

Table of Contents

CR-05 GOALS AND OUTCOMES.....	2
CR-10 RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF FAMILIES ASSISTED	9
CR-15 RESOURCES AND INVESTMENTS.....	11
CR-20 AFFORDABLE HOUSING	17
CR-25 HOMELESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS	20
CR-35 OTHER ACTIONS	23
CR-40 MONITORING	32
CR-45 MONITORING	34
CR-50 HOME (HOME GRANTEEES ONLY)	35
CR-55 HOPWA (HOPWA GRANTEEES ONLY)	37
CR-60 ESG 91.520(G) (ESG RECIPIENTS ONLY)	38
CR-65 ESG PERSONS ASSISTED (ESG RECIPIENTS ONLY)	44
CR-70 ESG ASSISTANCE PROVIDED (ESG RECIPIENTS ONLY)	45
CR-75 ESG EXPENDITURES (ESG RECIPIENTS ONLY)	46
ADDITIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORTING	48

CR-05 GOALS AND OUTCOMES

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its Strategic Plan and its Action Plan

CDBG

The number of businesses assisted with CDBG economic development program (CDBG-ED) funds remains lower than anticipated due to several factors. Under the current lending environment of low interest rates, businesses are finding conventional loans more advantageous than the underwriting, compliance, and long term reporting commitments required for CDBG-ED funding.

In addition, transitioning, reviewing, remediating, and closing issues discovered in projects from the former Department of Commerce remain a top priority of the DEHCR. In an effort to ensure continued compliance, the DEHCR provided training through the Council of State Community Development Agencies (COSDA) in addition to the annual application and implementation trainings.

The number of communities assisted with CDBG funds for planning (CDBG-PLNG) remains low. DEHCR received seven applications in the 2015 program year and funded five. DEHCR staff promotes the planning program through contact with consultants, funding agency staff, and presentations at professional organization events. Planning utilization is a challenge due to projects needing to meet a national objective and result in an eligible activity outcome.

The number of persons assisted with CDBG funds for public facilities projects (CDBG-PF) significantly exceeded expectations. The CDBG-PF program continues to be in high demand with many non-entitlement communities facing challenges with aging public infrastructure. DEHCR anticipates the high demand for CDBG-PF dollars to continue in the coming years.

Through the first full year of operation under the CDBG Housing Regions program (CDBG-H), program funds and services were made available to all eligible Wisconsin communities. This effort assisted in meeting geographic needs of the program. Contracted grantees were required to meet low-income (30 percent of funds expended) thresholds in an effort to target and provide services to that population.

The CDBG SSI/SSDI Outreach and Recovery (CDBG-SOAR) assisted 54 people, the majority of whom were homeless, in applying for SSI/SSDI to ensure they could afford housing.

HOME

The average amount of HOME-HHR assistance provided to homebuyers in Program Year 2015 was higher than planned by almost 20 percent (\$12,400 planned versus \$14,815 actual). This increase in cost contributed to a lower number of units being completed. Reasons for the higher amount can be attributed to the improving housing market, resulting in higher prices for homes. To make homes affordable to Low-Moderate Income (LMI) families, more down payment assistance was required.

The average amount of assistance provided to homeowners for rehabilitation in Program Year 2015 was higher than planned by around 60 percent (\$10,000 planned versus \$16,454 actual). This increase contributed to a lower number of units being completed. Reasons for the higher amount can be attributed to the improving housing market, resulting in higher prices for materials and labor. In addition, waiver requests submitted to the Department of Administration (DOA) show that the extent of work required to rehabilitate a home increased, resulting in a higher amount of assistance being

provided. A waiver request is required if the amount of funding, in total, exceeds \$30,000. Finally, grantees received a substantial amount of program income (repaid loans) due to the improving housing market. Program income was used instead of contract funds, resulting in fewer units being recorded in the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS).

HOME-RHD accepted applications for affordable rental housing projects during two formal competitions held in June and October of 2015. A total of eight projects received HOME-RHD funds during the formal competitions. HOME-RHD provides an opportunity for small developers to apply for funding through a rolling application process. There were two rolling application periods during the program year. Four projects received funding during the rolling application rounds. HOME-RHD funding during the program year provided for construction, and/or rehabilitation of 123 affordable rental units.

HOME-TBRA provided rental assistance to 250 households which were homeless or at risk of homelessness. Grantees who had previously failed to meet their service goals were not renewed while new grantees were added. The state hosted an all-grantee training to equip grantees to deliver consistent, high-quality service to participants. The state also piloted a service approach which required grantees to cover more than one county.

ESG

The ESG program has made significant progress towards its goals. The ESG program served about the same total number of persons as anticipated in the goals, but the split between the different goals or ESG project types was different than the Action Plan goals. More persons were served in emergency shelters than anticipated, and fewer people were served in rapid re-housing and prevention than anticipated. There are several explanations for this.

- First of all, data from domestic violence provider grantees is not included at this time. The domestic violence providers do not use the same Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database as all of the other grantees, and their database is not yet capable of producing the newly required ESG CAPER CSV report. These providers were given an extension by HUD until their database is able to produce the report.
- Secondly, rapid re-housing providers across the state are having difficulties identifying housing for clients to move into. This prolongs periods of homelessness, and means that fewer households are served. Providers are working on this issue by trying to engage landlords, and work with households to address barriers to housing.
- Thirdly, emergency shelters are beginning to focus on prioritization using coordinated entry, the VI-SPDAT tool, and diversion. This means some households who have low barriers to housing may not be enrolled in a rapid re-housing program because they are capable of obtaining housing quickly on their own. This frees up resources to serve clients with more significant housing barriers, who likely need much more rapid re-housing assistance than a client with lower barriers to housing. This causes the program to have a higher cost per person, but overall will result in more persons in the state exiting homelessness.
- Fourth, the focus on rapid re-housing has meant that some grantees have shifted resources away from prevention programs and towards rapid re-housing programs. While this means that prevention goals may not be reached, it is an overall more efficient use of scarce ESG funding.

HOPWA

Short-term rental, mortgage, and utility assistance was provided to 103 households with HOPWA funding.

Accomplishments – Program Year

Goal	Category	Funding		Outcome				
Rehabilitate Owner Occupied Housing	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$16,881,228.00	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	935	803	Household Housing Unit	85.88%
		HOME	\$1,502,366.00					
Rehabilitate Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$56,841.00	Rental units rehabilitated	26	22	Household Housing Unit	84.62%
		HOME	\$1,296,017.00					
Build New Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		HOME	\$2,592,034.00	Rental units constructed	47	44	Household Housing Unit	93.60%
Provide Down Payment Assistance to Homebuyers	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$227,363.00	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	187	132	Households Assisted	70.59%
		HOME	\$2,074,696.00					
Provide Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		HOME	\$1,064,019.00	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	330	251	Households Assisted	76.06%
Provide Homeless Assistance	Homeless	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		ESG	\$3,553,944.00	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	6,000	2,308	Households Assisted	38.47%
				Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	8,000	14,258	Persons Assisted	178.23%
				Homelessness Prevention	8,000	5,122	Persons Assisted	64.03%
				Other	3,000	2,280	Other	76.00%

Assist Communities with Public Facilities Projects	Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$13,403,208.00	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	40,210	61,292	Persons Assisted	152.43%
Create Jobs Through ED Assistance and Job Training	Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$25,024,531.00	Jobs created/retained	716	551	Jobs	76.96%
Increase Housing Options for Persons with HIV/AIDS	Non-Homeless Special Needs	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		HOPWA	\$468,812.00	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	145	103	Households Assisted	71.03%
Increase Access to Benefits	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$406,774.00	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	407	54	Persons Assisted	13.27%
Assist Communities with Local Planning	Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$835,052.00	Other	33	-	-Other	0.00%
Special Projects	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$2,012,363.00	Other	3	-	-Other	0.00%
		HOME	\$76,001.00					

