest rate is achieved for the homeowner.

a. Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

Federal Law allows the State to retain two percent (\$48,696) plus \$100,000.00 of its annual CDBG allocation for program administration (\$148,696 for 2016). It also mandates that the State provides a non-federal match for the two percent. The match is documented at the time CDBG funds are drawn for the State's administrative expenditures above \$100,000.00. During the July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 period covered by this CAPER, the State provided \$100,563.12 in matching funds.

Grantees anticipated leveraging CDBG funds with \$4,957,747 in funding from other sources (Cash, State/Federal and Other Funds, or In-Kind) for the PY 2016-2017 projects. This includes additional funding sources from 2016 Round #2.

b. HOME Program

HOME match liability was met through a combination of State Trust Fund dollars invested and the tax exemption that is provided to projects when they expend HOME funds in a project. The State had \$39,287,321 in match that was carried over from the previous year. The HOME program match liability of \$760,750 was based on 25 percent (statutory requirement) of actual expenditures of actual program dollars spent during this period. This resulted in the State carrying into the next fiscal year over \$33 million in available matching funds.

c. Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)

Regulations for the ESG program provides for a waiver of the State match requirement for the first \$100,000.00 of the ESG award. The remaining allocation is required to be matched 100% during the two (2) year grant period. Unless a waiver of the match requirement is issued by the Division, agencies must report the type of match used for their ESG program on the draw reimbursement request form which is recorded in the ESG Match Log. Information provided is then verified during site visits.

In PY 2016 agencies expended a total of \$285,006 in ESG funds. A reported \$760,164.50 in match support, including in-kind and cash match sources, was reported. **Refer to the ESG IDIS Appendix for a copy of the match table.**

d. HOPWA

Northern Nevada HOPES is the sole recipient of HOPWA funds in Northern Nevada, receiving an additional \$59,370 of unused HUD funds which allowed enhanced housing assistance to help alleviate client housing needs in Northern Nevada. Additionally, \$88,248 was received through the Ryan White Part B to fund additional housing and utility assistance, short-term housing,

rental assistance and case managers to assist with care navigation to individuals with HIV. These leveraged funds allow the staff of Northern Nevada HOPES to provide comprehensive case management services to all clients receiving HOPWA housing services.

Northern Nevada HOPES has an established relationship with the Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board (NNCHRB) for the past five years. NNCHRB is a local non-profit organization that develops innovative affordable housing complexes for low-income individuals. NNCHRB dedicates 27 units at three of their apartment sites to clients of HOPES at over \$200 a month off the market rate. In addition to this, at three of their other apartment sites they have set aside 9 units (at each site) for veterans. If they are unable to fill these units with veterans, they then offer the apartment units to HOPES clients. HOPES has partnered with Nevada Libelle for the past two years and they provide 8 units to HOPES clients at \$345 each. HOPES operates a donation based housing program for individuals with an AIDS diagnosis who are not eligible for other housing programs. Most of these individuals are undocumented immigrants. HOPES has provided \$19,621 worth of funding towards rental assistance for this group. Although it is not considered to leveraged funds, HOPES partnership with the Reno Housing Authority (RHA) is worth mentioning. Although RHA has a very lengthy wait list, they have created a partnership with HOPES which allows any HOPES client that meets eligibility criteria get moved up to the top of a wait list.

3. Overview of PROGRAM Accomplishments

Table A, in the CDBG Program Narrative Section that follows, represents HUD resources available in PY 2016 to address various community and economic development needs. All avenues for additional resources were pursued by those awarded CDBG funds. An overview of the projects and accomplishments completed in PY 2016 is provided below:

- Completed and closed five (5) 2014 projects. One project was an Economic Development/Micro-business project that benefited 196 LMI individuals; another Economic Development project assisted with business creation and benefited 7 individuals who were LMI; two projects were Public Facility projects: a test well benefiting 494 people, 59.31 percent of whom were LMI; and a sewer project, benefiting 68 people, 60.29% of whom were LMI. All projects totaled \$437,445.54 in CDBG funding and \$166,221 in other funding sources.
- Completed and closed fifteen (15) 2015 projects: eight (8) Public Facility projects with \$1,304,743 of CDBG funds and an additional \$2,302,104 of other funding sources, which benefited 10,520, of which, 62.85 percent were LMI; five (5) Planning & Capacity Building projects with \$335,000 of CDBG funds and \$71,345 other funding, which benefitted 8,440 people, of whom 64.55 were LMI; one (1) Housing Rehabilitation project with \$50,000 of CDBG funds and \$67,647 of other funding, benefitting 6 LMI households; and one (1) Economic Development/Micro-business project, with \$87,216 CDBG funds, benefitting 7 LMI individuals.
- Completed and closed two (2) 2016 projects: one (1) a hydroponic/aquaculture Feasibility Study with \$22,500 of CDBG funds and \$2,500 from another source,

benefiting 1,063 people, of which 61.34 percent were LMI; one (1) a Public Service project to purchase a van to be used for transportation to medical facilities, with \$30,000 CDBG funds and \$20,592 other funding, benefitting 200 people, of whom 75 percent were LMI.

- Provided three (3) workshops/training opportunities to the CDBG-eligible units of general local government and other interested parties. Trained on a one-to-one basis to accommodate those with scheduling conflicts.
- Conducted three (3) on-site CDBG monitoring visits in three cities/counties (3 projects).
- CDBG staff members attended HUD environmental training held in Reno on April 18th – 20th. The Program Specialist attended a CDBG Boot Camp Training held June 14th – 20th in D.C. The CDBG Grant Administrator attended a COSCDA Manger’s Training in D.C. in December and a COSCDA Conference, September 11th – 14th.
- Provided ten (10) households with down payment assistance. All seven were funded with HOME funds.
- Provided three (3) homeowners with HOME rehabilitation funds.
- Provided rental subsidy and deposit payment assistance to Three hundred thirty-two (332) recipients. Twenty-eight (28) of those recipients were disabled and two hundred and three (203) female heads of household using Housing Trust Funds.
- Sixty-five (65) households received additional Housing Trust Fund money for additional assistance with the weatherization program.
- Provided 259 of the most vulnerable homeless adults and children in rural Nevada with rental assistance vouchers using Housing Trust funds allocated to the Nevada Rural Housing Authority;
- 584 adults and children, including 64 chronically homeless, 23 veterans, 377 with HIV/AIDs, 769 with severe mental illness, 621 with chronic substance abuse, and 263 elderly in northern and rural Nevada received assistance using ESG and State Low-Income Welfare Set-Aside funds.
- 89% of HOPWA program participants remained adherent to their HIV treatment and medication regimen, thus increasing their health outcomes and overall quality of life.
- 126 unduplicated HIV+ participants were served with HOPWA funds; 14 people were served through TBRA, 104 through STRMU and 26 through PHP.
- 30 participants received more than one HOPWA service, i.e. STRMU and PHP.
- Three participants receiving TBRA services were able to be transited off; of the two receiving TBRA services have been able to successfully sustain their own housing and one participant transited to STRMU but has a plan to successfully sustain their own housing in the future. One participant receiving TBRA assistance unfortunately passed away. There are still 11 active participants on the TBRA program will continue to need such assistance for a lengthier amount of time.
- 104 participants have received STRMU services.
- 26 participants served with PHP funds were able to obtain permanent housing through partnerships with Northern Community Housing Resource Board and Reno Housing Authority.

- Twenty-eight recipients received HOPWA assistance in the operating year prior to this report, and of those, fifty-five received assistance in the two years prior to this report.
- In addition, partnerships with a few local motels has yielded positive results in being able to provide temporary housing and/or permanent housing to participants with a fixed.

4. PROGRAM NARRATIVES

A. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

1. Resources

The State of Nevada received \$2,434,790 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) for the program year July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. This amount was \$12,851 or 5.3 percent less than the 2015 allocation of \$2,447,641.

Of the \$2,434,790 made available from HUD, \$148,696 was set aside for State administration (\$100,000 plus two percent); \$24,348 (or one percent) was set aside for training and technical assistance. The 2016 HUD allocation, less administration and technical assistance, plus recaptured funds, resulted in CDBG project funding of \$2,487,326 for 2016 Program Year projects. As 2015 was the last year set-asides were awarded, all funds were allocated through a competitive grant application process.

On March 22nd, 23rd, and 24th, 2016, applicants' projects were presented to the CDBG Advisory Committee and allocation recommendations made. All funds were obligated/encumbered by July 1, 2016, with the caveat that no funds were available until the grant agreement with HUD was effective later in the year.

2. Use of Funds

The total amount drawn down from HUD and disbursed to grantees during Program Year (PY) 2016-17 was \$2,233,897.18. Of the total, \$442,032.86 came from the 2014 HUD allocation; \$1,058,792.64 came from the 2015 HUD allocation; \$733,071.68 came from the 2016 HUD allocation. The 2015 grant year is the first year that FIFO was eliminated and grants are paid from the grant year of their funding.

All 2014 Administration and Technical Assistance (TA) funds had been used by the end of the 2016 PY. All 2015 Administration funds had been used; \$3,104.79 remained of the Technical Assistance funds. All 2016 Administration funds had been used; the full \$24,348 remained of the 2016 Technical Assistance funds as of June 30, 2016.

Of the 18 projects selected for CDBG funding:

- 5 were public facilities and improvements (PF), valued at \$1,549,833;
- 6 were planning grants (PCB), valued at \$317,498;
- 4 were public service grants, valued at \$132,914;
- 1 was an economic development (ED) grants, valued at \$87,0750;
- 1 was a housing grant (HS), valued at \$200,000.00;
- 1 was a Slum & Blight (S/B), valued at \$200,000.

Of the five (5) public facility type projects, four (4) were water/wastewater improvement projects; one was acquisition of a historic property. The housing grant was for the rehabilitation of LMI owner-occupied housing in rural Nevada.

The planning grants were given to support water/sewer master plans, the Nevada Rural Continuum of Care, and two community facility projects. Two public service grant were given to provide vans for emergency transportation: seen as an urgent need because of the sudden closing of a hospital. One economic development grant was given to support small business development.

3. Proposed Use of Resources and Actual Allocation of CDBG Funds

CDBG funds in Nevada are not awarded on a geographical basis, but are allocated annually on a competitive basis. In past years, funds have been set aside at an annual forum for activities, such as the Nevada Rural Continuum of Care and assistance to the Small Business Development Centers in rural Nevada. The balance of the HUD allocation is distributed among applicants who compete for the funds through an open competitive process. In 2015, the CDBG Advisory Committee made the recommendation to discontinue set asides and have all applications subject to the competitive process. They believed that set aside projects were strong enough to be funded through the competitive process. That recommendation was adopted for the 2016 program year.

Application workshops occur during the summer months with a due date the following January. The application review and allocation of funds takes place between January and April, generally in March. Recommended allocations are reviewed by the Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Economic Development and then forwarded to the Governor for final approval.

The Annual Action Plan, prepared and submitted annually to HUD by mid-May, summarizes the actual funding allocation for the 2016-17 program year. The majority of 2016-17 funds were obligated to public facilities and improvements (70.3 percent). This is typical of the Nevada CDBG program as well as throughout the nation. Refer to Table A and Table B.

Table A: CDBG Grants: 2016 Proposed Use of Funds; National Objectives & Beneficiaries

Beneficiaries			Community & Funding Category		HUD Nat. Obj.	CDBG Allocation	% of Total	HUD Statements	
Benef.	LMI	%	Public Facilities					Objectives	Outcomes
200	150	75.00%	Esmeralda Co	Goldfield Water Supply/Transmission Line, Phase 2	LMI-A	\$ 275,000.00		Suitable Living Environment	Sustainability
865	560	64.74%	Caliente	Caliente Water Distribution Improvements	LMI-A	\$ 286,160.00		Economic Opportunity	Sustainability
2734	1455	53.22%	Mineral Co	Fight Blight in Mineral County	LMI-A	\$ 200,000.00		Suitable Living Environment	Sustainability
522	274	52.49%	Ely	Ely Ave - West 15th Street Water Line Project	LMI-A	\$ 366,300.00		Suitable Living Environment	Sustainability
16645	9280	55.75%	Nye Co	Nye County Complex Well Upgrade	LMI-A	\$ 322,373.00		Economic Opportunity	Sustainability
S/B	S/B	S/B	Fallon	Fallon Theatre Acquisition	S/B-S	\$ 300,000.00		Economic Opportunity	Sustainability
20966	11719	55.90%	PUBLIC FACILITIES TOTAL			\$ 1,749,833.00	70.3%		
Benef.	LMI	%	Public Services						
200	150	75.00%	Esmeralda Co	Goldfield Senior Transportation Vehicle	LMI-A	\$ 30,000.00		Suitable Living Environment	Availability/Accessibility
616	616	100.00%	Nye Co	Long-Distance Medical Trip Vehicle	LMI-A	\$ 30,000.00		Suitable Living Environment	Availability/Accessibility
1251	1251	100.00%	Churchill Co	Pennington Life Center, Phase 3	LMI-A	\$ 43,352.00		Suitable Living Environment	Availability/Accessibility
1505	1030	68.44%	Fallon	Fallon Food Hub	LMI-A	\$ 29,568.00		Economic Opportunity	Affordability
3572	3047	85.30%	PUBLIC SERVICES TOTAL			\$ 132,920.00	5.3%		
Benef.	LMI	%	Planning						
1057	1057	100.00%	Douglas Co	Carson Valley Community Food Closet	LMI-C	\$ 42,998.00		Economic Opportunity	Sustainability
3023	3023	100.00%	Lyon Co	Rural Nevada Continuum of Care	N/A	\$ 50,000.00			
2734	1455	53.22%	Mineral Co	Hawthorne Regional Water Plan	LMI-A	\$ 27,000.00		Suitable Living Environment	Sustainability
1063	652	61.34%	Wells	Hydroponics/Aquaculture Feasibility Study	LMI-A	\$ 22,500.00		Economic Opportunity	Availability/Accessibility
1063	652	61.34%	Wells	Alternative Energy Feasibility Study	LMI-A	\$ 115,000.00		Economic Opportunity	Sustainability
4646	3354	72.19%	Fernley	Fernley Depot, Phase 1	LMI-S	\$ 60,000.00		Economic Opportunity	Availability/Accessibility
13586	10193	75.03%	PLANNING TOTAL			\$ 317,498.00	12.8%	Economic Opportunity	
Benef.	LMI	%	Economic Development						
100	100	100.00%	Fernley	SBDC Business Counseling & Training	LMI-C	\$ 87,075.00		Economic Opportunity	Availability/Accessibility
100	100	1	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOTAL			\$ 87,075.00	3.5%		
Benef.	LMI	%	Housing						
11	11	100.00%	White Pine Co	RNDC Housing Rehabilitation	LMI-H	\$ 200,000.00		Suitable Living Environment	Sustainability
11	11	100.00%	HOUSING TOTAL			\$ 200,000.00	8.0%		
Benef.	LMI	%	Acquisitions						
0	0	0.00%	ACQUISITION TOTAL			\$ -	0%		
38235	25070	65.57%	CDBG TOTAL			\$ 2,487,326.00	100%		