Table 1 – Accomplishments – Program Year

Accomplishments – Strategic Plan to Date

Goal	Category	Funding		Outcome									
Rehabilitate Owner Occupied Housing	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete					
		CDBG	\$16,881,228.00						Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	3,352	803	Household Housing Unit	23.96%
		HOME	\$1,502,366.00										
Rehabilitate Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete					
		CDBG	\$56,841.00						Rental units rehabilitated	127	22	Household Housing Unit	17.32%
		HOME	\$1,296,017.00										
Build New Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete					
		HOME	\$2,592,034.00						Rental units constructed	257	58	Household Housing Unit	22.57%
Provide Down Payment Assistance to Homebuyers	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete					
		CDBG	\$227,363.00						Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	893	132	Households Assisted	14.78%
		HOME	\$2,074,696.00										
Provide Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	Affordable Housing	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete					
		HOME	\$1,064,019.00						Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	1,167	251	Households Assisted	21.51%
Provide Homeless Assistance	Homeless	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete					
		ESG	\$3,553,944.00						Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	30,000	2,308	Households Assisted	7.69%
									Homelessness Prevention	40,000	5,122	Persons Assisted	12.81%

Assist Communities with Public Facilities Projects	Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$13,403,208.00					
Create Jobs Through ED Assistance and Job Training	Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$25,024,531.00					
Increase Housing Options for Persons with HIV/AIDS	Non-Homeless Special Needs	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		HOPWA	\$468,812.00					
Increase Access to Benefits	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$406,774.00					
Assist Communities with Local Planning	Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$835,052.00					
Special Projects	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	Source	Amount	Indicator	Expected	Actual	Unit of Measure	Percent complete
		CDBG	\$2,012,363.00					
		HOME	\$76,001.00					

Table 2 – Accomplishments – Strategic Plan to Date

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

CDBG

The annual application and implementation trainings provided by DEHCR have aligned with community needs for infrastructure upgrades. An opportunity exists to emphasize additional planning and CDBG-ED funding availability with community stakeholders during the training programs. DEHCR also has identified the need for additional marketing throughout the state to utilize available funds and meet program goals.

The use of CDBG-H funds as no-interest loans assists low- to moderate-income households to address structural needs they might not otherwise be able to afford, and meets priorities of serving both rental units and owner-occupied units. The program requires a pre- and post-construction inspection to guarantee finished projects meet safe and sanitary guidelines, particularly in the area of lead-safe rehabilitations, which is identified as a program priority.

CDBG-SOAR assisted 54 people, the majority of whom were homeless, in applying for SSI/SSDI to ensure they can afford housing.

HOME

The state uses about 42 percent of HOME funding to provide affordable housing for single families throughout Wisconsin. Funding is distributed by regions; 42 percent is for homebuyer down payment assistance and 58 percent is for owner occupied housing rehabilitation. To meet the goals and objectives, contracts are awarded on a competitive basis to non-profit organizations and local units of government statewide. Each grantee is then monitored annually to ensure all HOME requirements are being followed correctly.

HOME-RHD continues to provide much needed affordable rental housing.

HOME-TBRA target populations are restricted to chronically homeless individuals/families, homeless individuals/families with a disability, individuals/families with a disability who are at risk of homelessness, and other special needs as designated by the local continuum of care (CoC) and outlined in a specific grant application. As a result, the overwhelming majority of HOME-TBRA participants are homeless or at risk of homelessness. HOME-TBRA grantees are required to affirmatively market their HOME-TBRA programs to all qualifying members of their target populations, which necessarily include people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. They are also required to identify those target populations least likely to apply for HOME-TBRA, and determine what special outreach activities will ensure they are fully informed about HOME-TBRA.

HOPWA

AIDS Resource Center of Wisconsin, the project sponsor for the state formula HOPWA grant, is now fully staffed. It will be able to provide HOPWA services and increase efforts to identify eligible clients.

CR-10 RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF FAMILIES ASSISTED

Racial and Ethnic Status

	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Race:				
White	14,664	857	12,872	75
Black or African American	166	64	8,864	74
Asian	200	12	161	1
American Indian or American Native	82	27	532	-
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	4	-	38	2
Total	15,116	960	22,467	152
Ethnicity:				
Hispanic	1,047	-	1,934	13
Not Hispanic	14,617	-	21,924	163

Table 3 – Racial and Ethnic Status

Additional Narrative

CDBG program TOTAL families/persons assisted equals 15,664

548 additional families/persons assisted by the CDBG program also include:

Race data

- 10 American Indian/Alaskan Native & White
- 4 Asian & White
- 1 Black/African American & White
- 2 Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African
- 531 Other multi-racial

HOME program TOTAL families/persons assisted equals 992

32 additional families/persons assisted by the HOME program also include:

Race data

- 6 American Indian/Alaskan Native & White
- 8 Black/African American & White
- 1 Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African
- 17 Other multi-racial

ESG program TOTAL families/persons assisted equals 23,968

1,501 additional families/persons assisted by the ESG program also include:

Race data

- 1,431 Multiple races
- 49 Don't know/refused
- 21 Information missing

Ethnicity data

- 100 Don't know/refused
- 10 Information missing

HOPWA program TOTAL families/persons assisted equals 176

25 additional families/persons also include:

Race data

7 Black/African American & White

18 Other multi-racial

CR-15 RESOURCES AND INVESTMENTS

Resources Made Available

Source of Funds	Source (Federal, state local)	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year Program Year 2015
CDBG	public - federal	\$57,677,360	\$21,795,070
HOME	public - federal	\$8,605,133	\$5,896,758
ESG	public - federal	\$3,553,944	\$3,664,252
HOPWA	public - federal	\$468,812	\$323,918

Table 4 – Resources Made Available

Geographic Distribution and Location of Investments

DEHCR has not chosen geographic target areas as a basis for funding allocation priorities. Rather, DEHCR allows all non-entitlement communities to submit applications to programs on a competitive basis. Our rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically is explained by each program.

CDBG

The DEHCR does not typically award CDBG funds in entitlement communities that receive CDBG funds from HUD directly. CDBG Non-Housing programs typically receive applications from units of local government (UGLGs) across Wisconsin. Applications are reviewed and funded with those projects and areas that will have a significant impact or make a substantial contribution to enhancing the overall economic well-being of the state receiving priority. The CDBG Housing program distributes funds to seven housing regions, and then the regional administrator of each housing region distributes dollars around the region.

HOME

The DEHCR does not award HOME funds in participating jurisdictions or consortia that receive HOME funds directly from HUD. Rental Housing Development, Homebuyer and Rehabilitation, and Tenant Based Rental Assistance funds are awarded in the rest of the state (not in participating jurisdictions or consortia) on a competitive basis.

ESG

In Wisconsin, the DEHCR, and the cities of Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine receive ESG funds directly from HUD. DEHCR ESG funds are awarded on a formula basis to regional entities throughout the state using indicators of poverty and homelessness.

HOPWA

The DEHCR ensures, currently through its contract with Aids Resource Center of Wisconsin (ARCW), full coverage in the 66 counties in DEHCR's HOPWA area.

Leveraging and Match

CDBG

CDBG-ED funding is often used as gap financing, allowing it to leverage other sources of funds at the local level. CDBG-PF, CDBG-PLNG, and public facilities for economic development (CDBG-PFED) have a 50 percent match requirement. This requirement is often satisfied using funds from local government and other state or federal agencies. Matching funds used on CDBG projects often greatly exceed the minimum match requirements.

HOME

HOME funding is used to leverage additional finances to fund affordable housing programs. The 25 percent match requirement for HOME programs is met through a combination of private finance, cash contributions investments from state and local government sources, donated land, materials, service, and labor. The DEHCR meets the 25 percent match requirement through grantee agencies providing the match and state programs that provide significant matching funds (Housing Cost Reduction Initiative/Critical Assistance, Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Wisconsin Department of Corrections, DOA, Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority [WHEDA] Home Loan Program, and the WHEDA Foundation). DEHCR continues to work with WHEDA, the state administrators of the Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), to coordinate affordable housing resources. WHEDA staff continues to provide input and advice to DEHCR staff on the Rental Housing Development Program (HOME-RHD).

ESG

The ESG program exceeded its match requirement this year, as shown in CR-75. Each year, \$1,515,000 in state homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing funding is awarded to ESG grantees along with federal ESG funding. This funding is used to satisfy a portion of the match requirement, and the rest of the match requirement is met through federal, state, and local government funding, private donations, and donated materials, services, and labor.

Fiscal Year Summary HOME Match

Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	\$84,397,387
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	\$1,874,113
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	\$86,271,500
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	\$1,742,438
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	\$84,529,062

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary HOME Match

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution (mm/dd/yyyy)	Cash (non-federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land /Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Prep, Construction Materials, Donated Labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
HHR 12.14	05/26/2015	\$4,850				\$0		\$4,850
HHR 12.01	04/18/2015					\$900		\$900
HHR 12.12	06/24/2015	\$5,500						\$5,500
HHR 12.14	06/18/2015	\$5,956						\$5,956
HHR 12.10	06/16/2015	\$4,564						\$4,564
HHR 12.20	08/21/2015	\$8,737						\$8,737
HHR 12.13	03/09/2015	\$6,000						\$6,000
HHR 12.04	05/22/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR WFS 1204	09/16/2013	\$35,998						\$35,998
HHR 12.16	03/17/2015	\$10,500						\$10,500
HHR 12.09	02/24/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.09	07/18/2014	\$8,000						\$8,000
HHR 12.09	11/03/2014	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.09	02/13/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.07	03/06/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.03	08/09/2014	\$8,000						\$8,000
HHR 12.16	09/25/2015	\$6,000						\$6,000
HHR 12.16	12/30/2014	\$2,490						\$2,490
HHR 12.07	06/27/2014	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.19	10/08/2014	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.21	09/01/2014	\$4,000						\$4,000
HHR 12.16	08/04/2014	\$25,969						\$25,969
HHR 12.09	05/15/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.09	05/10/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.13	04/18/2014	\$8,500					\$24,000	\$32,500
HHR 12.19	07/01/2015	\$66,708				\$4,010		\$70,718
HHR 12.09	01/21/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.09	06/02/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.07	05/27/2014	\$30,970						\$30,970
HHR 12.19	07/01/2015	\$69,703				\$4,190		\$73,893
HHR 12.04	04/06/2015	\$0						\$0
HHR 12.06	07/13/2015	\$5,000				\$135,168		\$140,168
HHR 12.10	07/21/2015	\$9,000						\$9,000
HHR 12.16	06/24/2015	\$6,000						\$6,000
HHR 12.18	06/10/2015	\$6,000						\$6,000

HHR 12.18	05/29/2015	\$2,350					\$2,350
HHR 12.04	05/05/2015	\$0					\$0
HHR 12.04	05/29/2015	\$0					\$0
HHR 12.19	06/12/2015	\$61,421			\$2,083		\$63,504
HHR 12.04	04/06/2015	\$0					\$0
HHR 12.04	02/04/2015	\$12,305					\$12,305
HHR 12.07	06/25/2015	\$10,938					\$10,938
HHR 12.18	05/18/2015	\$6,000					\$6,000
HHR 12.18	06/10/2015	\$6,000					\$6,000
HHR 12.18	04/24/2015	\$2,000					\$2,000
HHR 12.18	05/04/2015	\$2,300					\$2,300
HHR 12.10	04/30/2015	\$1,000					\$1,000
HHR 12.19	05/29/2015	\$0					\$0
HHR 12.19	04/06/2015	\$0					\$0
HHR 12.09	03/02/2015	\$0					\$0
HHR 12.10	05/28/2015	\$3,000					\$3,000
HHR 12.06	11/07/2014	\$0					\$0
HHR 12.19	03/17/2015	\$47,784			\$3,300		\$51,084
HHR 12.19	03/17/2015	\$48,204			\$5,260		\$53,464
SPCHDO 10.01	09/29/2015	\$8,500					\$8,500
SPCHDO 10.01	09/29/2015	\$8,500					\$8,500
SPCHDO 10.01	09/29/2015	\$8,500					\$8,500
RHDC 1403	07/17/2015			\$7,000	\$43,442		\$50,442
RHDC 1310	07/20/2015	\$700,000					\$700,000
RHDC 199461	04/17/2015	\$48,000	\$71,128				\$119,128
15-01 Appleton Housing Authority	03/01/2016	\$50,386					\$50,386
15-02 Chippewa County Housing Authority	03/01/2016	\$42,821					\$42,821
15-03 Couleecap	03/16/2016	\$43,106					\$43,106
15-04 Lakeshore Cap	03/01/2016	\$2,563					\$2,563
15-05 NewCap	03/01/2016	\$43,832					\$43,832
15-06 Renewal Unlimited	04/01/2016	\$16,304					\$16,304
15-07 Salvation Army Barron Cty	03/01/2016	\$28,883					\$28,883
Salvation Army -Sheboygan	06/01/2015	\$3,725					\$3,725
Salvation Army _GP	06/01/2015	\$5,321					\$5,321
15-08 West Cap	01/01/2016	\$15,610					\$15,610

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME Program Income

Program Income – Enter the program income amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period	Amount received during reporting period	Total amount expended during reporting period	Amount expended for TBRA	Balance on hand at end of reporting period
\$2,168,431	\$2,923,830	\$3,166,782	\$0	\$1,925,479

Table 7 – HOME Program Income

Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises (MBE-WBE)

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts: Number	18	0	1	0	1	16
Dollar Amount	\$1,902,594	\$0	\$15,185	\$0	\$193,408	\$1,694,001
Sub-Contracts: Number	8	0	0	0	1	7
Dollar Amount	\$731,543	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$193,408	\$538,135
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts: Number	18	15	3			
Dollar amount	\$1,694,001	\$1,310,408	\$383,593			
Sub-Contracts: Number	8	7	1			
Dollar Amount	\$731,543	\$538,135	\$193,408			

Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises (MBE-WBE)

Minority Owners of Business Property

Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Business Property

Relocation and Property Acquisition

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
	Number	Cost				
Parcels Acquired	0	\$0				
Businesses Displaced	0	\$0				
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced	0	\$0				
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced	0	0				
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	White Non-Hispanic
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Property Acquisition

CR-20 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Affordable Housing – Number of Households Assisted

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of homeless to be provided affordable housing units	200	133
Number of non-homeless to be provided affordable housing units	1195	1015
Number of special-needs to be provided affordable housing units	130	117
Total	1525	1265

Table 11 – Number of Households Assisted

Affordable Housing – Number of Households Supported

Number of households supported through:	One-Year Goal	Actual
Rental Assistance	330	250
The Production of New Units	47	58
Rehab of Existing Units	961	825
Acquisition of Existing Units	187	132
Total	1525	1265

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

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

CDBG

The CDBG-H program met and exceeded the number of units assisted for homebuyer and rental rehabilitation. While the homeowner rehabilitation did not meet the estimated goal, a significant impact was made to the homeowners served. The CDBG-H program has experienced a shortage of contractors to work in the program; this is especially true of trade contractors including plumbers and electricians. In addition, the housing program has seen a rise in the number of projects exceeding \$50,000 to make the property decent, safe and sanitary.

HOME

The HOME-HHR program didn't meet the goals for homebuyer assistance and homeowner rehabilitation. The average amount of assistance provided to homebuyers in Program Year 2015 was higher than planned by almost 20 percent (\$12,400 planned versus \$14,815 actual). This increase in cost contributed to a lower number of units being completed. Reasons for the higher amount can be attributed to the improving housing market resulting in higher prices for homes. To make homes affordable to LMI families, more down payment assistance was required.

The average amount of assistance provided to homeowners for rehabilitation in Program Year 2015 was higher than planned by around 60 percent (\$10,000 planned versus \$16,454 actual). This increase contributed to a lower number of units being completed. Reasons for the higher amount can be attributed to the improving housing market, resulting in higher prices for materials and labor.

In addition, waiver requests submitted to DOA show that the extent of work required to rehabilitate a home was higher than planned, resulting in a higher amount of assistance being provided. A waiver request is required if the amount of funding, in total, exceeds \$30,000. The HHR program has seen an increase in the number of waiver requests. Finally, grantees received a substantial amount of program income (repaid loans) due to the improving housing market. Program income was used instead of contract funds, resulting in fewer units being recorded in IDIS.