Table B: CDBG Grants, PY2016: Allocation of Funds and Leveraged Resources (U.S.\$)

Community	Project	Total Project Cost	CDBG Award	Other	State	Local Cash	Local In-Kind	Total Leverage
Caliente	Caliente Water Distribution Improvements	\$ 441,160.00	\$ 286,160.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 155,000.00	\$155,000.00
Douglas Co	Carson Valley Community Food Closet	\$ 83,498.00	\$ 42,998.00		\$ -	\$ 40,500.00	\$ -	\$40,500.00
Ely	Ely Ave to West 15th street Water Line Project	\$ 578,500.00	\$ 366,300.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 12,200.00	\$212,200.00
Esmeralda Co	Goldfield Water Supply & Transmission Line, Ph. 2	\$ 1,011,200.00	\$ 275,000.00	\$ -	\$ 736,200.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$736,200.00
Esmeralda Co	Goldfield Senior Transportation Vehicle	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,000.00	\$ -	\$15,000.00
Fallon	Fallon Theatre Acquisition	\$ 441,131.61	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 118,668.00	\$ -	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 15,263.61	\$141,131.61
Fernley	SBDC Business Counseling	\$ 105,578.00	\$ 87,078.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 8,500.00	\$18,500.00
Lyon Co	Rural Nevada Continuum of Care	\$ 139,146.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 19,249.00	\$ -	\$ 7,800.00	\$ 62,097.00	\$89,146.00
Mineral Co	Fight Blight	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 200,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Mineral Co	Hawthorne Regional Water Plan	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 27,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -	\$3,000.00
Nye Co	Long-Distance Medical Trip Vehicle	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0.00
Nye Co	Nye County Complex Well Upgrade	\$ 352,373.00	\$ 322,373.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000.00	\$30,000.00
Wells	Wells Hydroponics/Aquaculture Feasibility Study	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 22,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	\$2,500.00
White Pine Co	RNDC Housing Rehabilitation	\$ 521,000.00	\$ 200,000.00	\$ -	\$ 321,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 321,000.00
Fernley	Fernley Depot, Phase 1	\$ 76,544.32	\$ 60,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,544.32	\$ 16,544.32
Fallon	Fallon Food Hub	\$ 131,960.00	\$ 29,568.00		\$ 98,792.00		\$ 3,600.00	\$ 102,392.00
Wells	Alternative Energy Feasibility Study	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 115,000.00	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -	\$ 21,900.00	\$ 28,100.00	\$ 200,000.00
Churchill Co	Pennington Life Center	\$ 44,852.00	\$ 43,352.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00
TOTALS		\$ 4,611,942.93	\$ 2,487,329.00	\$ 287,917.00	\$ 1,155,992.00	\$ 307,900.00	\$ 372,804.93	\$2,124,613.93

4. Program Objectives and Accomplishments

The Housing and Community Development activities that ranked as the highest needs of rural Nevada are: (1) Human Services (22.0%); (2) Housing (21.9%); (3) Economic Development (18.6%); (4) Water Systems (12.9%); (5) Public Facilities (12.9%); (6) Infrastructure (10.3%); (7) Other (1.4%). All were discussed in some detail in the Community Needs section of the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. Public facility and public service needs are highlighted as well as insufficient employment opportunities and inadequate workforce training opportunities.

The Strategic Plan component of the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan outlined how the state will address the housing and community development needs over the 2015-2019 plan period. Public facility needs included crisis facilities, youth centers, senior centers, and parks. Necessary infrastructure improvements, including federally-mandated upgrades, water and sewer lines and facilities, and solid waste disposal services, were also noted as high priorities. Investment in infrastructure results in the creation of short-term jobs and long-term benefits and helps create economic opportunities in Nevada's rural communities.

Fifteen (15) priority needs were identified through the five-year planning process. They are:

Housing Priorities:

Priority 1: Increase the availability of rental housing for low- to moderate- income households.

Priority 2: Increase, preserve and improve the long-term life of existing affordable rental and owner-occupied housing stock, as well as improving housing accessibility and safety.

Priority 3: Expand homeownership opportunities for low-income homebuyers.

Homeless Priorities:

Priority 4: Continue support of existing sub-recipients operating emergency shelters and transitional housing for the homeless, including motel vouchers in communities lacking adequate shelter.

Priority 5: Create additional transitional and permanent supportive housing, including the rapid re-housing program.

Priority 6: Provide financial support to assist those at imminent risk of homelessness.

Priority 7: Support effective data collection and entry activities for the homeless services provided when servicing client populations.

Special Needs Priorities:

Priority 8: Increase and preserve the supply of affordable housing available to the elderly and disabled.

Priority 9: Improve the access that special needs populations have to needed services.

Community Development Priorities:

Priority 10: Improve infrastructure by assisting with sidewalk/path, street, water and wastewater system upgrade and development projects.

Priority 11: Enhance access to quality facilities to serve the population throughout rural Nevada.

Priority 12: Provide infrastructure and other planning support for units of local government.

Economic Development Priorities:

Priority 13: Retain and expand existing businesses.

Priority 14: Support recruitment and attraction of new businesses to Nevada.

Priority 15: Provide employment opportunities low- and moderate-income people.

For the CDBG program, priorities 10 through 15 are the focus of activity.

One 2016 project was Slum and Blight; all other projects fell under the LMI National Objective. Of the 18 grant projects funded for the 2016 PY, two grantees had expended all grant funds by June 30, 2017 and closed out the projects. All the 2014 projects had expended all funds and were closed. One 2015 project had expended all funds and was in the closing process; the other 2015 project had a balance, which will be de-obligated and re-allocated in a 2017 Round #2 application process. Only two 2016 projects began implementation late, as a result of the environmental review process with SHPO.

Overall, it is expected that approximately 38,235 individuals will benefit from the completed PY 2016 CDBG grants. An estimated 25,070 LMI individuals (65.57%) will benefit. No activity funded by CDBG in PY 2016 will result in any permanent displacement of persons.

During PY 2016 staff members succeeded in closing a total of 22 grants. These closures were reported in IDIS and are summarized in Table C a following page. Recent grant closures are: 57 grants closed in 2011; 54 closed in 2012; 27 closed in 2013; 21 closed in 2014 and 26 in 2015. The high number of grants closed during 2011 and 2012 relate to the nation-wide issue of grants with zero balances remaining open because of lack of accomplishment data. The

decrease that began in 2013 reflects an increase in desk monitoring and technical assistance offered by CDBG staff members throughout the life of the project. Additionally, funding fewer but larger grants results in having fewer grants to close. While the state continues to receive 35 to 38 proposals, fewer proposals develop into applications or projects.

Over the past five years, the Rural Community & Economic Development Director has been working closely with regional development authorities, cities, and counties to collaborate on projects that will have greater impact for the communities and regions. The type of activities the Nevada CDBG Program will fund are focused to more closely align with community and economic development goals of the state and regions. This has furthered the goal of the Governor's Office of Economic Development, to fund fewer but larger grants.

The newly implemented on-line ZoomGrants process also assists in refining the application process. There are now two steps: (1) an eligibility step and (2) the application step. By working with applicants during the eligibility step, staff members can determine if a proposed project is shovel ready. All engagement with applicants help ensure projects begin and end within an estimated timeline.

Beginning in 2017, Carson City, a prior entitlement city, is reverting to the state program. Staff believe the number of open grants will continue to fluctuate between 30 to 35, with no grant open more than three years. With more intense grant management, closing approximately 20 grants per year is deemed to be a normal rate of closure.

Table C: Summary of CDBG Accomplishments in Terms of Beneficiaries from Closed Grants PY 2016-2017

Grant Year	Project Name	City/County	Date Closed	Beneficiaries	LMI Number	National Objective	Objective/ Outcome
2014	SBDC Business Counseling	Fernley	July 6, 2016	196	196	LMI-C	EO-1
2015	Fire Protection District Ambulance	Storey Co	July 14, 2016	945	675	LMI-A	SL-1
2014	RNDC Housing Rehab	White Pine Co	August 1, 2016	10	10	LMI-H	SL-1
2015	Gabbs Swimming Pool Renovation	Nye Co	September 8, 2016	0	0	LMI-A	SL-1
2015	Economic Development Plan	Wells	September 19, 2016	1,038	664	LMI-A	EO-3
2015	Senior Center Energy Efficiency Project	Elko	September 19, 2016	805	445	LMI-C	SL-2
2015	Indian Hills Needs Assessment	Douglas Co	September 19, 2016	2,522	1,290	LMI-A	SL-1
2015	Rural NV Continuum of Care	Lyon Co	October 6, 2016	1,820	1,820	N/A	SL-1
2016	Goldfield Transportation Vehicle	Esmeralda Co	November 28, 2016	200	150	LMI-A	SL-1
2015	Goldfield Fire Truck	Esmeralda Co	December 15, 2016	325	175	LMI-A	SL-1
2014	McGill-Ruth Test Well	White Pine Co	February 1, 2017	494	293	LMI-A	SL-3
2015	Florence Way Street Improvement, Phase 2	Wendover	February 16, 2017	4,425	2,775	LMI-A	SL-1
2015	WWTP Improvement Design	Lyon Co	February 22, 2017	2,222	1,527	LMI-A	SL-1
2015	Dayton Valley Roadway Rehabilitation	Lyon Co	March 30, 2017	1,473	839	LMI-A	SL-1
2015	RNDC Housing Rehab	White Pine Co	April 5, 2017	6	6	LMI-H	DH-2
2015	Montello Storm Water Master Plan	Elko Co	April 11, 2017	65	59	LMI-A	SL-1
2016	Hydroponics/Aquaculture Feasibility Study	Wells	April 24, 2017	1,063	652	LMI-A	SL-1
2015	Water Resources Plan	Yerington	May 5, 2017	2,995	1,615	LMI-A	SL-3
2014	WNDD Revolving Loan Fund Grant	Fernley	April 4, 2017	11	7	LMI-J	EO-1
2015	Goldfield Water Line	Esmeralda Co	June 14, 2017	325	175	LMI-A	SL-3
2014	Imlay Sewer Improvement	Pershing Co	June 16, 2017	68	41	LMI-C	SL-3
2015	Tahoe Chamber Business Counseling	Douglas Co	June 22, 2017	5	5	LMI-C	EO-1
TOTALS				21,013	13,419	63.86%	

OUTCOMES	#1 = AVAILABILITY/ACCESSIBILITY	#2 = AFFORDABILITY	#3 = SUSTAINABILITY
OBJECTIVES			
DECENT HOUSING	DH-1	DH-2	DH-3
SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT	SL-1	SL-2	SL-3
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY	EO-1	EO-2	EO-3

Note: Table C provides a summary of accomplishments for grants closing during the 2016 program year

Table D: Summaries of CDBG Beneficiaries from Closed Grants PY2016-2017 by Race & Ethnicity for LMC, LMJ, LMH

Location	Title	White	African American	Asian	Am. Indian/Alaskan	Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	Asian/White	African American/White	Am. Indian/Alaskan & White	Other Multi Racial	Total by Race	Hispanic	Total Area-Wide Benefit
Fernley	SBDC Business Counseling	160	6	1	12	5	0	0	0	12	196	15	
White Pine Co	RNDC Housing Rehab	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	
Elko Co	Senior Center Energy Efficiency Project	410	3	5	25	2	0	0	0	0	445	38	
White Pine Co	RNDC Housing Rehab	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	
Fernley	WNDD Revolving Loan Fund Grant	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Pershing Co	Imlay Sewer Improvement	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	
Douglas Co	Tahoe Chamber Business Counseling	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
Storey Co	Fire Protection District Ambulance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	945
Nye Co	Gabbs Swimming Pool Renovation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
Wells	Economic Development Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1063
Douglas Co	Indian Hills Needs Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2500
Lyon Co	Rural NV Continuum of Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Esmeralda Co	Goldfield Transportation Vehicle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Esmeralda Co	Goldfield Fire Truck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
White Pine Co	McGill-Ruth Test Well	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Wendover	Florence Way Street Improvement, Phase 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4425
Lyon Co	WWTP Improvement Design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2222
Lyon Co	Dayton Valley Roadway Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1423
Elko Co	Montello Storm Water Master Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Wells	Hydroponics/Aquaculture Feasibility Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1063
Yerington	Water Resources Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2687
Esmeralda Co	Goldfield Water Line	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Total		634	9	6	37	7	0	0	0	12	705	54	17879

Table E: Summary of CDBG Beneficiaries by Income Levels LMC, LMJ, LMH - Grants Closed in the 2016-17 Program Year

INCOME LEVEL	BENEFICIARIES
Extremely Low Income	4
Low Income	699
Moderate Income	2
Total:	705

NOTE: Tables D and E reflect the direct benefit recipients by race, ethnicity, and income levels.

5. CDBG Self Evaluation Considerations

Are the strategies and activities making an impact on identified needs?

As noted in the Executive Summary, the State CDBG Program met its overall objectives for PY 2016-17. The following chart lists priorities identified in the Consolidated Plan and reflects progress made in addressing each priority by persons, businesses or jobs projected for the 2016 projects.

The strategies and activities of the State CDBG Program make a significant impact on identified needs of rural Nevada, especially in the areas of public infrastructure, housing rehabilitation, and planning and capacity building at the local government level. Annual applications reflect the needs identified by the local rural communities. Each year 15 to 20 of the eligible 26 units of general local government apply for or sponsor projects requesting CDBG assistance, indicating the grant program is considered worthwhile and valuable to rural Nevada.

Community & Economic Development Priorities: 2016 CDBG				
Priority #	PROJECT ACTIVITIES:	Five Year Goal	2016 Program Year	Total to Date: 2015-19
10	Improve infrastructure by assisting with sidewalk/path, street, water and wastewater system upgrade and development projects.	105,000 persons	20,966	34,010
11	Enhance access to quality facilities to serve the population throughout rural Nevada.	70,000 persons	0	12,279
12	Provide infrastructure and other planning support for units of local government.	65,000 persons	13,586	24,455
13	Retain and expand existing businesses.	100 businesses	0	0
14	Support recruitment and attraction of new businesses to Nevada.	125 businesses	0	0
15	Provide employment opportunities low- and moderate-income people.	25 Jobs or People	100 people	214 people
	TOTALS	240,000 persons; 225 businesses; 25 jobs	34,652	70,958

Additionally, eleven (11) households will be assisted with housing rehabilitation (Housing Priority #2). Also, Priority #15 lists Jobs as the Goal. There is one small business counseling project that serves approximately 100 LMI-C individuals annually. Jobs are reported at the end of the project. Total beneficiaries for the 2016 program year are estimated at 38,235: 25,070 (65.57%) are LMI.