The HOME-RHD program didn't meet the goal for construction and/or rehabilitation of affordable rental units. The goal was for 47 affordable units, but only 44 units were deemed complete in IDIS during the reporting period. HOME-RHD experienced a transition in staffing with the program manager's retirement, and several other staff members resigned which caused a delay in processing completion inspections.

HOME-TBRA levels of service were lower than anticipated due to case manager changeover in several grantee programs. Those programs were granted short contract extensions to ensure they met projected service levels within the amended period of the contract. Two of the programs were with new grantees that didn't begin enrolling participants until the first quarter of 2016. Those programs were granted a contract extension, but also given enrollment deadlines to ensure they began meeting their service level targets.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future Annual Action Plans

CDBG

Grantees continue to reach out to the contractor base in their service area and recruit contractors for the CDBG-H program. The CDBG-H program continues to make funds available to assist contractors in becoming trained in lead-safe work practices, lead abatement, and lead risk assessment.

HOME

DEHCR can work to develop more contractors and affordable housing. For example, funding could be used to provide more lead paint training to assist contractors in becoming certified in lead abatement procedures, risk assessment, and lead safe work practices. The DEHCR can also work with grantees to develop more housing units in areas where demand for housing is higher.

Staff transition should not impact future Annual Action Plans. In fact, there are multiple projects scheduled for completion inspections within the next one to two months which will increase the number of affordable units above our current goal.

All HOME-TBRA grantees for Program Year 2016 were also Program Year 2015 grantees with existing HOME-TBRA programs, so none of them should experience unusual challenges ramping up their programs or accurately projecting their levels of service. The HOME-TBRA program will reduce its estimated number of households served to compensate for any additional case management challenges in Program Year 2016.

Number of Persons Served

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	Home Actual
Extremely Low-income	74	852
Low-income	119	35
Moderate-income	219	74
Total	412	961

Table 13 – Number of Persons Served

Additional Narrative

All HOME-TBRA data comes from HMIS.

CR-25 HOMELESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS

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

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

HOME

HOME-TBRA target populations are restricted to chronically homeless individuals/families, homeless individuals/families with a disability, individuals/families with a disability who are at risk of homelessness, and other special needs as designated by the local continuum of care (CoC) and outlined in a specific grant application. As a result, the overwhelming majority of HOME-TBRA participants are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Wisconsin HOME-TBRA grantees are required to affirmatively market their HOME-TBRA programs to all qualifying members of their target populations, which necessarily include people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. They are also required to identify those target populations least likely to apply for HOME-TBRA, and determine what special outreach activities will ensure the target populations are fully informed about HOME-TBRA.

Wisconsin HOME-TBRA programs are required to participate in coordinated entry and assessment via the Wisconsin HMIS. HMIS was implemented at the continuum of care (CoC) level; as of May 2016 all eight Wisconsin HOME-TBRA programs are active participants.

DEHCR encourages its HOME-TBRA grantees to adopt a "Housing First" model for their HOME-TBRA programs, providing permanent housing to beneficiaries before delivering supportive services. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, Housing First is an approach to ending homelessness. For those people who are experiencing homelessness, it centers on providing them with housing as quickly as possible – and then providing services as needed. This approach has the benefit of being consistent with what most people experiencing homelessness want and seek help to achieve.

ESG

Coordinated entry is being implemented by all four Wisconsin HUD Continua of Care (and Balance of State local Continua of Care) to ensure that resources are targeted towards those who need them most. Coordinated entry assesses individual needs and directs persons to the program that is best equipped to meet their needs. Those who have the most acute needs, such as unsheltered persons or persons with serious mental illness, are directed towards programs such as permanent supportive housing that are best equipped to work with clients with high needs. ESG recipients are required to participate in the implementation and use of coordinated entry.

Street outreach to unsheltered persons is necessary to engage them and work towards housing stability. The DEHCR encourages the use of best practices in street outreach which seek to meet basic needs and engage those experiencing homelessness in a respectful way.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

HOME

Across eight programs, Wisconsin HOME-TBRA provided 182 households (individuals and families) across 38 counties with up to 18 months of transitional housing assistance in the form of rent, security deposits, and utility assistance. HOME-TBRA target populations are restricted to chronically homeless individuals/families, homeless individuals/families with a disability, individuals/families with a disability who are at risk of homelessness, and other special needs as designated by the local continuum of care (CoC) and outlined in a specific grant application. As a result, the overwhelming majority of HOME-TBRA participants are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

ESG

Emergency shelter is a critical part of the homeless service system. Shelters provide temporary refuge and often serve as the “front door” or first place of entry to those experiencing homelessness. As such, it is important that emergency shelters have the ability to connect those experiencing homelessness with the resources needed to exit homelessness, using the lightest touch possible. Approximately 43 percent of 2015 ESG funding was used for emergency shelter and grandfathered in transitional housing programs. In 2016, for the first time, the DEHCR required ESG applicants to assess homeless system performance and use performance data when distributing funding at the local level. In many cases, applicants assessed shelter data to meet this requirement, and allocated more funding to shelters who are serving higher numbers of clients, moving clients into permanent housing quickly, and best ensuring that clients do not return to homelessness. New transitional housing projects are not funded by the ESG program, but the DEHCR encourages the use of transitional housing cases where it has been demonstrated to be efficient and effective.

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

HOME

HOME-TBRA can only subsidize units that meet HUD fair market rent and rent reasonableness guidelines; therefore Wisconsin HOME-TBRA programs assist beneficiaries in locating and selecting units that meet these affordable housing guidelines.

ESG

The ESG program requires each local continuum of care (CoC) to have a rapid rehousing program and encourages local CoCs to spend more than the minimum requirement on rapid re-housing. Rapid re-housing focuses on quickly moving households out of homelessness and into permanent housing. This has the potential to decrease the length of time participants spend homeless, taking strain off of the shelter system. The funding formula which distributes ESG funding takes “length of homelessness” into account. It also rewards CoCs who have the shorter average lengths of homelessness.

Homeless prevention programs are also funded by ESG and other state funds. These funds allow agencies to keep individuals and families from becoming homeless in the first place. This allows families to avoid potential trauma, upheaval, and an eviction on their record. To promote efficient use of funds, the DEHCR encourages targeting of prevention funds towards those with the greatest need. The funding formula which distributes ESG funding takes reduction in first time homelessness into account, and rewards CoCs who have managed to reduce first time homelessness through prevention and diversion efforts.

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

ESG

Through its involvement with the Interagency Council, the DEHCR works with the four Wisconsin CoCs and other state agencies which house publically funded systems that can discharge persons into housing instability and homelessness. Collaboration on this Council allows these agencies to work together towards discharge planning solutions. Currently, the Council is working on a Wisconsin plan to end homelessness. In addition, collaboration on this Council has led to interagency efforts to end homelessness. Recently, the DEHCR collaborated with the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families to fund a program targeted at youth who have aged out of the foster care system and are experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness.

HOPWA

The HOPWA program provided short term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to 103 households.

CR-35 OTHER ACTIONS

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

The Wisconsin “home rule” provision means that zoning ordinances are left to the judgment of local governments. Sometimes local governments, in an attempt to cover the broad-based costs of public facilities improvements or to slow down a boom in new housing starts will choose to impose impact fees, increasing lot sizes and setbacks, or establishing minimum square foot requirements for new residences.

State statutes do allow local governments to waive impact fees for affordable housing developments, but it is not known how often these fees are actually waived. The net effect of these local actions may make housing more expensive than it would be without the new fees and regulations which may represent a barrier to affordable housing for people in lower income brackets.

The DEHCR respects this constitutional policy of local control, and therefore cannot directly intervene to remove barriers to affordable housing that results from a local ordinance’s imposition of regulations or fees. The DEHCR and other state agencies do work to ameliorate barriers to affordable housing in several ways, including:

- Support for the WIHousingSearch.org website. This free online resource provides Wisconsin individuals and families a searchable database of statewide affordable rental housing.
- DEHCR works to improve the stock of affordable housing in non-entitlement jurisdictions through its state- and federally-funded housing programs.
- The WHEDA’s LIHTC program offers a reduction in tax liability to property owners and private investors to encourage the development of affordable rental housing.

DEHCR will continue to work with grantees to minimize the impact of these fees and other restrictions.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

CDBG

The primary obstacle to meeting underserved needs in Wisconsin is a lack of adequate funding. The DEHCR will continue efforts to ensure maximum state coverage with program resources. Emphasis will also be placed on enhancing local capacity building and disadvantaged and under-served areas.

DEHCR will continually evaluate its administration of CDBG funds in order to meet Wisconsin’s affordable housing and community and economic development needs. DEHCR will continue to work collaboratively with units of general local government (UGLGs) so that nonprofit entities and businesses will be able to receive grants, loans, and/or equity investments for activities that are both allowed under the federal guidelines and best address the needs of the local community.

DEHCR will continue proven program approaches and efforts to improve strategies. It will explore more efficient and effective approaches to address community needs with maximum responsiveness, including:

- Collaborate with WHEDA, HUD, USDA Rural Development, and US Department of Commerce-Economic Development Administration to:
 - Address special housing and community and economic development opportunities.
 - Sponsor training and technical assistance for local officials. This will increase knowledge of and access to available state and federal programs and resources.
- Review current policies and procedures related to maximizing the efficient reuse of program income funds to meet critical needs. DEHCR will pursue modifications where redirecting resources could address needs in programs with unmet critical needs.

The CDBG-H program continues to serve 69 counties in the state of Wisconsin. The remaining 3 counties receive direct assistance from HUD. This approach ensures all LMI households have access to housing resources. Additionally, DEHCR used CDBG-SOAR funds to increase access to SSI/SSDI benefits for those living with mental health issues.

HOME

DEHCR will continue efforts to ensure maximum state coverage with program resources. Currently, the HOME-HHR program serves 65 counties through Wisconsin that do not receive HOME funds directly. The program will also continue to review grantee allocations to best serve the 65 counties. DEHCR continues to collaborate with WHEDA, HUD, USDA Rural Development, and the US Department of Commerce-Economic Development Administration to address special housing needs throughout the state.

ESG

The primary obstacle to meeting the underserved needs of persons experiencing homelessness is lack of adequate funding. The Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing (ETH) program is working to increase the impact of scarce funding by emphasizing performance in the application process, and rewarding the highest performing grantees with additional funding. Efforts taken in other programs to increase the supply of affordable housing will also help to meet the needs of persons experiencing homelessness.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards

The CDBG-H and HOME programs require all pre-1978 homes be rehabilitated in a lead-safe manner. 217 CDBG-H housing units (owner occupied =206, rental units = 5, and homebuyer with rehab = 6) and 236 HOME-HHR units were rehabilitated using lead-safe work practices (see IDIS HOME lead based paint report) during the 2015 program year.

The programs will continue to ensure all rehabilitation on pre-1978 homes is done in a lead-safe manner, including abatement, interim controls or standard practices, lead safe work practices, visual assessment/paint stabilization or other actions required by local/state codes. All projects that utilize lead-safe work practices receive a lead clearance to ensure the property is safe from lead hazards. All units subsidized by HOME-TBRA must pass a HUD Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection before move-in and at least once annually thereafter. HQS requires that units built before 1978 and occupied by households with least one child under the age of six have little to no peeling paint on most interior and exterior surfaces. CDBG-H requires that units built before 1978 have little to no peeling paint on

most interior and exterior surfaces regardless of the age of the housing occupants. Additionally, the ETH program requires grantees to comply with all applicable lead-based paint remediation and disclosure laws.

Funding for lead training is made available to assist contractors in becoming trained in lead-safe work practices, lead abatement, and lead risk assessment.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families

A number of grantees require their recipient households, as a condition of assistance, to become as self-sufficient as possible. The DEHCR encourages the development of self-sufficiency components within an applicant's program design. Through these efforts, the DEHCR seeks not only to stabilize households in crisis, but also to reduce households' dependence on public assistance and to begin developing pathways out of poverty.

CDBG

DEHCR and the Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC) will continue collaborative efforts with WHEDA and USDA-Rural Development to help local communities, particularly in rural areas, be aware of programs available to them and ways to leverage dollars to maximize both the impact of program dollars and the quality of housing and community development.

In the CDBG-PFED and CDBG-ED programs, priority will continue to be given to those projects that produce high wages and offer decent health insurance where the employer pays more than half the costs of the premiums. High wages are defined as an hourly amount that will provide for disposable income for a household after meeting basic shelter, food, and health costs.

The DEHCR increased access to SSI/SSDI benefits for those living with mental health issues using CDBG-SOAR funds.

HOME

HOME-HHR grantees hired 13 new Section 3 employees and trained 34 others that were considered Section 3.

ESG

In the ESG program, a number of grantees work with their clients to ensure that they become as self-sufficient as possible through case management and referral to mainstream resources.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure

The need for CDBG housing and community development projects continues to exceed available funding. The allocation of CDBG funds that will occur in Program Year 2015 allows the DEHCR to focus needed resources on housing and public facility projects without adversely affecting the DEHCR's ability to support appropriate economic development projects.

DEHCR supports collaborative efforts among local agencies and is working with partner agencies to identify opportunities for weatherization and housing to work together. DEHCR believes this approach will lean itself to improved efficiencies for both programs and the clients we serve.

HOME

The DEHCR also has HOME programs to complement existing networks of service providers. DEHCR continues its long-term support of stable non-profit organizations that provide services in areas covering most of the state. Collaborative efforts among local agencies are strongly encouraged. Training and technical assistance continue to improve the delivery of housing and homeless assistance. The HOME-HHR program continues to work with approximately 16 non-profit organizations to develop a structure statewide. DEHCR is also working with partner agencies to identify opportunities for weatherization and housing to work together. DEHCR believes this approach will lean itself to improved efficiencies for both programs and the clients we serve.

ESG

DEHCR is working to update the ESG program manual and provide more training and technical assistance to grantees statewide. DEHCR encourages grantees to strengthen Continua of Care systems and collaborate with housing providers and mainstream resources.

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

In addition to the connection with WHEDA, DEHCR works in collaboration with many state agencies and partners as well as participates in coalitions of public and private sector housing organizations including:

1. Wisconsin Collaborative for Affordable Housing
2. Wisconsin Fair Housing Network
3. Childhood Lead Poisoning Committee
4. Wisconsin Fresh Start Projects
5. Interagency Workgroup
6. Council of State Community Development Agencies (COSFDA)
7. Balance of State Continuum of Care
8. Racine Continuum of Care
9. Milwaukee Continuum of Care
10. Madison/Dane Continuum of Care

Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdiction's analysis of impediments to fair housing choice

Units of General Local Governments who receive CDBG funding in the CDBG-PF, CDBG-PLNG, CDBG-PFED, and CDBG-ED programs are required to complete three actions to affirmatively further fair housing. DEHCR verifies these actions are completed through its program monitoring.

IMPEDIMENT #1: LACK OF STATE LAWS EQUIVALENCE TO FEDERAL LAW.

Because the state's Open Housing Law did not include the provision of legal representation for the complainant or respondent in discrimination cases that proceed to administrative hearings or court,

HUD has not certified Wisconsin as a “substantially equivalent” jurisdiction. This could result in less reporting of fair housing violations to the state as well as a potential loss of federal funds for administration, enforcement, education and outreach available to substantially equivalent jurisdictions.

ACTION TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENT #1: LACK OF STATE LAWS EQUIVALENCE TO FEDERAL LAW.

Wisconsin Open Housing Law revisions made as part of the 2005-2007 Biennial Budget makes Wisconsin law equivalent to federal law. The revised Open Housing Law requires representation for the complainant by the Attorney General in cases where both the Department of Workforce Development and the Attorney General find probable cause. Representation by the Attorney General is provided for administrative and civil hearings, where the complainant elects to do so. In addition, at the request of the Department of Workforce Development the Attorney General will file a petition for a temporary injunction. Following the law changes, Wisconsin applied to HUD for substantial equivalency but it was not approved.