What indicators would best describe the results?

The best indicators of the impact of the CDBG program are the enhanced quality of life and viability of the rural communities served through the program. Other measures of the impact of the program are:

- the total number of persons served by a project and the LMI component contained in that number;
- the amount of money leveraged by CDBG funds is a significant indicator of success;
- improved infrastructure and facilities;
- the number of houses rehabilitated;
- improved emergency services;
- increased access to facilities and places;
- increased economic opportunity.

What barriers may have a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and the overall vision?

The level of funding relative to the size of the service area, the diversity of needs throughout the service area, and the small number and turnover of staff are areas of concern. The “boom and bust” economies prevalent throughout rural Nevada can seriously impact program objectives and long-term vision. Nevada is once again, after the Great Recession, experiencing growth. The five-year objectives crafted need to be monitored and reconsidered as circumstances change throughout rural Nevada.

What adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities might meet your needs more effectively?

While the five-year plan sets out broad objectives and priority needs, in reality, program objectives are adjusted each year through the grant application and review process. Typically, the highest priority for the use of CDBG funds in the State of Nevada, as determined by the grantees themselves, is in public facilities and improvements.

The State does not propose changing this overwhelming priority use of CDBG funds. However, state priorities may affect how non-entitlement funds are prioritized in rural Nevada to coordinate and compliment economic development in each region of rural Nevada. In 2016, all applicants participate in a competitive grant process versus prior years which allowed for pre-determined set-aside funds. This was not always the highest use of funds. The competitive process allows the best projects to rise to the top for funding.

Good planning remains an on-going priority. Plans awarded funds must detail how the plan will result in a project and how that project will be funded. Plans are not funded if it appears they will “sit on a shelf.”

On-going training remains a priority for CDBG team members. Increased flexibility in methods of training help ensure new CDBG Grant Administrators are trained when they take on responsibility for the program and projects. CDBG staff members continue to assist units of general local government through workshops and on-going technical assistance, in determining community needs and making stronger applications for CDBG grant funds. The CDBG Grant Administration Manual, finalized in 2015 and on the website, is updated as needed and used for on-going training. Each CDBG eligible entity received a hard copy of the manual in 2015 and can access updates on the website or by contacting the CDBG office.

In June of 2016 CDBG Eligible Entities were trained in using the new ZoomGrants application and grant management system. This is a cost and time saving system for both the State and the grantees. Changes in the application procedure have continued to focus on streamlining the process for applicants while maintaining the quality of an application’s content. Applicants can submit two applications for the city or county and two sponsored applications, if there are no more than five currently open grants by the applicant.

Each year the CDBG Grant Application Guidebook is updated and posted to the CDBG website. Additionally, in June of 2016, ZoomGrants application training and Grant Administration Workshops were held in Elko, Carson City, and Ely. This training and workshop is held each year. For other training, CDBG staff members have found it is more effective when technical assistance is provided in smaller groups or one-on-one, if appropriate. Such assistance is and will be tied in with monitoring site visits.

Other improvements targeted for 2016 were:

- 1) Increase the accuracy of data entry in IDIS (including ethnicity, race, disability, and female head of household for projects requesting that data).

During the 2016 program year, the Program Specialist has been diligent regarding data entry into IDIS. CDBG staff members have revised the Project Benefits Report(s) to clarify the report form(s) and accurately reflect the information required in IDIS for each type of project. Also, with fewer staff members, reporting is more accurate when staff works closely grantees on fewer and larger grant projects.

- 2) Continued Updating of the CDBG Grant Administration Manual.

CDBG staff members developed a CDBG Manual in the 2015 and have found it to be helpful and effective in the annual training. Grantees may use their manuals or view chapters and exhibits on the CDBG website. Updates are posted as needed.

- 3) Develop resource materials for use by the program and grantees.

CDBG continues to target specific training topics, such as *Actively Furthering Fair Housing Choice*, in which current or revised resource materials are needed by program staff and/or grantees. In the case where resource materials do not exist, CDBG staff researches and develops materials. CDBG staff hopes that by implementing the ZoomGrants system, time will be freed up to work on resource materials. Additionally, the HUD Integrity Bulletins help staff members communicate key issues to local jurisdictions.

- 4) Monitor status of grantees' civil rights & equal opportunity policies and procedures.

Silver State Fair Housing provides Fair Housing Training, which is available to CDBG grantees. The revised CDBG monitoring helps with assessing the status of the grantees' Civil Rights & Equal Opportunity Policies and Procedures. Additional training and guidance is provided as needs are assessed.

5. Monitoring

The frequency and method of monitoring grantees and grant-funded activities

Grantees are monitored through a quarterly reporting system, by site visits, regular communication with grantees, and as Draw Requests are submitted. Prior to closing grants, program staff members review the CDBG office grant files for completion, make on-site visits to ensure grantees' files are complete, and that all required reports are on file. A risk analysis approach is used in deciding which grantees require field monitoring and in determining the monitoring calendar.

During the past program year, three (3) monitoring visits were conducted on-site. Monitoring on-site is considered an opportunity to work with grantees in a reciprocal manner. Staff learns more about the community and concerns the grantee may have; the grantee learns more about CDBG regulations and processes.

Additionally, CDBG staff members have devised an internal grant management system by which grantees are not allowed to proceed to a next step if all documentation is not current and in place. The step process varies according to the type of grant project but has helped eliminate the problem of "missing" documentation at the end of a project. This is especially important for construction projects.

What is the status of grant program?

The total amount drawn down from HUD and disbursed to grantees during Program Year (PY) 2016 was \$2,233,897.18. Of the total, \$442,032.86 came from the 2014 HUD allocation; \$1,058,792.64 came from 2015 funds; \$733,071.68 came from the 2016 HUD allocation. The 2015 grant year is the first year that First In/First Out was eliminated and grants are paid from the grant year of their funding.

All 2014 Administration and Technical Assistance funds had been used by the end of the 2016 PY. All 2015 Administration funds had been used; \$3,104.79 remained of the Technical Assistance funds. All 2016 Administration funds had been used; the full \$24,348 remained of the 2016 Technical Assistance funds.

For the quarter ending 2016, Nevada had a Ratio Expended Last 12 Months to Grant of 0.85. This should be 1.00 or over, and generally is. There have been projects that are having larger draws, which – in the short term – lower this ratio. The Ratio Unexpended to Grant stood at 0.79 and is well under the 2.5 times unexpended. The spending rate ratios are from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Line of Credit Control System (LOCCS) Report. Nevada was third best in the nation in these assessment ratios following Delaware and Utah.

As with prior years, an effort has been made in this program year to update the accomplishments more accurately and close grants in a timely manner. In prior years, this

information was reported in PER tables. These tables were not required for the 2013 or 2014 project year CAPER, as the 2013 and 2014 Annual Action Plans were done in the IDIS e-Con Planning Suite. Per Notice CPD-16-10, the 2015 State PER includes the PR 28 Activity Summary and Financial Summaries. The CAPER, per the definition in the Notice, is the qualitative narrative reporting as required by 24 CFR Part 91, which is applicable to State CDBG grantees. See Appendices for the PR 28 Activity Summaries for the 2016 program year.

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

Progress continued during PY 2016 in monitoring and closing-out of projects. In total, 22 projects were closed during the year. The goal is to have open grants from three grant years at the maximum (and few from the oldest year). At the end of the 2016 program year, no grants were open for PY 2013 and 2014. Two projects from 2015 were open: one had expended all funds; the second project had a balance of \$60,833.25, which will likely be de-obligated, as the project has received two extensions on its timeline and has been open for two years. Technical Assistance had a balance of \$3,104.79 at the end of PY 2016. Fifteen of the 2016 program year grant awards were open as of June 30, 2016; three projects had closed. For additional details on grants closed during the 2016 program year, refer to Table D.

In addition to closing out grant projects, the State of Nevada has closed out grant years 1995 through 2012. We anticipate closing grant years 2013, and possibly 2014, in 2017.

At the end of June 30, 2016, there were 19 open grants: none in PY 2014; two (2) in PY 2015; and 17 in PY 2016. An additional 17 projects will be funded when the HUD allocation is distributed. While there were delays in implementing two 2016 projects, all projects have made substantial progress and should close on schedule.

Monitoring, both desk and on-site, is an effective tool by which to manage activities. Monitoring remains a high priority of the CDBG program. The continued goal is to work closely with grantees throughout the grant period, especially at the start of a project, and assist in any way to ensure timely completion of projects and grant close-out. This is generally accomplished through thorough desk monitoring and on-going contacts with the grantees.

Are grant disbursements timely?

Draw requests from the units of local government (UGLG) are processed immediately upon receipt against a checklist of draw requirements. If all relevant documents are in the State's grantee file, the draw request is processed by the CDBG office in one to three days. It is then sent to the Governor's Office of Economic Development Business Office for processing. Approval of draw requests can be withheld if the relevant supporting information and other administrative documents are not in place at the time of the draw request.

Over the years there has been improvement in the rate at which UGLGs draw down. Generally, Nevada stays ranked in the top three or four for drawing down funds and timely expenditure of

funds.

B. HOME Program

1. Investment of Resources

The State continued to invest dollars in a variety of activities to support the following types of initiatives:

- Development of permanent supportive housing for homeless persons with disabilities.
- Prevention of eviction to prevent homelessness.
- Provision of down payments, closing cost assistance, and homeownership counseling to assist families in rural areas purchase their first home.
- Construction and rehabilitation of affordable rental units. Resources are invested to fill gaps in financing to develop rental units that are affordable to individuals at 60 percent, 50 percent, 40 percent or less of the median income for the area.
- Rehabilitation of housing through locally managed programs that assist low-income homeowners with needed home repairs.
- Funding support for communities that seek to assist low-income disabled and senior residents with rental payments.
- Education on fair housing that supports HUD required activities in support of the Fair Housing Act.
- Administrative funding is provided to local communities and nonprofits to support the administrative costs for some of the program categories above.

The total allocation received from HUD for the year was \$3,002,348. Total commitments to projects and programs from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 totaled \$1,177,179.56

Every year the State determines the amount of funds which will be disbursed in the State based on a formula that has historically been used in the HOME program. First, the formula considers the population within the geographic regions based on the latest available statistics and takes into consideration the amount of all HOME funds coming into the state. The State then allocates a portion of the State HOME funds to all areas of the State, ensuring each Nevadan gets the same amount of HOME funds regardless of where they are living.

The State continues to well exceed its 15 percent CHDO set-aside requirement. We continue to work with CHDOs to continue to surpass the 15 percent requirement.

2. Analysis of Activity Goals

The goal of the State was to rehabilitate eleven units of affordable rental units, to weatherize and rehabilitate ten to twenty units, provide down payment assistance for twenty home owners, assist 5-10 vouchers for households that are seniors or disabled and ensure equal

access and opportunity to housing resources throughout the state and partner with fair housing service providers to offer casework, discrimination complaint investigation, education and outreach.

The Division was able assist ten (10) households in achieving homeownership and an additional six (6) homes were rehabilitated using HOME and Housing Trust funds. The Division was able to provide three hundred and thirty-two (332) households with rental assistance and rental deposits using Trust Funds. The Division continues to fund Nevada Rural Housing with Trust Funds to provide rental assistance and deposits.

The State also had goals to increase and preserve the supply of affordable housing available to the elderly, disabled, and large families, improve housing accessibility and safety and improve access special need populations have to services. This year one hundred and eighty-two (182) tax credit units will be built or rehabilitated for the elderly, two hundred and fourteen (214) tax credit units will be built or rehabilitated for mixed-income projects, one hundred and two (102) family units will be rehabilitated, and one hundred and twenty-two (122) special needs units will be constructed. The State continues to make elderly, special needs, and veteran housing a priority in its tax credit annual Qualified Allocation Plan. In addressing housing accessibility and safety, all new construction projects are ADA compliant. When Rural Nevada Development Corporation rehabilitates single family homes they ensure that the homes are brought up to code and if any accessibility requests are needed, they ensure that they are completed. The Division and Rural Nevada Development Corporation also refer persons who are in need of only a ramp to Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living. They have an office in Reno, Elko and Fallon. The Division works closely with many state agencies such as the Division of Developmental Disabilities and Aging Services. Although the Division is not involved in services related to populations with special needs, they are well informed as to what agencies may assist them when they do receive calls from people asking for help. One staff member is on the Governor's Mental Health Planning Advisory

Council and attends quarterly meetings. Being involved in the Continuum of Care also educates staff in assisting people with their needs.

3. Rental Projects

The Division completed three new HOME projects this year. Carefree Lincoln in Caliente, Panaca, and in Pioche, Nevada contains fifty-two (52) affordable senior living units.

4. Owner-Occupied Housing

Through the State's regular year-round State Housing Fund funding cycle, a total of \$300,000.00 was awarded to Rural Nevada Development Corporation in HOME funds for down payment assistance and homeowner rehabilitation in the non-entitled rural areas. The total amount expended on homeowner rehabilitation this year was \$48,087. RNDC completed five (5) homeowner rehabilitation projects this year. The amount expended for down payment

assistance was \$88,102.22. These funds assisted twenty-one households, giving them the opportunity to achieve homeownership.

5. On-Site Inspections of Affordable Rental Housing

NHD has conducted the required monitoring of affordable rental housing units assisted under the HOME and Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program. During this period, the State conducted on-site monitoring of 77 HOME and Trust fund-assisted rental properties. There were 238 tenant files reviewed for compliance to program regulations, and 238 units were physically inspected for compliance to Housing Quality Standards. The monitoring of HOME-assisted projects is conducted at the same time as the tax credit and bond program audits, and are incorporated into the annual monitoring schedule for those programs.

If there was an issue of non-compliance, properties were required to respond within 24 hours to 90 days to rectify the situation, depending on the severity of the issue. All properties are currently in compliance.

The Division also conducted the annual audit of State Recipients and sub-recipients funded with HOME and Low-Income Housing Trust Funds. This past year the Division audited City of Henderson, City of Reno, Washoe County, Lyon County, Clark County and the City of Las Vegas.

Rural Nevada Development Corporation was also audited to review their Down Payment Assistance and Homeowner Rehabilitation Programs. Home funds are provided to families at or below 80 percent of area median income and Trust Funds to families at or below 60 percent of area median income. Clients are assisted on a first-come first-served basis throughout rural Nevada.

7. Affirmative Marketing Actions and Outreach to Minority- and Women-Owned Businesses

The State continues to require that all recipients of State HOME dollars adopt an affirmative marketing plan as described in 24 CFR 92.351. Requirements were set forth in funding contracts and consist of actions required by recipients to provide information and otherwise attract eligible persons from all racial, ethnic and gender groups in the housing market.