CDBG grantees are required to adopt a Fair Housing ordinance and to affirmatively further their Fair Housing ordinance by doing a minimum of three Fair Housing activities during the contractual period. Activities completed range from mailing informational letters to local realtors and lenders, doing local radio talks that cover Fair Housing principles, and writing articles to local newspapers that educate citizens about Fair Housing requirements, etc.

In addition, CDBG-Housing staff educated all of its potential and current grantees on Fair Housing laws and requirements during 2014 Application Training and 2014 Implementation Training.

IMPEDIMENT #2: LOCAL LAND-USE REGULATIONS.

Wisconsin’s tradition of “home rule”, embodied in the state constitution, means municipalities control most zoning and land use decisions (the siting of community residential facilities and environmental regulations are exceptions). The concern is that “home rule” allows communities to use ordinances to keep affordable and multifamily housing—frequently the routes by which lower-income, often minority, households enter a community—from being developed. In addition, the use of impact fees for new development raises the cost of new housing and increases the value of existing housing, thus generally reducing affordability. In short, zoning and impact fees can have the effect of “disparate impact”. Policies that appear neutral on their face may actually increase segregation.

ACTION TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENT #2: LOCAL LAND-USE REGULATIONS.

The success of state HOME recipients in promoting their program locally and providing affordable housing opportunities to all racial and ethnic groups is evidenced by the March 31, 2015, HOME Program Progress Dashboard. Per the 03/31/15 dashboard, non-white households account for 8.6 percent of the HOME rental projects, 11.4 percent of the homebuyer projects, and 5.2 percent of the homeowner rehab projects. These percentages compare favorably with the 2003 Census estimate of a 4.1 percent ethnic and minority population for the Wisconsin Balance of State (the category that closely aligns with the state’s jurisdiction).

The HOME-RHD program continues to fund projects with three, four, or occasionally more bedrooms throughout the Balance of State area. HOME-RHD partners with WHEDA LIHTC on many of these projects.

The scoring system for the WHEDA LIHTC program applications includes preference points for developing large family units (3-bedroom or larger) intended for occupancy by residents with special needs, and units with accessible design.

IMPEDIMENT #3: LOCAL DISCRIMINATION IN CONSUMER LENDING.

The administrative code (DFI-Bkg 80.85) on discrimination in the granting of credit prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status only. Currently, a complainant would have to seek remedy from the Department of Workforce Development, Division of Equal Rights under the Open Housing Law.

ACTION TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENT #3: LOCAL DISCRIMINATION IN CONSUMER LENDING.

The Wisconsin Department of Financial Institutions (DFI) has amended ss. DFI-Bkg 80.85 (1) and (2), and created s. DFI-BKG 80.85 (5), Wis. Admin Code (DFI-WCA1 Wisconsin Consumer Act), effective 09/17/05, to expand the bases of discrimination for consumer lending by banks. The rule makes discrimination on a prohibited basis in the granting or extension of credit an unconscionable credit practice. The rule now defines prohibited basis to include sex, marital status, age provided the applicant has the capacity to enter into a binding contract, race, creed, religion, color, disability, national origin, ancestry, sexual orientation, or membership in the military forces of the United States or this state; that all or part of the applicant's income derives from any public assistance program; and that the applicant has in good faith exercised any right under the Consumer Credit Protection Act or any state law.

IMPEDIMENT #4: PREDATORY LENDING.

While the effects of past predatory lending can still be seen across the state, and loans with abusive terms have created hardships among thousands of vulnerable households, recently enacted Wisconsin and federal laws have all but eliminated any new predatory loan activities from occurring. Stronger regulatory standards and heightened consumer awareness have improved lending practices in the state.

ACTION TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENT #4: PREDATORY LENDING.

Although recent law changes have improved the lending environment, DFI continues to closely monitor mortgage bankers, brokers, and originators. In addition, they have made available some foreclosure prevention funds to assist borrowers that may still be affected by lending practices of the past.

In addition, DEHCR staff continues to support homebuyer education which includes predatory lending training. Lending options, which includes a predatory lending discussion, is part of mandatory homeowner education that all households receiving homebuyer assistance are required to attend.

Finally, one of the required activities in the DEHCR's annual fair contract, currently with the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC), is to provide information and training on Fair Lending Laws and practices.

IMPEDIMENT #5: PREDATORY APPRAISALS.

Predatory appraisals, whether due to collusion between appraisers and lenders or due to pressure put on appraisers by a third party, decrease the affordability of housing by increasing fees that are based on the value of the home, and can result in decreased equity from homeownership. Legal protection

against predatory appraisals is limited. Appraisers are required by statute and professional ethics guidelines to appraise properties honestly, rather than on a predetermined basis.

ACTION TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENT #5: PREDATORY APPRAISALS.

The changes in state and federal laws that regulate lending practices have made predatory appraisals less common statewide.

In Wisconsin, a real estate appraiser is a person engaged in the practice of real estate appraisal. Real estate appraisal means providing an analysis, opinion, or conclusion relating to the nature, quality, value, or utility of specified interests in or aspects of real estate. Wisconsin grants three types of credentials; licensed appraiser, certified residential appraiser, and certified general appraiser.

Federal mandate requires that after January 1, 1993, all appraisers must be licensed or certified by a state licensing agency in order to conduct appraisals which involve "federally related transactions." However, appraisers are not required to be licensed or certified in Wisconsin in order to perform "non-federally related transactions."

Licensing involves taking and passing a real estate appraisal exam. A handbook has been prepared by the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services to help applicants prepare for the exam. Among the subjects covered are social, governmental, legal, and regulatory aspects of real estate markets.

IMPEDIMENT #6: HOUSING STOCK.

The housing stock in Wisconsin provides limited housing choices for people with mobility impairments and for large families. Much of Wisconsin's housing stock is older and is not accessible for people with mobility impairments to do an initial inspection, thus limiting housing choice.

Housing choices for larger families are limited due to occupancy standards and the low availability of homes with many bedrooms. According to the 2000 Census, in owner-occupied housing, more than 77 percent of the units had three or more bedrooms. However, in rental housing, more than 76 percent of the rental housing stock had two or fewer bedrooms.

ACTION TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENT #6: HOUSING STOCK.

Homebuyer new construction houses that were completed and occupied during this time period were constructed to provide for first floor visitability.

State-administered housing programs address the need for rental units for larger families through the HOME housing programs, including HOME-RHD, which continues to fund projects with three, four, or occasionally more bedrooms. The WHEDA LIHTC program provides preference points for developing large family units (3-bedroom or larger), units intended for occupancy by residents with special needs, and units with accessible design.

HOME-RHD funds projects with 0 (efficiency) bedrooms, up to four, or occasionally more bedrooms, and partners with WHEDA LIHTC on many of these projects.

For this reporting period, CDBG, HOME, NSP1, NSP3, and state-funded programs continued to provide housing assistance for special needs households.

IMPEDIMENT #7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS.

Wisconsin is home to many people who speak English as a second language (ESL) that have varying levels of competency in the English language. It is likely that this population will continue to increase due to immigration. The ESL population is a double concern due to their English language skills and because the ESL population tends to be lower-income, and thus have limited resources. Households with limited English language capacity are less likely to be aware of their rights and of resources available to aid in cases of housing discrimination. In addition, these households may not be aware of other housing resources available, putting these households at a disadvantage in securing housing. Even households where English is spoken well may find it easier to understand documents available in their first language.

ACTION TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENT #7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS.

Some of DEHCR's grantees have access to interpreters to help conduct outreach and translate information for non-English speaking persons. They also produce non-English language program brochures.