The State of Nevada has a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program. The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program is comprised of minority and women owned businesses that are socially and economically disadvantaged. The State keeps a list of qualified contractors on its website which and be located at <http://www.nevadadbe.com>.

The Housing Division has changed its data collections procedures to get a clearer picture of who is being served. All recipients are aware of the new data collection procedures and the Division has incorporated the requirement into all of its housing programs.

Silver State Fair Housing Council did multiple trainings throughout the State. Information was

forwarded to all the managing companies. The State continues to work closely with Silver State Fair Housing Council ensuring that the State is addressing any issues that Housing and Urban Development may have regarding fair housing. Silver State Fair Housing Council provides information and assistance with fair housing issues to all residents of Nevada, including housing consumers, housing providers and state/local agencies. They have a statewide Fair Housing Hotline, which is 1-888-585-8634.

The State's HOME program has done a good job of ensuring that minorities have had access to HOME funds. As of last quarter's snapshot of the state, the rental projects have housed eighty-eight percent (88%) White households and twelve (12%) Hispanic households. The homebuyer projects have assisted ninety (90%) White households and ten percent (10%) Hispanic households.

The Division has still works closely with the Governor's Council on Disability.

8. Housing Units Produced

The Consolidated Plan established priorities for unit production by income level, rental homes, homelessness and special needs. The priorities established are shown in the following tables:

Table F: Priorities for Housing Units Produced

Type of Household	Low-Income, 0-30%, MFI	Low Income, 31-50%, MFI	Moderate Income, 51-80 % MFI
Renters—Elderly	High	Medium	Medium
Renters—Small Related (2-4) Persons	High	High	Medium
Renters—Large Related (5 or More) Persons	High	High	Medium
Homeowners	High	Medium	Low
Special Needs	High	High	High

Table G: Rental Housing Units Produced vs. Goal

Type of Renter	HOME	Trust Funds	FY 2016 Goals	FY 2016 Actual	Five Year Goal	Five Year Goal Actual
Small Related (includes 3 homeless units)	4	0	0	0	50	71
Large Related	1	0	10	4	50	38
Elderly	1	0	0	9	30	91
Renters (All Others)	3	0	0	0	0	3
Special Populations	0	0	0	0	20	26
Grand Total	9	0	10	13	150	229

Table H: Housing Units Produced by Income Level

Assistance Provided by Income Group	HOME	Trust Funds	HOPWA	Tax Credits	Total Units Produced
Extremely Low Income, 0-30% MFI	9	0	102	98	100
Very Low Income, 31-50% MFI	2	0	6	640	648
Moderate Income, 51-80% MFI	2	0	3	233	238
Grand Total	13	0	111	971	886

Table I: Homeownership Units Produced with HOME and Trust Funds

Name of Project (Agency Name)	Funding Amount	Source	County Location	No. of Units	Type of Assistance	Population
Rural Nevada Development Corporation	\$150,000	HOME	Humboldt,	1	Down Payment Assistance	3-Single
			Elko,	2		3-Single
			Nye,	4		Parent
			Lyon,	1		2-Related
			Churchill,	0		Two Parent
			Lincoln,	0		0
			Mineral,	0		Elderly
			White Pine,	1		2-Other
			Douglas	1		
			Total	\$150,000		

Of the ten (10) households assisted with Down Payment Assistance, six (6) were single-female head of household.

Table J provides a summary of the owner-occupied housing rehabilitation projects funded in FY 2016 with HOME and Trust Funds.

Table J: Owner Occupied Housing Rehabilitation Produced with HOME and Trust

Agency	Funding Amount	Source	County Location	Number of Units	Population
Rural Nevada Development Corporation	\$150,000	HOME	Churchill,	0	3-Single
			Eureka,	0	
			Nye,	1	
			Elko,	0	
			White Pine,	1	
			Lincoln	1	
Totals	\$150,000			3	3

Of the three households assisted with owner-occupied housing rehabilitation, three (3) were single-female head of household.

9. Worst-case housing needs and the housing needs of persons with disabilities

NHD sees that there is a great need for homeowner rehabilitation in the rural areas when it comes to worst-case housing needs. This program is the most time consuming program that we fund. This year we were only able to assist four homes with homeowner rehabilitation because of staff turnover at the non-profit who administers the program. We hope to maintain or increase this level of assistance in the years to come. The Division continues to augment its weatherization program with Trust Funds and this year thirty-seven (37) of the ninety-five (95) households assisted were disabled households. NHD also sees the need to increase housing vouchers. Although, the need is great NHD has very limited resources to be used in the rural area. Therefore, to use NHD's Trust Funds in conjunction with their voucher program, NHD requires that those persons for families being assisted are either disabled or seniors on their waiting list.

10. HOME Activities in relation to Objectives in Annual Plan

OBJECTIVE: PROVIDE DECENT HOUSING (RENTERS)

1. Goal: Decent Housing for very low-and low-income elderly and families with new and improved affordability.

Annual Goal: Approximate 20 units of production per year

Outcome: Create decent housing with new and improved affordability through rental housing production.

Indicator: In FY2016 the HOME program completed nine units (9) for low-income seniors.

2. Goal: Decent Housing by enhancing suitable living environment through new and improved sustainability

Annual Goal: Provide approximately 20 units per year of tenant-based rental assistance to elderly and persons with disabilities.

Outcome: Assist elderly and disabled households to receive housing assistance with rental assistance.

Indicator: In FY 2016 the Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program allocated \$739,257 for Tenant Based Rental Assistance. NHD was able to assist twenty-eight (28) elderly and disabled households with rental subsidy and we provided three hundred and thirty-two (332) households with Tenant Based Rental Assistance and security deposit funds.

1. Goal: Decent Housing for very low-and low-income elderly and families with new and improved affordability.

Annual Goal: Approximate 20 units of production per year

Outcome: Create decent housing with new and improved affordability through rental housing production.

OBJECTIVE: PROVIDE DECENT HOUSING (OWNERS)

1. Goal: Decent Housing by creating decent housing with new/improved affordability.

Annual Goal: Assist 20 households per year at or below 80 percent of area median income with down payment assistance.

Outcome: Provide homeownership assistance to low and moderate income households

Indicator: In FY 2016 the HOME and Low-Income Housing Trust Fund programs spent \$96,129 to assist ten (10) households with down payment assistance.

OBJECTIVE: CREATE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT (RENTERS)

1. Goal: Suitable living environment by increasing the availability and accessibility of transitional and permanent housing opportunities for very low income households and persons who are homeless or on the verge of homelessness

Annual Goal: Identify potential to expand transitional and permanent housing opportunities.

Outcome: Provide housing to 5-10 homeless persons/households annually.

Indicator: In FY 2016 six hundred and forty-two (642) new units were added to inventory that house very low income households.

OBJECTIVE: CREATE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT (OWNERS)

1. 1. Goal: Suitable Living Environment by enhancing suitable living environments through new and improved sustainability by providing rehabilitation to existing owner occupied housing units.
2. Annual Goal: Provide housing rehabilitation and weatherization to approximately 10-20 low-to-moderate income owner-occupied housing units.
3. Outcome: Units meeting energy star standards and number of low and moderate income households assisted.
4. **Indicator: In FY 2016 the Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program expended \$114,765 to weatherize sixty-five (65) units, resulting in lower energy costs for low-to-moderate income households.**
5. The following tables summarize the HOME program housing accomplishments for the 2015 program year.

Table K: Summary of Accomplishments HOME Program PY 2015

Priority Need Category	No. of persons served
Renters: 0 - 30% of MFI	9
31 – 50% of MFI	2
51 – 80% of MFI	2
Owners: 0 - 30% of MFI	0
31 – 50% of MFI	4
51 – 60% of MFI	3
61 – 80% of MFI	0
Homeless: Individuals	0
Families	0
Non-Homeless Special Needs	0
Total Housing	20

Table L: Summary of Accomplishments HOME Program FY 2016

Total Housing	No. of persons served
White	13
Black or African American	0
Asian	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0
American Indian or Alaska Native & White	0
Asian and White	0
Black or African American & White	0
American Indian or Alaska Native & Black or African American	0
Other Multi Racial	0
TOTAL	13
Number listed above with Hispanic Ethnicity	2

11. HOME Self Evaluation Considerations

Nevada Housing Division (NHD) measures success both in terms of the efficiency with which programs are administered and the number and diversity of the individuals that are served through the programs.

Are the activities and strategies making an impact on identified needs?

NHD feels that the activities and strategies are making an impact on the identified needs. The State's identified needs were multi-rental rehabilitation, homeowner rehabilitation, homebuyer assistance and new construction-multi-family. The Division completed two multi-unit projects this year. One project is a new construction property in Winnemucca. The second, Summerhill, is in Las Vegas. This project is also a tax credit project and consisted of acquisition rehabilitation. The Division has also funded five projects currently under construction. These projects, located in the City of Henderson, City of Las Vegas and three in the rural counties will add new units for families, seniors, veterans and those on the verge homeless. These projects are currently under construction and it is anticipated that they will be complete within the next 18 months.

What indicators would best describe the results?

The indicators that would describe the results are that the communities that are having HOME projects built are all very pleased with the projects that are being built or being rehabilitated. One of the strongest indicators is that the communities must approve the project before it is awarded HOME funds.

What barriers may have a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and the overall vision?

One barrier is with the way the HOME funds are distributed through the state because although we have a great working relationship with the other Participating Jurisdictions, the control as to how fast the funds are being committed to their projects is taxing. We do, however, keep a very close eye on the projects being committed and completed in IDIS to ensure that the time limits are met. We previously shortened the time frame that they have to spend the funds to three years rather than five.

In economically distressed rural areas, local governments may not have sufficient staff to do the work necessary to develop projects and obtain grant funding. The problem is further compounded in these areas by the lack of nonprofit housing and service providers, the lack of design professionals and the lack of contractors to implement projects. NHD has been steadily increasing its presence in the rural areas and working with the non-profits to ensure the rural areas of the state are being assisted.

What is the status of grant programs?

NHD's programs are strong, effective and improving. There continues to be a steady demand for NHD's programs. The HOME funds are being spent in a timely manner and we hope to continue the rate of spending in the next coming year. NHD uses the LIHTF to provide the match requirements for HOME as well as gap financing for the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program (LIHTC).

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

The Division feels that all projects under way will be completed in a timely manner. There were a couple of projects that did fall behind this year due to the timing of the tax credit allocation and the fact that tax credits were not as lucrative as they were in the past so more funding was needed for the projects. All jurisdictions have gotten a handle on the funding needed to complete these projects; NHD does not anticipate having any more slowly moving projects.

Are grant disbursements timely?

NHD has a rapid grant disbursement system. On average, NHD approves grant awards within 30 days of application and begins disbursing funds shortly afterward. Reimbursements for project costs are generally made within five working days.

Are major goals on target?

Although the Division feels the major goals are on target, it is very hard to report on those goals. The Annual Plan only reflected the goals of the areas of the non-entitled area and project that we directly fund HOME funds and Trust Funds. Most of the bond and tax credit projects are in Clark County. We will not be reporting on the HOME and Trust Fund projects

that Clark County, Washoe County, and the City of Henderson are administering with State HOME and Trust Funds. However, we will report on the units that are receiving tax credits and Bond funding for informational purposes only and they will not be counted in our goal totals.

What adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities might meet your needs more effectively?

Because the Division does allocate the HOME funds on a pro-rata basis, we have limited funds for the rural areas. This is also because the Trust Funds have gone from a 12,000,000 allocation a year down to \$3,000,000. Therefore, we will continue to leverage our funds with as many resources as we can find. We plan to coordinate as much with Rural Development as their funding sources allow more families to be assisted with HOME funds.

C. Emergency Shelter/Solutions Grant Program (ESG) Summary

1. Investment of Resources

In addition to using ESG allocations to fund programs in rural and northern Nevada, agencies are also required to match 100% of their ESG allocation by utilizing other available resources to address the needs of homeless and at risk of homeless households. Programs that were used to provide cash match resources included State Low-Income Housing Trust funds, Community Services Block Grant funds, county and city funds, and cash donations. In addition, shelters utilized volunteers to help with the management of local shelters and to man crisis call centers, and vouchers were provided to shelter clients so they could obtain clothing and other needed items as needed.

ESG funds were awarded to agencies who submitted a Request for Funds application. Funds were allocated for the following programs and services:

- 31% for operational costs for emergency and transitional shelters for the homeless and domestic violence victims, including motel vouchers in communities that lack access to homeless shelters, and
- for homeless clients in emergency and transitional housing shelters;
- 41% of the 2016 award was allocated for rapid re-housing rental assistance and case management programs to place homeless individuals and families into apartments;
- 16% was allocated to reimburse agencies for costs of collecting and entering client data into the required Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database, and to pay for DV shelters to have access to the HMIS comparable database;
- 12% of the allocation was awarded to HMIS Lead Agency to offset costs of maintaining the HMIS database, to help offset costs of the HMIS database; and
- 3% of the 2016 allocation was used to offset administration costs for the Division and sub-recipients.

Table L reflects the 2016 grant awards by sub-recipient, along with the amount of the allocation that has been expended as of June 30, 2017.

Table L: Emergency Solutions Grant Program Allocation Summary

EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT PROGRAM PY 2016				CFDA NUMBER 14.231-16			ALL FUNDS WERE COMMITTED TO AGENCIES BY 09/01/2015. GRANT END DATE 06/30/17	
SUB-RECIPIENT	COUNTY	EMERGENCY/ TRANSITIONAL SHELTER	HOMELESS PREVENTION	RAPID RE-HOUSING	DATA COLLECTION	ADMIN 7.5% CAP (23,320)	TOTAL AWARDED	PERCENT EXPENDED GRANT-TO-DATE
Carson City ADV	Carson	\$25,000			\$8,000		\$33,000	100%
Churchill County Social Services	Churchill	\$15,640			\$5,420		\$21,060	75.69%
City of Reno	Washoe			\$60,000			\$60,000	60%
Carson City HSS	Carson			\$53,950	\$12,000	\$5,300	\$71,250	50.5%
FISH-Carson	Carson/Douglas Co	\$32,500			\$3,000		\$35,500	99.8%
Lyon Co. HHS	Lyon			\$60,000	\$8,000		\$68,000	49.2%
Clark Co. DSS	Clark				\$54,000		\$54,000	100%
State Admin						\$4,700	\$4,700	100%
TOTAL		\$136,140		\$170,950	\$100,420	\$15,300	\$420,810.06	100%

2. Analysis of Annual Goals

The annual goals impacting the ESG program were as follows:

- Support homeless shelter and transitional housing for approximately 1,000 persons
- Create transitional and permanent housing beds, including rapid re-housing assistance, for 35 households
- Assist approximately 700 households who are at imminent risk of homelessness; and
- Support collection of data in HMIS.