DEHCR provided \$56,700 for a contract with the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC) to undertake a variety of fair housing related activities in both HOME entitlement and non-entitlement areas, including:

- **Fair housing complaint intake, investigation and referrals.** (MMFHC received and processed complaints regarding discrimination based on race/color, national origin, sex, religion, disability, familial status, age, marital status, lawful source of income, sexual orientation, and ancestry.)
- **Conducting fair housing testing.** (MMFHC conducted fair housing testing activities, including activities in HOME non-entitlement areas.)
- **Offering referral services to clients with non-fair housing inquiries.** (MMFHC provided referral services to clients with questions on topics such as rent abatement, breaking a lease, and repair-related concerns, including those in HOME non-entitlement areas.)
- **Technical assistance in fair housing to Wisconsin residents, housing providers, and social service agencies throughout Wisconsin.** (MMFHC provided technical assistance, including instances in HOME non-entitlement areas. The assistance provided included clarification of fair housing law, information on legal and/or administrative interpretation of the law, information on the nature and extent of housing discrimination, and demographic data.)
- **Distribution of fair housing and fair lending educational materials.** (MMFHC distributed significant fair housing and fair lending materials on numerous occasions throughout Wisconsin.)
- **Conducting presentations, workshops, or trainings to provide information on fair housing and fair lending laws and practices.** (MMFHC planned and conducted workshops in various locations around the state that covered fair housing law, fair lending, and predatory lending.)

CR-40 MONITORING

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

CDBG

Units of General Local Government who receive CDBG funding in the CDBG-PF, CDBG-PLNG, CDBG-PFED, and/or CDBG-ED program are monitored prior to project completion. A risk matrix is completed prior to monitoring to identify risk criteria. The outcome of the risk matrix determines whether a desk monitoring or on-site monitoring visit is required. MBE/WBE utilization is reported by grantees. Funded projects are evaluated for compliance with UGLG comprehensive plans.

Annually, the CDBG-H program develops a risk analysis of the grantees to prioritize grantees for monitoring. The program staff conducts two monitoring reviews each month for program compliance.

Among the items included in the review are:

- Financial management records,
- LMI Benefit,
- Program Outreach Efforts,
- Administrative Files,
- Individual Project Files, and
- On-site Inspection of completed projects.

Program staff work with grantees to correct any identified deficiencies through the monitoring process.

CDBG-SOAR subgrantees are monitored on an annual basis. Included in the monitoring are programmatic procedures, fiscal procedures, and interviews with CDBG-SOAR beneficiaries.

HOME

Annually, the HOME-HHR housing program develops a risk analysis of the grantees to prioritize grantees for monitoring. Grantees are monitored once a year. Based on the number of grantees, program staff conducts two monitoring reviews each month for compliance. Any findings and concerns are documented, and a corrective action is developed to ensure long term compliance of program requirements.

HOME-RHD program staff develops a risk analysis of projects that are within their affordability period. Staff determine how often to monitor projects based on the results of the analysis. The program staff monitors all projects within twelve months of project completion, and then, based on the results of the risk analysis, projects are scheduled for monitoring at least once every three years. The HOME-RHD program staff conducts a minimum of two monitoring reviews each month; however, they frequently conduct additional monthly monitoring depending on the number of projects identified during the risk analysis.

Additionally, HOME-RHD has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with WHEDA to jointly conduct on-site monitoring. Projects that receive on-site monitoring conducted by WHEDA undergo desk monitoring by program staff. Staff issues a formal monitoring letter to the grantee after completing the

monitoring inspection. The letter outlines any issues or concerns found during the monitoring, identifies corrective action(s), and issues a date by which the grantee must have all actions completed.

Among the items included in HOME-HHR and HOME-RHD reviews are:

- Financial management records,
- LMI Benefit,
- Program Outreach Efforts,
- Administrative Files,
- Individual Project Files, and
- On-site Inspection of completed projects.

HOME-TBRA subgrantees are monitored on an annual basis. Included in the monitoring are programmatic procedures, fiscal procedures, HQS inspection of at least one HOME-TBRA-funded unit, and interviews with HOME-TBRA beneficiaries.

ESG

The DEHCR's ESG program conducts in-person site monitoring visits and desk monitoring to ensure that grantees are in compliance with the requirements of the ESG program. Standard forms that touch on financial standards and ESG-specific requirements are used for site and desk monitoring. The DEHCR is also working to update its ESG program manual to ensure grantees have an immediate resource when they have questions about ESG requirements.

HOPWA

HOPWA project sponsor and subgrantees are monitored on an annual basis, including fiscal and program procedures review and interviews with HOPWA clients.

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

The DEHCR solicited general public comment by posting information about the 2015 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) on the DEHCR's website, holding a public hearing, and accepting e-mailed comments. The DEHCR read, responded to, and recorded every e-mail received. To the extent possible, the DEHCR incorporated public comments into the 2015 CAPER.

CR-45 MONITORING

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

In order to meet its job creation goals, DEHCR will work to increase marketing efforts for the Community Development Block Grant programs that create LMI jobs. Under the current lending environment of low interest rates, businesses are finding conventional loans more advantageous than the underwriting, compliance, and long term reporting commitments required for CDBG funding. This barrier can be overcome through marketing and outreach to local stakeholders and by providing training to make the rules and regulations seem more manageable.

The CDBG-H program continues to prioritize homeowner rehabilitation. While we didn't meet our estimated number of units rehabilitated, we are still making a significant impact and making homes safe for the clients we serve. The CDBG-H program has experienced a shortage of contractors to work in the program; this is especially true of trade contractors, including plumbers and electricians. In addition, the CDBG-H program has seen a rise in the number of projects exceeding \$50,000 to make the property decent, safe, and sanitary.

No changes were made in CDBG-SOAR program objectives.

Does this jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?

No

Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.

N/A

CR-50 HOME (HOME GRANTEES ONLY)

Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations. Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

An approximate total of 100 individual HOME-RHD projects were monitored during Program Year 2015. Based on each Grant Specialists' monitoring schedule, one on-site monitoring visit was cancelled and later rescheduled. Due to the extensive nature of monitoring responsibilities, a wide variety of file documentation and physical corrective items can be raised. Typical items brought up during physical inspections included repair or replacement of various household infrastructure and appliances. These included doors, walls, floor, and ceiling repairs, as well as various issues associated with sinks/faucets, piping, light bulbs, gutters, and windows. Grantees are notified of issues during an in-person exit interview at the time of inspection, as well as through a formal follow-up letter. All monitoring issues are explained, and corrective actions are described.

Provide an assessment of the jurisdictions' affirmative marketing actions for HOME units.

HOME recipients used the established affirmative marketing policies and procedures that HOME recipients must adopt. These policies and procedures are based upon the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), specifically 24 CFR 92.351. HOME recipients must make an effort to inform potential applicants from all racial, ethnic, and gender groups in the housing market about available vacant units. In particular, they must inform persons in the housing market area that are not likely to apply for HOME-assisted housing.

During the program year, the DEHCR did not receive any complaints concerning its recipients' affirmative marketing practices.

Data on the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics

\$2,923,830 of new HOME-RHD program income was received during the 2015 program year. \$3,166,782 of old and new program income was used during the year for the following projects; Antigo Park View apartments, Elementary School Apartments, Union Square Apartments, Croft Place Apartments, Homeless Assistance Leadership Organization, Highway 8 Rentals, and Jackson Square Apartments.

Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing.

The HOME-RHD program issues HOME project funds to increase the amount of existing affordable rental housing within the state. The program also monitors grantees to ensure compliance with affordability

regulations. A major directive of the monitoring process is to ensure residents of HOME-assisted units are income-compliant with program stipulations. The HOME program is a consistent driver of new affordable housing stock within the state, as well as maintainer of existing affordable stock.

The HOME-RHD program routinely coordinates with WHEDA (Wisconsin's LIHTC-dispersing entity) to fund construction of new affordable housing stock and rehabilitate existing affordable housing stock. There are currently over 80 active projects in Wisconsin that contain both HOME and LIHTC funding.

CR-55 HOPWA (HOPWA GRANTEES ONLY)

Number of Households Served Through	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	145	103
Tenant-based rental assistance	0	0
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased or operated with HOPWA funds	0	0
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased or operated with HOPWA funds	0	0
Total	145	103

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

The program partly met anticipated outcomes for this reporting period. Challenges this year in meeting projected outcomes included potential clients not being named on a valid lease or utility bill and therefore not being eligible for housing assistance, as well as staff turnover. New staff has been hired, and with additional training, all staff will identify and enroll eligible clients to more effectively meet outcome goals.