The maximum amount allowed by program regulations (60%) was awarded to homeless shelters, domestic violence shelters, and transitional housing for the homeless to pay for shelter operation costs and case management. A total of 589 adults and children were provided access to shelter housing and services in rural and northern Nevada.

State ESG funds were also allocated for housing relocation and stabilization cost, which provided case management and other supportive services to the homeless and those at imminent risk of homelessness. A limited amount of ESG funding was provided for rental assistance, as agencies utilized State Low Income Housing Trust funds to provide most of the rental assistance needed for homeless prevention and rapid rehousing clients. All totaled 35 adults and children were prevented from becoming homeless, and 140 homeless adults and children were provided access to housing.

Funding was also provided for HMIS data collection support which allowed for agencies to enter client data into the statewide HMIS database, and to provide funding for the statewide HMIS

system to provide financial support since two HUD grants were not awarded funding in the northern and rural Continua, and a small amount was used to pay for agency and state administrative costs.

3. ESG Beneficiary and Financial Data (ESG Supplement to the CAPER)

Addendum #1 at the end of this report reflects data retrieved from HUD's IDIS software, along with all narratives and Performance Standards outcomes, as required for the ESG Program.

4. ESG Self-Evaluation Considerations

Summarize how activities and strategies are making an impact on identified needs.

The Division expects that programs and services funded through ESG and other programs will assist local communities with efforts to address and end homelessness. Examples of actions that agencies took during this past year to help with these efforts included: utilization of employment programs to help persons obtain jobs; providing case management services to residents of homeless shelters to assist them with housing and services referrals; partnering with mental health and substance abuse providers to access shelter + care and other housing vouchers and supportive case management services; working with the VA and local housing authorities to obtain VASH vouchers and other VA supportive services; and offering bridges out of poverty training, including financial literacy classes, to teach program participants life skills to remain stable once assistance has ended.

The Division also required sub-recipients to take additional steps which would help ensure the long-term success of the ESG program, and to support efforts of local continuums of care in meeting HUD's goal of ending homelessness. Specifically, sub-recipients were asked to do the following:

- Integrate with local Continuums of Care;
- Increase collaboration efforts including coordination with local CDBG, CSBG, VA, faith-based groups, charities, and other programs or services to obtain funding to support ESG programs;
- Coordinate with local Workforce Investment Boards and/or Community Coalitions;
- Implement formal community-wide Discharge Plans;
- Ensure the timely expenditure of ESG program funds; and
- Help make HMIS a functional and effective database by ensuring accurate and timely data entry.

This past year sub-recipients remained actively engaged in community-wide collaborations, which will have positive and long-lasting impacts on local and statewide efforts to address and end homelessness. The following reflects some examples of partnerships that occurred:

- Medical professionals to provide participants with free, long-term, chronic medical/prescription care. Proper medical care will promote long-term housing stability.
- Chronically Homeless referred to Carson City Health & Human Resources to help place them into the Rapid Rehousing Program through NV Rural Housing - HUD.
- Refer people to the Carson City Health & Human Services for their different housing programs. Centralized Intake Form developed with other Agencies in order to improve efficiency,
- Access to Healthcare Network for Aging/Disability Resource Center for the Carson City area. This partnership offers elderly or disabled ESG participants an additional resource for assistance in completing applications for non-cash mainstream resources, understanding his/her benefits, and any other additional assistance they may need. They are onsite one day per week.
- Nevada State Welfare Division (NSWD) to provide onsite services. CCHHS hosts an outreach eligibility worker from NSWD three days per week. Applications for Medicaid and SNAP are processed immediately onsite.
- Financial Guidance Center (FGC), a non-profit financial consultant agency. Appointments with FGC are onsite at Carson City Health and Human Services which assists with financial consults on debt related issues, bankruptcy, and credit options including rebuilding credit history. Nevada State Bank provides volunteers who facilitate financial workshops on budgeting, identity theft, “needs” versus “wants”, and rebuilding credit. This has been a key component in getting participants to start taking responsibility for bad decisions and understanding how credit will affect their ability to rent an apartment, employment, etc. After participants attend the workshops they get a better sense of how to communicate with bankers.
- Churchill County engages mainstream partners by co-locating in the county facility and working on program development and access so that program barriers are removed for participants. We obtain applications for all partners and assist in completion and submittal to alleviate frustration.
- Elko FISH continues to issue campsites, needed camping items, food, showers, laundry and vouchers for clothing. City of Elko enforces the camp rules/regulations. Frontier Resource Center, (Communities In School) provides improved efficient services to clients. The State of Nevada Welfare Department provides direct face to face client interaction. Additionally, assisting with SNAP benefits and Medicaid while a card can be printed immediately.

What indicators would best describe the results?

Although agencies struggled to meet some of the performance outcomes such as increased

earned income and referrals to permanent housing, there have been improvements in these areas from previous years. Increased efforts by shelters to improve household income is occurring, and utilization of local coordinated intake and referral systems has provided access to housing vouchers funded by the State Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program. Because of collaboration that occurred between local communities, the rural housing authority, and the Division, homeless and at-risk of homeless clients are being housed much sooner than would have occurred in past years.

Finally, progress continued in communities to address unemployment issues. Job creation became a priority at the state, county and local level which resulted in continued reductions in the unemployment rate this past year.

Describe actual outcomes that occurred based on performance measures created in partnership with local Continuum's of Care.

The Division required that programs and services funded through the ESG program help with local efforts to address and end homelessness. Program objectives were created in partnership with the northern and rural Continuum's of Care since these areas were funded with State ESG allocations.

Overall, most the State's outcomes were met, although a review of data obtained from HMIS reflects a need for shelters to work more closely with homeless individuals and families to increase earned and unearned income so long-term stability can be obtained.

Refer to Attachment B for the listing of objectives, anticipated outcomes, and actual results of agencies funded with State ESG funds.

What barriers may have a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and the overall vision?

For the 12-month period ending in June 2017, the long-term unemployment rate is 1.2 percent, down 5.8 percentage points from the peak. There is still a need for viable employment with livable wages which would allow a household to live without the constant threat of housing instability. It has been challenging to improve the earned income of the homeless enough so that they can become stable in the long term.

Lack of sufficient permanent housing units, and funding to pay for housing vouchers, continues to be a huge barrier. The Governor's Interagency Council on Homelessness, along with the three Continuum's of Care, have identified large gaps in the availability of permanent housing, including permanent supportive housing, for the homeless across the state.

The Nevada Rural Housing Authority's Section 8 program closed the waitlist due to an unusually high volume of applications received from out of state. This is causing agencies that would normally use ESG funds to provide rapid re-housing rental assistance to high-risk or vulnerable homeless clients to cut back. Program regulations and limited funding reduces the length of

time program participants can be in ESG-funded programs, and clients will not be able to transfer into Section 8 when allocations are expended.

State Low-Income Housing Trust Funds allocated to the Rural Housing Authority, which were used to provide housing vouchers to the most vulnerable homeless in rural Nevada, has been tapped out. Funds received this upcoming year will be used to maintain housing for clients currently receiving vouchers, and does not allow for increased assistance.

Implementation of a “Housing First” approach continues to be a challenge throughout Nevada. In rural Nevada, there are limited vacancies and landlords willing to rent to high-risk tenants. In addition, lack of sufficient oversight by case managers in other funded programs has resulted in limited oversight of homeless tenants and damage occurring in rental properties.

The continued lack of transportation in rural communities means access to jobs can be challenging when communities lack ways for its citizens to travel between where they live and/or receive shelter or services and where they work.

Finally, although the HMIS database has become a huge component in the overall success of the ESG program, funding cuts and lack of other funds available to pay for agency staff to enter clients into HMIS has resulted in over 30% of the ESG annual allocation being used for HMIS-related expenses. This equates to approximately \$121,920 in funding that could be used to provide much need housing and services to the homeless and at risk of homelessness populations each year.

5. Monitoring and Grant Status

The frequency and method of monitoring ESG sub-recipients

The ESG Program Manager is responsible for the monitoring of ESG sub-recipients as reflected in the ESG’s Policies and Procedures-Compliance Monitoring section. Each year a Risk Assessment Worksheet is completed to determine which sub-recipients require a monitoring visit in the upcoming year. In PY 2016 Division staff conducted four ESG on-site visits and there were no areas of improvement required. There was a substantial change in staff at the end of PY16 as the PY17 applications were being reviewed and awards were due.

The Division’s financial auditor also reviews sub-recipient financial statements and notifies the ESG Program Manager of any concerns or issues that need to be addressed either immediately or during an on-site monitoring visit. The financial auditor participates in the annual program monitor; uses information received in the annual financial statements to make recommendations of sub-recipients that may need a site visit; and participates in the on-site monitoring visit.

What is the status of grant programs?

All 2015 funds have been completely expended; 67.7% of the 2016 allocation awarded July 1, 2016 has also been expended. The balance will be utilized by sub-recipients during the 2017 program year.

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

As of submission of this report three (3) agencies have expended 50% or less of their 2016 allocation. The following are summaries explaining delays in the timely expenditure of funds:

- Lyon County Human Services - 49% of their 2016 grant funds have been spent. Lyon County is working to provide more case management for individuals who are not able to move to Rapid Rehousing in the allotted 30 minutes.
- Carson City Human and Human Services – 50% of their 2016 grant funds have been spent. Staff shortages and lower availability in housing units has delayed their spending.
- City of Reno - 0% of their 2016 grant funds have been spent. Rapid Rehousing staff have not been hired. If they have not found an individual by September of 2017, they will be allocating their funds to provide more support to Emergency Shelter Operations.

Are grant disbursements timely?

The Division has expended 67.72% of the 2016 allocation, and has processed drawdowns from IDIS at least quarterly as required by program regulations.

The ESG Sub-Recipient Award Agreement executed between the Division and all sub-recipients requires draw reimbursement requests be submitted at least quarterly. Agencies that fail to meet this requirement risk the recapture of their allocation. Most agencies submitted requests at least quarterly and are processed within seven days of receipt by the Division. Several agencies did not meet the draw reimbursement timeline requirements this past year and submitted narratives explaining the reason for delay, along with a plan to ensure all funds will be expended by the end of the grant period, with their annual reports. Division fiscal staff have reiterated to Sub-recipients that draw requests of \$0 will be expected for months where there is no spending to be reimbursed.

What adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities might meet your needs more effectively?

The Division will continue to monitor performance reports obtained from HMIS to see types of programs and services provided within a community; identify any unmet needs; and to use the information to divert funds from an under-performing agency to one with the capacity to meet established outcomes.

It is challenging to take funds from shelters in rural communities as there are limited resources for the homeless; however, if data shows that shelters are not improving the stability of clients served, funds may be diverted. Shelters and homeless providers must make every effort to increase the earned, cash, and non-cash income of the homeless population so that long-term stability can be obtained.

6. State of Nevada Low-Income Housing Trust Fund Welfare Set-Aside Program (WSAP)

The State's Low-Income Housing Trust Fund Welfare Set-Aside Program is a set-aside of state generated funding that is allocated to county social services agencies and the City of Henderson each year for emergency homeless prevention activities. Funds may be used for emergency rental and utility assistance, along with security deposits for apartments and utilities, to prevent homelessness throughout Nevada. In addition, counties may use these funds to provide motel vouchers for homeless individuals and families who lack a regular fixed night time residence. In FY 2007, the Division also began allowing use of these funds for short-term rental assistance for up to six months if it was determined that without the assistance clients would not be able to pay their rent and would be homeless. As a result, Welfare Set-Aside funding was eligible to be used as match to the new ESG-Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program.

In 2009, due to a dramatic decrease in existing housing sales throughout Nevada, the amount of revenue deposited into the Trust Fund account decreased substantially. The Trust Fund account continued to see decreases in revenues until increases in the sale of existing homes this past year resulted in an increase in allocations.

This past year 643 households who were at risk of homelessness throughout Nevada received assistance using these funds. Individuals and families were prevented from becoming homeless due to eviction or utility termination.

The following table summarizes the allocation and clients served with Welfare Set-Aside funds, as reported by agencies from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017:

Table N: Welfare Set-Aside Program for Emergency Assistance

Agency	Award	Households Served 7/16-6/17	# Of Households at Poverty	Total # of adults and children
Clark County Social Services	\$658,778	NOT REPORTED		
City of Henderson	\$102,795			
Washoe County Social Services	\$162,015			
Carson City Health and Human Services	\$95,000			
Churchill County Social Services	\$11,000			
Douglas County Social Services	\$13,500			
Elko County Social Services	\$12,000			
Humboldt County Indigent Services	\$8,420			
Lincoln County	\$12,000			
Lyon County Human Services	\$17,000			
Mineral County (CAHS)	\$12,500			
Nye County Social Services	\$17,000			
White Pine County Social Services	\$9,000			
TOTALS	\$1,129,008			

7. Homeless Discharge Coordination

The Division created Performance Standards for ESG sub-recipients which included the requirement to formally develop community-wide discharge plans. Agencies created action plans to implement formal discharge planning processes which included executing Memorandums of Understanding with at least 2 partner agencies.

This past year one rural community created teams consisting of jails, hospitals, behavioral health departments, fire department emergency management staff, community health centers, and mental health providers to identify the most vulnerable encounters/clients based on usage of services. Teams discussed cases; resources were identified; and shared case planning was developed between the agencies. The most vulnerable were moved to the top of the community services lists. When a person was identified in a jail or hospitals the team was notified with a date of expected discharge. Resources were discussed and if homeless, housing upon discharge was coordinated. For homeless persons with the need for medical follow up, hospitals assisted with finding temporary or permanent housing. If there was an opportunity, social services staff visited the homeless in hospitals prior to discharge to present programs and screen for eligibility. The same process was followed for jails.

The success of this community with identifying and addressing the issues of these chronic and vulnerable homeless has been noted and other communities have shown interest in developing similar programs.

D. Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) – PY 2016.

Northern Nevada HOPES is the only HOPWA project sponsor in Northern Nevada. Using HOPWA funds, HOPES provides TBRA (Tenant Based Rental Assistance), STRMU (Short Term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility Assistance) and PHP services to HIV positive individuals. Through the provision of these services clients are assisted in creating a plan for self-sustainment, thus aiding in the prevention of homelessness.

HOPES is a federally qualified health center (FQHC) located in Reno, Nevada that provides coordinated medical care and support services to over 6,500 individuals. Since 1997, HOPES has been the only comprehensive HIV provider in northern Nevada. For 19 years, HOPES has provided medical, pharmaceutical, case management, and support services to persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA). In recent years, HOPES has added behavioral health, transportation, and medication delivery to its already robust list of services offered. In 2013, HOPES became a Federally Qualified Health Center and in May 2014, received national Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) status recognition.

Utilizing a healthcare team of medical providers, case managers, behavioral health specialists, pharmacists, and outreach workers, HOPES provides compassionate integrative care to over 75% of the PLWHA living in northern Nevada. Their team-based approach to healthcare allows clients to access a range of comprehensive services in one central location. Northern Nevada HOPES serves all counties in Nevada except for Clark, Esmeralda, and Nye counties. Outside of the Reno/Sparks area, the geographic area that HOPES serves is primarily rural and frontier.

Northern Nevada HOPES currently provides integrative services (medical care and supportive) to 9,400 HIV positive individuals living in northern Nevada. HOPES' HIV patients are largely low-income, with 69% living at or below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level. 92% are on antiretroviral therapy, 89% are viral load suppressed, 12% are co-infected with hepatitis C, 24% are homeless, and an estimated 15% are still uninsured after Affordable Care Act implementation. 40% are men who have sex with men (MSM), 17% are female, 18% are Hispanic and 8% are African American. Approximately 10% of HOPES HIV positive clients live in rural areas.

HOPES is committed to caring for northern Nevada's HIV positive population and recognizes that HIV patients require a dedicated healthcare team to ensure they remain in care. Utilizing Ryan White Part's B, C, and D funding, HOPES provides PLWHA with integrative healthcare that includes: primary medical care, chronic disease management, behavioral health counseling, substance abuse counseling, mental health medication management, nutrition counseling, housing assistance, transportation, and individualized case management designed to remove barriers to accessing care.

The staff at Northern Nevada HOPES has been specially trained in HIV treatment, and remains up to date on HIV treatment recommendations. Many of the HIV positive individuals presenting at Northern Nevada HOPES are experiencing homelessness or are at risk of becoming homeless. HOPES utilizes HOPWA funds to provide housing services to these individuals, thus increasing their likelihood of being retained in care and adherent to their medication regimen. All clients receiving HOPWA funded services are asked to apply for all public assistance/subsidy programs that they are eligible for, and when approved for said programs, are transitioned from HOPWA services to the new subsidized program.

This past year 126 unduplicated HIV positive individuals were served with HOPWA funds; 14 people were served through the TBRA program, 104 through STRMU, and 26 people were served through PHP service. Thirty individuals received more than one HOPWA service (i.e. STRMU and PHP). Of the three individuals transitioning off the TBRA program this grant year, two were able independently sustain their own housing and after transitioning off the program, one was able to transition onto STRMU for short-term support with a plan to independently sustain their housing in the new future, and one individual passed away while on the program. Eleven individuals served by TBRA remain on the program and will continue to need TBRA funding assistance during the next grant year. Many of the individuals continuing TBRA live on fixed Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) incomes and therefore do not anticipate their financial status changing in the near future. Four of the eleven individuals served are families with one or more children.

Of the 104 people receiving STRMU funds, 31 have stabilized their financial and housing situations and can maintain private housing without further subsidy, and one individual transferred to a non-HOPWA funded subsidy program. One individual served with STRMU funding passed away this prior year exiting the program. Thirteen participants disconnected due to relocating to an area or another unknown reason. It is anticipated that 73 of the clients who received STRMU assistance this past year will likely need additional STRMU assistance in the future to maintain their stable housing arrangements. 126 of the clients receiving HOPWA funded services maintained contact with their case manager consistent with the schedule specified in his or her individualized service plan. Additionally, 126 maintained a housing plan with their case manager. 126 individuals receiving HOPWA assistance remained compliant with their medical treatment. 126 accessed and maintain health insurance, many of whom HOPES staff helped enroll into and/or maintain their healthcare plan. 42 participants successfully accessed or maintained a source of income while on the program. The individuals who did not maintain a source of income experienced negative life events such as the loss of a job, loss of temporary employment, and/or discontinuation of unemployment assistance. Additionally, some of the individuals could not work due to the importance of focusing their time on resolving health problems.

Twenty-eight recipients received HOPWA assistance in the operating year prior to this report, and of those, fifty-five received assistance in the two years prior to this report. Regarding previous housing situations prior to being placed on the program, 27 individuals receiving HOPWA assistance met HUD's definition of homelessness. No individuals joined the program

directly after being released from a substance use treatment facility, and none directly after being released from a psychiatric hospital. No participants prior living situation was a medical hospital. One individual previously lived in a group home, one in jail, and three owned private housing. 80 individuals rented room, apartment, and/or house, and all of whom were at risk of homelessness.

Twenty-eight percent of clients accessing HOPWA services identified as American Indian 1.5% Latino, 23% identified as African American, 18% as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 1.5%, and 56% as White/Caucasian. 58 percent of clients receiving HOPWA assistance had incomes between 0-30% of the area median income, and 29% had incomes between 31-50% of the area median income, and 13% had income above 50% of the area median income. Throughout the year, ten individuals were defined as chronically homeless prior to accessing HOPWA services, and two individuals served were homeless veterans. Combining these numbers with the 29 homeless individuals served as stated above, there were a total of 31 individuals defined as homeless who accessed the HOPWA program this grant year.

The goal for the 2016-2017 fiscal year was to provide assistance to 148 unduplicated individuals through HOPWA funded services; however, the program did not meet its goal and total of 126 unduplicated individuals were served. Regarding specific programs, HOPES goal was to serve 18 individuals with TBRA funds and ultimately served 14 individuals. HOPES goal was to serve 100 individuals with STRMU funds and served 104 throughout the year. Regarding PHP, HOPES missed its goal of serving 30 individuals by serving 26 individuals. HOPES has identified housing shortages and increased rental prices as being one of the main reasons for not achieving its TBRA and PHP goals. In the past year, Washoe County has seen a drastic reduction in the number of available housing units. As well, rents have begun to increase well beyond individual's affordable range. Because of this, fewer clients in need of housing assistance are able to locate suitable rental units. Because of the increase in housing prices, when a client is able to locate housing, HOPES now has to pay more towards a client's rental assistance than in previous years. Because of the high costs of housing in Reno/Sparks, motels in the downtown Reno area have become permanent housing alternatives for many clients; currently there is a movement to remodel the downtown area. This movement is causing more of a housing shortage and a larger number of displaced individuals. In addition to this, because of the partnerships that HOPES maintains with the Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board, and Reno Housing Authority, HOPES was able to assist 26 individuals with PHP funding so they could obtain permanent housing at one of these sites. HOPES has built a good relationship with a few local motels (Crest Inn, Gateway Inn, and Desert Rose) to provide temporary housing or in some cases permanent housing to individuals with a fixed income that cannot afford the high prices elsewhere.

HOPWA funds assisted HOPES in greatly improving the lives of 126 clients, and 72 beneficiaries. As previously mentioned, funding assisted 32 previously homeless individuals in accessing and sustaining adequate housing. This was accomplished through the coordinated effort of case managers, behavioral health, and clinic staff.

Some of the barriers that project sponsor Northern Nevada HOPES has encountered that impacts their ability to effectively assist clients with housing stability are: housing affordability and availability, criminal justice history, credit history, economic stability and fixed incomes, rental history, RWPB eligibility, Federal regulations related to undocumented citizens, and PLWHA living with multiple chronic diagnoses.

Housing affordability is a major concern for PLWHA in northern Nevada. Families and single adults, working or not, often have difficulty obtaining affordable housing. In the past year, as a result of the economic boom in Reno related to Tesla and other corporations moving to the area, housing prices have skyrocketed and housing availability has drastically decreased. In some areas, the rent for a one-bedroom apartment is \$850 a month. As a result, more and more PLWHA are experiencing great difficulty locating and obtaining affordable housing. This is especially true for PLWHA that are living on a fixed income. Although HOPES maintains partnerships with local housing developers and housing units who offer rentals to HOPES clients at a reduced rate, the availability of these types of housing units is not sufficient to meet the needs among the agency's clients.

In recent years, PLWHA in Reno have had a hard time locating and maintaining employment that provides a livable wage. Many PLWHA have minimal marketable job skills, have poor employment history, have criminal records, are undocumented or experience mental illness and substance abuse problems that limit their ability to seek and maintain employment. Additionally, many clients of HOPES are too ill or sick to maintain a 40-hour work week. Finally, low-income clients of HOPES do not have reliable sources of transportation and therefore have to take public transportation to their jobs when they do find employment. Along with the financial burden that this places on low-income clients, Reno's public transportation is ineffective with buses often running behind and the commute being very lengthy. It is not unheard of for it to take 1.5 hours to get somewhere on public transportation that it would take 15 minutes to drive. Although in the past year many PLWHA in Washoe County have managed to obtain employment, many still earn minimum wage which does not increase their chances of obtaining afford housing. When workforce and skills development negatively impact PLWHA's ability to locate housing, HOPES refers clients to local workforce development and employment assistance agencies.

PLWHA's difficulty obtaining stable employment can have a snowball effect on their ability to obtain housing. Inability to maintain employment that pays a livable wage prevents PLWHA from maintaining stable housing, which results in poor rental history and poor credit history, and ultimately impacts their ability to obtain future housing. To help overcome this barrier, the staff at Northern Nevada HOPES maintains strong working relationships with housing providers who will often overlook poor rental history and/or criminal background and agree to house a client despite their past. Additionally, many PLWHA still face discrimination and prejudice when seeking affordable housing. Through HOPES strong working relationships with housing vendors, HOPES is able to assist PLWHA in locating housing where they feel safe and free of discrimination and prejudice.

Remaining RWPB eligible can be a difficult task for many HIV positive individuals living in HOPES service area. Many clients live day to day, never knowing where their next meal will come from or if they will continue to have a roof over their head. For these clients, remembering to update their RWPB on time, or locating all their needed documentation can be a daunting task. Although HOPES Case Managers work with these clients, providing reminders and assisting in gathering up the needed documentation, many clients get discouraged and choose not to follow through and seek alternatives elsewhere. When PLWHA do not complete their RWPB eligibility, they do not have access to valuable services, and inability to access those services in turn negatively impacts their ability to not only sustain housing but to adhere to their medical treatment recommendations and medication regimens.

Per federal regulations, individuals who are not legal citizens (undocumented) of the United States may not access federally funded resources, including HOPWA. As a result of this policy, many PLWHA who are unstably housed or experiencing homelessness do not have access to the financial resources that HOPWA provides. As a result, their housing situation does not get better, and often gets worse.

Many PLWHA suffer from comorbid conditions, including hepatitis C, diabetes, substance use, and untreated mental health concerns. Because of these comorbid conditions, many PLWHA experience a double burden when attempting to maintain housing.

One last challenge that the project sponsor Northern Nevada HOPES has experienced this past year is related to employee turnover and continued education on HOPWA Federal policies and procedures. In the past year, HOPES has added many new staff members to its Case Management team. Because there is no formal HOPWA training program, training new staff on the HOPWA program has been difficult. If possible, HOPES would like to request technical assistance and/or individualized training on the HOPWA program to ensure that the agency is operating the program per all regulations.

HOPES has recognized the following trends in the past year, many PLWHA living with HIV for many years moving to the area, lack of affordable housing as a result of an influx of people moving to the area in search of employment, and discrimination related to employment and housing among PLWHA that have escalated to legal interventions.

In the past year, HOPES has conducted many intakes on long-term survivors of HIV who are moving to the area to be with family. Many of these people are not only living off of limited income, but are resistant to HIV medication which negatively impacts their ability to achieve economic growth and stability. As mentioned above, the Reno/Sparks area is experiencing a housing shortage. The housing shortage is driving up the cost of housing, creating gentrification and pushing “poor” people out of the affordable living areas, and causing great housing instability for PLWHA living in Washoe County. The last trend that HOPES has seen this past year is related to discrimination. Many PLWHA still face housing and employment discrimination because of their HIV status and/or sexual orientation. HOPES maintains a

relationship with the Nevada Disability Advocacy and Law Center who works with HOPES HIV positive clients on the resolution of discrimination cases.

HOPWA Monitoring:

The annual site monitoring visits were conducted for all Ryan White projects, including HOPWA. Site visits were conducted face-to-face to discuss programmatic, fiscal and barriers that have surfaced during the grant period. To maximize travel dollars and efficiency, the administrative, programmatic, quality management and fiscal monitors were accomplished simultaneously at each sub grantee location, concentrating on one geographic area at a time. Appointments were scheduled in coordination with the sub grantees at least a month in advance; reporting materials were prepared for each sub grant and forwarded to the sub grantee with confirmation of their appointment. In regards to Northern Nevada HOPES, there were no corrective actions noted.

Monitoring Process is as follows: Daily – AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) is centralized through the state office, permitting a daily review of client applications, especially if a housing client needs medications. Weekly - The Quality Management (QM) Coordinator has frequent contact with sub grantees, speaking and corresponding with them, providing technical assistance as needed. Monthly – The sub grantees must submit their Reimbursement Requests along with the required backup substantiating the requested amount. These requests are reviewed and monitored by the Fiscal and Grant Manager, verifying compliance with the budgets and scope of work where any issue of concern that might arise is addressed. Quarterly – Each sub grantee submits a quarterly report to the Quality Management Coordinator identifying services and numbers of clients served, and funds spent for the reporting period. These reports include their QM reports outlining their Quality Improvement (QI) efforts; challenges, and their successes. Monitoring Process Outcomes– The communication established and maintained with our sub grantees and community partners because of the monitoring activities listed above allows for regular and timely address to any questions or concerns that may arise.

5. RURAL NEVADA CONTINUUM OF CARE (RNCOC)

Below reflects a summary of actions that occurred PY 2014 with the Balance of State Rural Nevada Continuum of Care, which many ESG recipients and the ESG Program Manager participate. Although the State consulted with all three CoC's during the allocation process, the northern and southern Nevada CoC summaries are not reflected in this document as summaries are provided in local entitlement CAPERs:

A. Accomplishments

Accomplishments of the RNCOC during the past 12-month period included:

- Successful submission of grant applications to HUD on behalf of the RNCOC;
- Conduction of the point in time (PIT) count process and results;

- Provided specific profiles for each county in the balance of state related to homelessness in the PIT report;
- Conducted ongoing training and orientation of providers in the RNCoC to enhance utilization of HMIS;
- Successfully submitted the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) and all shells were accepted;
- Developed and finalized the Strategic Plan for ending homelessness in Nevada's rural and frontier counties;
- Worked with individual communities who oversee local coordinated intake and referral systems to identify the most vulnerable homeless using the VI-SPAT assessment system;
 - 146 of the most vulnerable homeless persons across rural Nevada were provided access to housing vouchers using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds. 100% of these clients were exited into the Section 8 Housing Voucher program.
- Updated and approved Performance Measures reporting system for rural CoC and ESG recipients;
- Created joint Written Standards for the RNCoC and State ESG program;
- Members participated in local community coalitions meetings to address homelessness and poverty in counties and towns;
- Coordinated with the two other CoC's in the state to implement a statewide approach to HMIS and enhance statewide efforts to address homelessness; and
- The RNCoC Chairperson became a member of the Governor's Interagency Council on Homelessness, and members attended meetings which were open to the public.