CR-60 ESG 91.520(G) (ESG RECIPIENTS ONLY)

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps* For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	WISCONSIN
Organizational DUNS Number	809036098
EIN/TIN Number	396028867
Identify the Field Office	MILWAUKEE
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Wisconsin Balance of State CoC, Milwaukee COC, Madison/Dane CoC, Racine CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Ms.
First Name	Lisa
Middle Name	0
Last Name	Marks
Suffix	0
Title	Administrator

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	101 E. Wilson St., 5th Floor
Street Address 2	0
City	Madison
State	WI
ZIP Code	-
Phone Number	6082670770
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	Lisa.Marks@wisconsin.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	Ms.
First Name	Ellen
Last Name	Hildebrand
Suffix	
Title	ETH Program Manager
Phone Number	(608) 261-6256
Extension	
Email Address	Ellen.hildebrand@wisconsin.gov

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date	04/01/2015
Program Year End Date	03/31/2016

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

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: WEST CENTRAL WI COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC

City: Glenwood City

State: WI

Zip Code: 54013, 8556

DUNS Number: 030016844

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 182,594

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY ACTION COALITION OF SOUTH CENTRAL WISCONSIN

City: Madison

State: WI

Zip Code: 53704, 2605

DUNS Number:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 55,075

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY ACTION INC OF ROCK & WALWORTH COUNTIES

City: Janesville

State: WI

Zip Code: 53548, 2916

DUNS Number: 076137975

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 70,149

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COULEECAP INC

City: Westby

State: WI

Zip Code: 54667, 1013

DUNS Number: 092780121

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 110,245

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: ADVOCAP INC.

City: Fond Du Lac

State: WI

Zip Code: 54935, 4122

DUNS Number: 078934148

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 167,574

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CAP SERVICES INC
City: STEVENS POINT
State: WI
Zip Code: 54482, 9113
DUNS Number: 083304105
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 78,451

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NORTH CENTRAL CAP INC
City: Wisconsin Rapids
State: WI
Zip Code: 54495, 1141
DUNS Number: 096826086
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 132,062

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: RENEWAL UNLIMITED INC.
City: Portage
State: WI
Zip Code: 53901, 3400
DUNS Number: 099140790
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 94,492

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: WESTERN DAIRYLAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL
City: Independence
State: WI
Zip Code: 54747, 0125
DUNS Number: 084490762
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 152,619

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NEWCAP, INC.
City: Oconto
State: WI
Zip Code: 54153, 1541
DUNS Number: 136478786
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 161,294

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: ADVOCATES OF OZAUKEE
City: Saukville
State: WI
Zip Code: 53080, 0166
DUNS Number: 124583654
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 28,638

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: MADISON, CITY OF
City: Madison
State: WI
Zip Code: 53701, 2983
DUNS Number: 076147909
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 339,920

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: YOUTH AND FAMILY PROJECT
City: West Bend
State: WI
Zip Code: 53095
DUNS Number: 607506524
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 51,728

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: KENOSHA HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, INC.
City: Kenosha
State: WI
Zip Code: 53140, 3715
DUNS Number: 080500861
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 127,064

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NORTHWEST WI CSA, INC.
City: Superior
State: WI
Zip Code: 54880, 1523
DUNS Number: 153452248
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 122,164

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: SOUTHWEST CAP
City: Dodgeville
State: WI
Zip Code: 53533, 1545
DUNS Number: 080507437
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 84,816

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: UNITED WAY OF RACINE
City: Racine
State: WI
Zip Code: 53404, 2910
DUNS Number: 080507320
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 139,815

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: YWCA OF THE COULEE REGION
City: La Crosse
State: WI
Zip Code: 54603, 1755
DUNS Number: 941006900
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 98,291

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: YWCA OF ROCK COUNTY
City: Janesville
State: WI
Zip Code: 53546, 6203
DUNS Number: 556432995
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 177,762

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: LAKESHORE CAP, INC.
City: Manitowoc
State: WI
Zip Code: 54220, 4034
DUNS Number: 611777327
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 113,271

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS ADMINISTRATION
GR1535312601
City: Milwaukee
State: WI
Zip Code: 53202, 3515
DUNS Number: 006434211
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 256,912

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: HOUSING ACTION COALITION OF WAUKESHA COUNTY INC.
City: Waukesha
State: WI
Zip Code: 53188, 3771
DUNS Number: 006959488
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 102,568

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Appleton, City
City: Appleton
State: WI
Zip Code: 54911, 4702
DUNS Number: 053090312
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 182,803

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: THE SALVATION ARMY OF BURNETT COUNTY, WI
City: Siren
State: WI
Zip Code: 54872, 8042
DUNS Number: 150777253
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Faith-Based Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 58,749

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: House of Hope Green Bay, Inc.
City: Green Bay
State: WI
Zip Code: 54303, 2665
DUNS Number: 618259688
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 200,655

CR-65 ESG PERSONS ASSISTED (ESG RECIPIENTS ONLY)

This requirement is replaced by the eCart tool requirement.

8. Shelter Utilization

	Number of Units
Number of New Units - Rehabbed	-
Number of New Units - Conversion	-
Total Number of bed-nights available	693,615
Total Number of bed-nights provided	581,245
Capacity Utilization	0.838

Table 15 – Shelter Utilization

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

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funding was distributed using a formula incorporating need and performance data, with a goal of rewarding those who are best aligning their homeless service systems towards preventing and ending homelessness. Information describing the proposed formula measures was sent to the leadership of the four Wisconsin HUD Continua of Care for feedback. The formula distributes funding among predetermined county groupings based on historical partnership for previous grant competitions, the HUD Continuum of Care process, and geographic proximity. The formula is comprised of HMIS data describing homelessness, an average of monthly census counts, and HUD system performance measures.

The four HUD system performance measures used this year are:

- average length of homelessness
- successful placement in or retention of permanent housing
- reoccurrence to homelessness, and
- first time homelessness.

These measures were used for the first time this year, and because of this, they were given a relatively low weight. The DEHCR anticipates placing a higher weight on system performance in coming years to reward the best performing systems. Applicants were also required to use performance data when distributing funds at the local level, and they came up with a plan for improving local system performance.

CR-75 ESG EXPENDITURES (ESG RECIPIENTS ONLY)

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance		\$59,348	\$85,887
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance		\$24,624	\$76,112
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services		\$46,355	\$103,263
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program			
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention		\$130,327	\$265,262

Table 16 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance		\$6,455	\$297,173
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance		\$178,719	\$70,634
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services		\$89,857	\$296,389
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program			
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing		\$275,031	\$664,196

Table 17 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Essential Services		\$188,820	\$540,469
Operations		\$132,470	\$527,285
Renovation			
Major Rehab			
Conversion			
Subtotal		\$321,290	\$1,067,754

Table 18 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
HMIS		\$7,287	\$135,844
Administration		\$20,958	\$ 133,697
Street Outreach		\$55,325	\$97,085

Table 19 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2013	2014	2015
		\$810,219	\$2,293,898

Table 20 - Total ESG Grant Funds

11f. Match Source

	2013	2014	2015
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds		\$80,875	\$215,289
Other Federal Funds		\$24,182	\$121,121
State Government		\$635,280	\$1,371,539
Local Government		\$43,216	\$180,861
Private Funds		\$187,303	\$803,368
Other		\$203,888	\$368,321
Fees		\$25,282	\$0
Program Income		\$810	\$24,195
Total Match Amount		\$1,200,836	\$3,084,694

Table 21 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2013	2014	2015
		\$2,011,255	\$5,448,532

Table 22 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities

ADDITIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORTING

During the 2015 program year, DEHCR closed a number of old projects with accomplishments being entered in program years prior to 2015. DEHCR believes that these accomplishments have yet to be recorded in a CAPER. These include:

- 3,503 jobs created under the 'Create jobs through ED assistance and job training' goal.
- 81,120 persons assisted under the 'Assist communities with public facilities projects' goal.
- 11 communities assisted under the 'Assist communities with local planning' goal.