B. Actions

The RNCoC met every month to facilitate the rural continuum process. The Governing Board held meetings each quarter and provided oversight of the RNCoC strategy to address homelessness. The Peer Review subcommittee presented grantee reports and updated the Board on grantee performance indicators. Meetings included grantees and homeless service providers from each of the rural counties and were conducted face-to-face and via teleconference to accommodate the geographic distance.

Technical meetings were held 8 times during the past 12 months as a complement to the quarterly Board Meetings. Technical meetings are end-user meetings that cover a variety of topics and issues as identified by service providers in the balance of state. Service providers use these meetings to identify emerging trends, update the service delivery system on changes in services and to learn about resources to aid in addressing homelessness.

Topics addressed during technical meetings included:

- Implementation and ongoing process of local coordinated intake and referral systems, including discussions on what works/does not work;
- Sharing of discharge planning processes;
- Review of utilization rates and bed coverage reports for agencies participating in HMIS;

- Discussion regarding HMIS statewide issues and updates;
- Provided updates on statewide CoC and Governor's Interagency Council on Homelessness meetings;
- Reviewed implementation of Statewide Performance Measures and targeted outcomes;
- Annual PIT counts and results;
- Planning and updates from CDBG forum presentation to demonstrate what the RNCOC has accomplished;
- Updates on the RNCOC strategic planning;
- Updates on funding of the renewal projects submitted as part of the RNCOC 2014 NOFA;
- Conducted ongoing meetings on how the RNCOC will fund HMIS costs since HUD did not award the HUD grants for northern and rural Nevada;
- Updates on the ESG grant, major changes and implications for RNCOC such as performance standards;
- Education, discussion, and planning regarding AHAR;
- Updates from members regarding community coalitions and local initiatives; and
- Ongoing collaboration with local educational agencies and other providers who assist homeless families.

Subcommittee meetings held throughout the year included the Strategic Planning subcommittee; the Grantee Performance/Peer Review subcommittee meetings; the annual Rating and Ranking of northern and rural grant applications; the Statewide CoC Coordination subcommittee meetings; and the annual homeless point-in-time working group.

6. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Nevada Housing Division is the largest producer of affordable housing in Nevada. This year the Division developed five hundred and fifty-two (552) new affordable units using its Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program. These projects will house all low-income families. There were three (3) multi-family bonds issued this year which represents an additional four hundred and ninety-one (491) units.

The Division continues to use its HOME funds for a down payment assistance program and homeowner rehabilitation program in the non-entitled areas of the state with the remaining state funds that are left after allocating to multi-family projects.

The Division continues to use of its Housing Trust Funds to augment the Section 8 programs around the state. These funds are helping to relieve the waiting lists and help the worst-case needs (which are low-income families who are paying more than 30 % of their income for rent and live in substandard housing, homeless people or people who have been involuntarily displaced). The Division funds the Rural Housing Authority Trust Funds to get the elderly and disabled off the waiting list. They also continue funding a "deposit" program for families at 60

percent of median income with Trust Funds. This has been a very successful program and the deposits are paid back to the Housing Authority and reused for other eligible families.

7. ACTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHER FAIR HOUSING

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires each state to conduct an analysis to identify impediments to fair housing choice within the state and to outline and take appropriate, effective actions to ameliorate the identified impediments. The phrase “fair housing choice” refers to an environment in which persons, of similar incomes, have the same housing choices, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, national origin, or disability.

CDBG and NHD sponsored Fair Housing training in 2013 conducted by Silver State Fair Housing Council. The training was mandatory for anyone planning on submitting a CDBG grant application for 2014. During the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan process, one action proposed is to include this as an application requirement. A process for this requirement will be reviewed during the 2016 and/or 2017 program years.

CDBG staff members continue to work on the development of a template for the 26 eligible entities to use in conducting the Four-Factor Analysis at the local level. This was not completed before the end of the 2015 program year and remained a goal for the 2016 program year. The intent is to work with the State Demographer in 2017 to secure accurate data from which an accurate template can be created.

CDBG staff members did finalize revisions for the Project Benefits Reports to accurately capture the data required for each project type. Unlike the other HUD programs, CDBG has no waiting lists so data collection and reporting are monitored for accuracy and completeness.

The state continues to review ADA accessibility issues; monitoring and updating buildings are part of an on-going process. State reviews are conducted on a scheduled basis by the State for all owned and leased properties.

With the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, a new Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice was completed to inform the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. The Impediments identified are:

Private Sector:

- (1) Discrimination against disabled residents and families with children.
- (2) Racial and ethnic minority home loan applicants are denied more frequently than white or non-Hispanic applicants.
- (3) Lack of understanding of fair housing laws and the role of the fair housing infrastructure.

Action steps include:

- partnering with Silver State Fair Housing Council on outreach to managers of new and existing rental housing complexes;
- working with professionals in the home lending industry and other pertinent agencies and organizations to discuss findings and address differentials;
- conduct outreach and education of prospective housing consumers on acquiring and keeping good credit;
- establish a requirement for grantees to take actions to publicize fair housing rights, responsibilities and remedies.

Public Sector:

- (1) Zoning laws and development standards have restricted some types of housing, notably group homes and other types of supportive housing.
- (2) Lack of a substantially equivalent state agency enforcing the Nevada Fair Housing Law
- (3) Lack of understanding of fair housing laws and the responsibility to affirmatively further fair housing.

Action steps include:

- Conduct a statewide survey to determine if local zoning and land-use ordinances are following recent changes to state law;
- Notify jurisdiction not in compliance with the requirements;
- Draft a compliance report.
- Contact the Equal Rights Commission to share findings of the State AI;
- Discuss with the Commission ways in which to collaborate;
- Request a copy of the Commission's most recent report.

During 2015, the Analysis of Impediments, the Consolidated Plan and the 2015 Annual Action Plan were completed. Initial action steps taken were: (1) contacting the Equal Rights Commission and (2) discussion about a Request for Proposals (RFP) to determine if local zoning and land-use ordinances are following recent changes to state law. The RFP needs to be thought out and developed. While it was scheduled to begin in late 2016 or early 2017, demand on staff time, and turnover in housing staff members, delayed this planning effort until August 2017. All priorities and action steps will be implemented over the next five years.

NHD works diligently with the developers of affordable housing in the rural areas to ensure that the development of affordable rental housing is outside of minority areas. This year the Division saw two projects completed. The projects are located at 3630 East Owens in Las Vegas and 242 W Minor Street in Winnemucca. Additionally, seven households were assisted in achieving homeownership. None of the homes were in a minority area. Of the seven (7) households assisted three (3) were female head of households. When assisting a disabled person, who is living on social security, the non-profit informs the borrowers of the Rural Development program. This program allows the homeowners to receive interest rates as low as one percent. These interest rates allow persons with low-incomes to achieve the dream of

homeownership.

8. OTHER ACTIONS (REPORTED VIA CR 35 IN IDIS)

Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations; and policies affecting the return on residential investment (In IDIS)

The State of Nevada's statute NRS 361.082 is the most effective policy that affects the return on residential investment. NRS 361.082 allows for an exemption for property taxes. It states that real property and tangible personal property used for housing and related facilities for persons with low incomes are exempt from taxation if the property is part of a qualified low-income housing project that is funded in part by federal money appropriated pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12701 et. seq. The State allows the local governments to control issues such as land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs (In IDIS)

Special needs populations, the homeless, elderly, and those with very low-income continue to be the most vulnerable populations who struggle to obtain or retain housing stability. Calls received daily demonstrate the need for additional resources to not only house the homeless, but to provide assistance to individuals and families who are facing financial difficulties and are at risk of eviction.

To help address this situation the Division's Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program identified the need for projects that could house the lowest income tenants, including projects serving persons with physical or developmental disabilities, individuals and families who are homeless, and veterans. Tax credits were awarded to projects throughout the state which will provide affordable housing to these populations.

The Division also received a Section 811 grant which will provide 44 units of housing to persons with severe physical and developmental disabilities. The Division will partner with existing tax credit properties, the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, and Medicaid to provide housing and services to these households.

The Division allocated State Low-Income Housing Trust funds in partnership with the Emergency Solutions Grant program to provide rental assistance to homeless and at-risk of homelessness populations throughout rural Nevada, and Trust funds were utilized by the Rural Housing authority to quickly house the most vulnerable homeless identified through local community screenings.

Finally, an allocation of funding is awarded to social services agencies across the state which is

used to provide emergency rent and utility assistance, security deposits, and mortgage payments if needed, to households earning less than 60% of the area median income so that they don't become homeless due to eviction.

8.1 Lead Based Paint Goals (Also in IDIS)

This past year the Nevada State Health Division created the Nevada Healthy Homes Program, an initiative to improve the quality and availability of safe and healthy homes for Nevada residents. It was developed as an expansion of the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, which is a collaborative effort between the Southern Nevada Health District, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, and the State of Nevada Health Division.

The purpose of the Healthy Homes Program is to identify unhealthy conditions in the home environment and address critical determinants of health. Collaborative efforts focused on reducing asthma triggers, preventing unintentional injuries, eliminating poisoning hazards, and to educate and assist residents to identify resources so that they may modify and improve their home environment.

The Nevada Healthy Homes Program spoke at the Managed Care Organizations Quarterly Meeting to inform them of the importance of lead screening and to inform them of new sources of lead poisoning from non-tradition sources. The Healthy Housing and Lead Poisoning Surveillance System are in the testing phase. Information from hard copies of lab reports and other medical submissions is being collected and will be used to track the voluntary submission of lead screening results. A Lead Poisoning Fact Sheet was created to build awareness for lead poisoning issues.

The Division continued to support a non-profit agency in rural Nevada that administers emergency rehabilitation, owner occupied housing rehabilitation, and acquisition and rehabilitation of existing buildings and is the point of contact for lead testing.

CDBG:

The Governor's Office of Economic Development: Rural Community Development/CDBG ensures that homes built prior to 1978 that are rehabilitated with CDBG funds are tested for lead-based paint hazard by the Rural Nevada Development Corporation (RNDC) staff. Any chipped, peeling, or flaking paint is tested with an XRF analyzer. If lead-based paint is present, the contractor is tasked with setting up proper containment areas during construction and with proper clean up. Any hazardous lead paint areas must be encapsulated. In some instances, the components, such as door and window frames, are replaced. Other times the peeling paint is scraped and peeled away and a special paint is used to seal the area. [Note: One-hundred percent of the homes rehabilitated with CDBG funds are LMI households.]

8.2 Anti-Poverty Strategy ***Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families (In IDIS)***

The Grants Management Unit (GMU) under the State of Nevada's Department of Health and Human Services created a mission to strengthen families, promote healthy outcomes, and support individuals to achieve self-sufficiency by working in partnerships with community agencies throughout Nevada. The GMU administers grants to support local, regional and statewide programs serving Nevadans, including the Community Services Block Grant, Children's Trust Fund, the Fund for a Healthy Nevada; and Title XX Social Services Block Grants. These programs address low-income and poverty issues through the prevention of child abuse and neglect, food security, services that support persons with disabilities and their caregivers, assisting low-income families and individuals to become more economically self-sufficient, and other services that promote the health and well-being of Nevadans. Although the GMU releases the annual report for activities and actions around October of each year, information was gathered from their website that included specific activities and initiatives that the GMU funded this past year. Below is a sampling of programs and initiatives that occurred throughout the state this past year:

- Community Action Agencies (CAA's) participated in community coalitions which were used to identify and address critical community needs affecting low-income individuals and families in areas such as unemployment, homelessness, mental health issues, and drug abuse. Community coalition agendas addressed improved coordination of services, prioritization of needs, and the establishment of common goals;
- CAA's collaborated with other community partners in the areas of joint planning, cross-referrals, shared case-management, and resource coordination;
- The GMU and the CAA's adopted the Nevada Service Directory Model, which consisted of a standardized intake assessment across 12 domains such as employment, housing, and transportation which each client completed. The intake was scale-based and measured client status in each domain using 5 level scale: thriving, safe, stable, vulnerable, and in-crisis. The intake assessment results were used to determine the type of services that the client received, which included any combination of the following: direct services provided by the CAA, information and referral, and case management. Clients receiving case managing created goals and plans to track progress on domain scales;
- CAA's established an agency Data Model which contained an extensive list of information and referral sources that were used to link clients with services the agency was not able to provide. The CAA's maintained ongoing relationships with their network of referral agencies through meetings and phone contact. Linkages were developed and gaps in services were addressed;
- CAA's expanded employment services to families and individuals, and coordinated with employment partners to provide training and workshops. Clients were registered with Job Connect and other partner agencies;
- CAA's served as the intake site for the State's Energy Assistance Program. Clients were screened and referred to emergency assistance programs as part of the intake process;

- Activities that prevented child abuse and neglect;
- Parent education classes and workshops;
- Hunger One-Stop Shop programs and other food security programs;
- Independent living programs;
- Mental health therapy services were provided to northern and rural Nevada youth between the ages of 13-17. SoS (Signs of Suicide) screening tools and educational curriculum were used to provide mental health services;
- In northeastern Nevada, a non-profit organization provided short-term quality care for children with special needs, offering a “gift of time” to families, enabling them to enhance the quality of their lives;
- Eligible children who were screened and identified as lacking access to affordable healthcare were linked to Medicaid or NV Check-up;
- Funded a program that provided behavioral health services to pediatric patients who were poor, uninsured or underinsured, and who were enrolled in Medicaid;
- Improved access to wellness and healthcare services in rural areas, focusing on low-income households that were medically underserved;
- Funded projects which assisted very low-income adults with disabilities at risk of institutionalization or homelessness in locating available housing; completing applications; and moving into and/or remaining in their accessible, affordable housing unit with community-based supportive care services; and
- Provided funding to the Crisis Call Center-First Call for Help via the statewide 2-1-1 system.

8.3 Institutional Structure and Intergovernmental Cooperation (Also in IDIS)

Intra- and inter-governmental cooperation has occurred for many years throughout the State of Nevada. The State is committed to continuing its participation and coordination with federal, state, county, local agencies, and the private and nonprofit sectors to serve the needs of low-income individuals and families across Nevada. The Governor’s Office of Economic Development, Department of Business and Industry, and the Department of Health and Human Services collaborate with various entities to continually improve coordination.

The Governor’s Office of Economic Development, Department of Business and Industry, and the Department of Health & Human Services all have individual institutional structures. Within each Office or Department, there are divisions that administer HUD programs. The Community Development Block Grant is in the Rural Community & Economic Development Division of the Governor’s Office of Economic Development. The HOME, ESG, and NSP programs are in the Nevada Housing Division of the Department of Business and Industry. The HOPWA program is in the Health Division of the Department of Health and Human Services. Each Division has its institutional structure, as well.

HUD funds pass through to local governments and other entities that are eligible to receive HUD program funding. These entities, when funded, are part of the institutional structure for each program. The scope of the institutional structure is from the state level to those at the

community level where projects are implemented and/or managed.

Actions taken in PY 2015 to enhance coordination and promote further development of that institutional structure included:

- Continued to support cross-jurisdiction economic development regions;
- CDBG provided funding for the Rural Continuum of Care (RNCOC). The continued financial support by the State CDBG office to the RNCOC Steering Committee supported funding to pay for consulting services that facilitated the grant process throughout PY 2015. Efforts by the Steering Committee, with help from the facilitator sponsored by Storey County CDBG staff, resulted in an estimated \$700,000 in HUD Continuum of Care Supportive Housing dollars for individuals who are homeless and chronically homeless in rural Nevada;
- Provided annual training workshops and on-going technical assistance to CDBG grantees;
- Supported planning collaboration efforts, such as Strengthening Economies Together (SET), in CDBG non-entitlement areas;
- Participated in quarterly meetings with other funders to maximize limited resources (CDBG, USDA, EPA, other collaborative funders);
- HOME continued to work with the staff of the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program to ensure that the HOME funds were used to leverage this program;
- The ESG Program Manager continued participation in the Rural Nevada Continuum of Care (RNCOC) Steering Committee and is the Homeless Management Information System Steering Committee chairperson. The ESG Program Manager also developed Performance Standards and Written Standards for use by both the ESG and Continuum of Care programs;
- Continued funding of State HOME and State Low-income Housing Trust Funds to Consortia and local jurisdictions to supplement HOME and ESG entitlement funding;
- Ongoing meetings between members of the Rural Nevada Continuum of Care, the Reno Area Alliance for the Homeless, and the Southern Nevada Continuum of Care to address unmet needs and issues of the homeless throughout Nevada;
- Meetings with HOME Consortia and local jurisdictions, local housing authorities and other service providers occurred to address affordable housing issues;
- Funding was provided by the Division to non-profit housing providers and local jurisdictions to subsidize weatherization funding throughout Nevada;
- Continued funding of State Low-Income Housing Trust Funds to Nevada Rural Housing Authority for TBRA program for senior clients on the Section 8 waitlist, as well as funding for a Security Deposit Program;
- Also, provided State Low-Income Housing Trust funds to Nevada Rural Housing Authority as part of the rural coordinated intake and referral system. 107 of the most vulnerable adults and children were provided housing vouchers until they could exit into the Section 8 program;
- The Division continued with the National Foreclosure Mitigation Grants and provided funding to Housing Counseling Agencies in northern, rural and southern Nevada;
- Division staff participated in local homeless point-in-time counts; so-chaired the RNCOC

Steering Committee; participated in Rating and Ranking of rural Continuum of Care applications; and attended statewide homeless conference calls;

- The Housing Division provided ESG funding to the Homeless Management Information System lead agency to ensure that the HMIS system oversight, user support, and data quality oversight would continue for the northern and rural Continua since two HUD grants were not funded to support the mandated database.

8.4 Public Housing Initiatives

Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies (In IDIS)

The following is a list of initiatives that occurred during FY 2012 with Rural Nevada Housing Authority:

- Security Deposit Program- assisted one hundred ninety-eight (198) families using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds received from the Housing Division;
- Provided fifty (50) elderly and disabled households TBRA Vouchers using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds received for the Housing Division;
- Housing Choice Voucher Home Ownership Program – 7 unduplicated families participated in the HCV Home Ownership program;
- Provided 146 homeless persons/104 households with State Trust-funded housing vouchers as part of the rural coordinated intake and assessment system
- Assisted 113 homeless Veterans and their families through the VASH (Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing) Program;
- Weatherization Assistance Program – Completed weatherization of 129 units. Completed 99% pass rate from Nevada Housing Division monitoring.
- HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program served 1,467 low income families through HUD funding and 63 veterans with VASH vouchers; and
- NRHA staff chaired the Continuum of Care Steering Committee and was selected to serve on the Governor’s Interagency Council on Homelessness. Their active participation and willingness to resolve issues helped homeless service providers in rural Nevada to assist homeless clients with access to Housing Choice Vouchers.

8.5 Weatherization

The Low-Income Weatherization Program’s mission is to reduce, when possible, the fuel or electricity required for heating and cooling for low-income eligible households. This mission is

accomplished through energy conservation and management strategies, as well as general repairs to dwelling units. Most of the applicant households receive other social services in addition to weatherization services. During FY 2015 \$4,738,952 in funds was spent to assist nine hundred and fifty-four (954) to reduce their energy costs.

8.6 Multi-Family Tax Exempt Bond Production

The Division issued multi-family bonds for three projects. The three multi-family projects are as follows:

Agate Senior Apartments	13,000,000
Boulder Point	15,000,000
Landsman Gardens	11,500,000

8.7 Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Production

Table O provides a summary of the multifamily housing units awarded Low Income Housing Tax Credits 2015.

Table O: Low Income Housing Tax Credits

Project Name	Tax Credits Awarded (\$)	City	County	LI Units	Total Units	Project Type	Population
Vera Johnson Manor	790,000	Las Vegas	Clark	76	76	Acquisition/ Rehabilitation	Family Housing
Woodhaus Apartments	291,000	Battle Mountain	Lander	28	28	Acquisition/ Rehabilitation	Family Housing
Alpine Haven	652,993	Sparks	Washoe	40	40	New Construction	Family Housing
Madison Palms	1,000,000	Las Vegas	Clark	72	72	New Construction	Senior Housing
Russell Senior Phase III	924,700	Las Vegas	Clark	90	105	New Construction	Senior Housing
501 North Lamb	930,000	Las Vegas	Clark	54	60	New Construction	Family Housing
Community Gardens	677,033	Reno	Washoe	181	181	Acquisition/ Rehabilitation	Family Housing
Stewart LIHTC	548,500	Carson City	Carson City	14	14	New Construction	Family Housing
Misc Additional Allocations	230,647						
TOTAL	6,044,873			555	576		

9. PROGRAM ASSISTANCE BY RACIAL AND ETHNIC BREAKDOWN

The following table provides a summary of the race and ethnicity of Nevada households and persons assisted with housing, homeless and community development activities in PY 2015.

Table P: Race and Ethnicity of Households/Clients Served

	HOME	CDBG*	ESG	HOPWA	Welfare Set-Aside	Trust Funds**
White	13	634	405	99	n/a	262
African Amer./Black	0	9	34	23	n/a	49
Asian	0	6	1	0	n/a	5
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	37	40	2	n/a	6
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0	7	6	2	n/a	8
Asian & White	0	0	0	0	n/a	2
Black/African American & White	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
American Indian/Alaska Native & White	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
Other Multi-Racial	0	12	20	0	n/a	0
Refused	0	0	1	0	n/a	0
Unknown	0	0	1	0	n/a	0
TOTAL	13	705	508	126	n/a	332
Hispanic Ethnicity	2	54	69	29	n/a	35

* The CDBG figures are based on data submitted at grant closing, which included projects funded in the 2014, 2015, 2016 program years, with National Objectives of LMC and LMH only.

** Trust Funds do not include households that have already been counted in the HOME figures.

10. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Citizen participation is a vital component of the Nevada formula grant programs. The State encouraged citizens, including low to moderate income and those with disabilities to comment on the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report for Federal Year 2016. The draft report was sent out to 26 eligible rural entities and other stakeholders in the state for publication and comment on August 23rd, 2017. The public was advised, through Public Notices in three newspapers August 22nd and 23rd (Elko Daily Free Press, Pahrump Valley Times, and Reno Gazette Journal), that the draft report would be available at rural city and county offices throughout the state. Copies of the Public Notices are attached to the final report. The Public Comment Period is from August 31st through September 14th, 2017.

11. ATTACHMENTS

- (A) Acronyms
- (B) CDBG PR 28's
- (C) ESG Supplement
- (D) Copy CDBG Section 3 Report [Submitted with final report]
- (E) Public Notice Advertisements and Affidavits [Submitted with final report]
- (F) e-Con CAPER Download [Submitted with final report]

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A

ACRONYMS

ADA	American Disabilities Act
AI	Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing
CADV	Committee Against Domestic Violence
CAPER	Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report
CBRC	Community Business Resource Center
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant
CoC	Continuum of Care
COSCDA	Council of State Community Development Agencies
CPD	Community Planning and Development
ED	Economic Development
ESG	Emergency Shelter Grant
FHIP	Fair Housing Initiatives Program
FISH	Friends in Service Helping
GOED	Governor's Office of Economic Development
HMIS	Homeless Management Inventory System
HOPWA	Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS
HQS	Housing Quality Standards
HS	Housing
HTC	HomeTown Competitiveness Program
HUD	U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
IDIS	HUD Integrated Disbursement and Information System
LIHTC	Low Income Housing Tax Credit
LIHTF	Low Income Housing Trust Fund
LMI	Low – Moderate Income
NAC	Nevada Administrative Code
NCED	Nevada Commission on Economic Development
NHD	Nevada Housing Division
NRDC	Nevada Rural Development Council
NSP	Neighborhood Stabilization Program
NvRWA	Nevada Rural Water Association
NWCDI	North West Community Development Institute
PATH	Provisional Assistance and Temporary Housing
PER	Preliminary Engineering Report
PF	Public Facility
PS	Public Service
PY	Program Year
RCAC	Rural Community Assistance Corporation
RLF	Revolving Loan Fund
RNCoC	Rural Nevada Continuum of Care
SBDC	Small Business Development Center
SHP	Supportive Housing Program
UGLG	Unit of General Local Government

ATTACHMENT B. CDBG – PER: PR 28's

ATTACHMENT C: ESG Performance Standards Outcomes

State ESG funds were provided to rural communities and the City of Reno for shelter operation costs, homeless prevention and rapid re-housing programs. The State was required to develop Performance Standards for the rural and northern recipients that were in alignment with local CoC's. Those standards, along with results from this past year, are reflected below.

STATE ESG PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (Rural CoC)	
Objective #1	Average length of stay in homeless shelter shall be reduced
Outcome #1	The average length of stay in shelter is less than 45 days, and program participant has exited successfully into transitional or permanent housing
Results #1	<i>Average length of stay was 47.52 days. (Average for homeless shelters was 34 days; domestic violence shelters was 74 days.) 63.33% of persons served exited to permanent housing</i>
Objective #2	Reduce returns to homelessness
Outcome #2	Decrease the number of persons that return to homelessness after exiting an ESG-funded program by 20%
Results #2	<i>8.5% of clients assisted in all ESG funded programs exited to homelessness</i>
Objective #3	Adults will obtain employment prior to program exit
Outcome #3	At least 10% of adults will obtain employment at program exit
Results #3	<i>12.20% of adults served obtained employment by program exit.</i>
Objective #4	Improve employment income for adults in household
Outcome#4	At least 5% of disabled adults gained employment income; or at least 20% of non-disabled adults have maintained or increased employment income prior to program exit.
Results #4	<i>4.59% of disabled adults gained employment income prior to program exit. 27% of non-disabled adults maintained or increased employment income prior to program exit.</i>
Objective #5	Adults will obtain cash income sources other than employment by program exit
Outcome #5	At least 54% of adults will obtain income from other cash income sources (SSI/SSDI, veteran's benefits, etc.)
Results #5	<i>30% of adults obtained income from other cash income sources by program exit.</i>
Objective #6	Increase percentage of persons who have obtained mainstream benefits or other non-cash income at program exit
Outcome #6	At least 56% of persons will obtain access to mainstream benefits at program exit
Results #6	<i>76% of adults obtained mainstream benefits or other non-cash income by program exit.</i>
Objective #7	Increase the number of homeless families with access to housing and stabilization services (RRH Only)
Outcome #7	20% of households served during the year in RRH will be homeless families with children
Results #7	<i>29% of Rapid Re-Housing households were households with at least one adult with children</i>

Objective #8	Prevent homelessness for families and unaccompanied youth (HP Only)
Outcome #8	At least 25% of homeless prevention program participants served will included families and/or unaccompanied youth
Results #8	88% of Homeless Prevention households were families.
Objective #9	Projects will serve "harder-to-serve" homeless populations
Outcome #9	At least 10% of persons served by program at entry into shelter or other program provided with ESG funds will have at least one of the following issues: mental illness, alcohol abuse, drug abuse, chronic health condition, HIV, developmental disabilities, physical disabilities, or are chronically homeless
Results #9	33% of homeless persons served were "harder-to-serve" populations
Objective #10	Increase the number of veteran's provided referral to permanent housing
Outcome #10	25% of homeless veterans served will be provided referral to permanent housing
Results #10	59% of homeless veterans served accessed permanent housing
STATE ESG PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Northern CoC)	
Objective #1	Reduce the average length of stay in emergency shelter
Outcome #1	The average length of stay in the shelter is less than 75 days
Results #1	Average length of stay in shelters was 51 days
Objective #2	Increased discharge to permanent housing from emergency shelters
Outcome #2	At least 25% of homeless clients placed in permanent housing upon discharge from shelters
Results #2	Average for three shelters-36.67% of persons exited to a permanent destination
Objective #3	Increase income for rapid re-housing clients
Outcome #3	25% of clients will have increased income at exit from RRH programs
Results #3	Of the 27 adults who exited, 17 exited with income = 63%
Objective #4	Increased housing retention for rapid re-housing clients
Outcome #4	75% of clients placed in permanent housing will remain in that housing after 7 months
Results #4	100% of clients placed in PH remained after 7 months and did not become homeless again
Objective #5	Increased discharge to non-ESG assisted housing
Outcome #5	75% of clients receiving rapid re-housing assistance will transition to non-ESG funded permanent housing
Results #5	24 of 30 persons who exited went to PH = 80%

ATTACHMENT D: Copy CDBG Section 3 Report

ATTACHMENT E: Public Notice Advertisements and Affidavits

ATTACHMENT F: e-Con CAPER Download

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Prepared by the Governor's Office of Economic Development
808 West Nye Lane, Carson City, NV 89703
Office & TDD Telephone (775) 687-9900
Partner Agencies:
State of Nevada's Housing Division
State of Nevada's Health Division

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

The *PY 2016 State of Nevada Consolidated Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)* represents a collaborative effort between the Governor's Office of Economic Development: Community Development Block Grant Program, the Department of Business and Industry: Nevada Housing Division, and the Department of Health and Human Services: Health Division. This document outlines the State's affordable housing and community development resources, funding objectives, and actions by the State to meet those objectives during the past fiscal year.

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability in the programs of a public agency. Persons who need information contained in this publication in an alternate format may call Jean Barrette, CDBG Program Administrator, at the Governor's Office of Economic Development, (775) 687-9900; for hearing impaired call TDD (775) 687-9906, Fax (775) 687-9924, or email @ jbarrette@diversifynevada.com.