



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

Program Year 2015

July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016

FINAL REPORT

Final Report

September 15, 2016

**State of Indiana Consolidated
Annual Performance and
Evaluation Report (CAPER)
for Program Year 2015,
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016**

Prepared for

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

Prepared by

BBC Research & Consulting
1999 Broadway, Suite 2200
Denver, Colorado 80202-9750
303.321.2547 fax 303.399.0448
www.bbcresearch.com
bbc@bbcresearch.com



Table of Contents

I. eCAPER

- CR-05 Goals and Outcomes1
- CR-10 Racial and Ethnic Composition of Families Assisted7
- CR-15 Resources and Investments8
- CR-20 Affordable Housing14
- CR-25 Homeless and Other Special Needs16
- CR-30 Public Housing.....18
- CR-35 Other Actions19
- CR-40 Monitoring22
- CR-45 CDBG25
- CR-50 HOME26
- CR-55 HOPWA27
- CR-60 ESG28
- CR-65 Persons Assisted33
- CR-70 ESG Assistance Provided and Outcomes.....37
- CR-75 Expenditures38

Attachments

- 1. Public Notice and Comment1
- 2. Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)2

Electronic CAPER

IDIS Version

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)

The 2015-2016 program year (PY2015) was the first year of the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan cycle.

During the 2015-2019 strategic planning period, the top-level goals that guide funding allocations include the following:

- Goal 1.** Expand and preserve affordable housing opportunities throughout the housing continuum.
- Goal 2.** Reduce homelessness and increase housing stability for special needs populations.
- Goal 3.** Promote livable communities and community revitalization through addressing unmet community development needs.
- Goal 4.** Promote activities that enhance local economic development efforts.

The goals are not ranked in order of importance, since it is the desire of the State to allow each region and locality to determine and address the most pressing needs it faces.

This CAPER describes how the 2015-2016 allocation of federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Partnerships Program (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) helped fulfill those goals.

During PY2015, the state continued to catch up with commitment shortfalls. Deployment was a primary focus during the program year, as the state moved first through prior year commitment. At the time this report was prepared, \$7 million of 2014 HOME funds had conditional commitments under review by HUD.

CDBG funds from prior years were also available to assist with current year activities. Remaining CDBG deployment catch up is anticipated as:

- All remaining 2010-2014 funds and some 2016 funds in program year 2016;
- All remaining 2015 funds and most 2016 funds in PY 2017; and
- All remaining 2016 funds, most 2017 in 2018.

Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

The following table shows the goals for PY2015, which were established in the 2015-2019 Five-year Consolidated Plan, and how they were met during the program year using PY2015 funding. The “category” column reports HUD activity categories, “source” is the HUD block grant fund, and “indicator and unit of measure” shows the outcome that was chosen to measure funding accomplishments. The expected strategic plan goal shows five-year goals and the program year column reports the 2015-2016 accomplishments. As discussed above, the state is working to improve deployment of funds. For CDBG, 2015 funds are expected to be deployed during the current program year, PY2016. As such, the annual goals are smaller than anticipated when the Action Plan was prepared.

Goal	Category	Source/Amount (PY2015)	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan, Five Year Goals	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year, One Year Goals	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Address Disaster Affected Community Needs	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$5.5 million DR1, \$20 million DR2, \$3.9 million program income	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	16	0	0%	16 public infrastructure activities, 4 with low to moderate income benefit	0	0%
Address Affected Community Needs	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: included above	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	100	0	0%	100 rental units rehabilitated	0	0%
Address Disaster Affected Community Needs	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: included above	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	150	0	0%	150 homeowner units rehabilitated	0	0%
Assist HIV/AIDS Residents Remain in Housing - TBRA	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$400,000	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 580 Households Assisted	106	18%	120 households assisted	106	88%
Assist HIV/AIDS Residents with Housing - STRUM	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$165,000	Other	Other	STRUM: 1,200 Households Assisted	192	16%	240 households assisted with rental, mortgage and utilities costs	192	80%
Build Nonprofit Housing Developer Capacity	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$600,000	Other	Other	40 grants	0	0%	8 nonprofits assisted	0	0%
Create and Preserve Affordable Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$3.2 million competitive rounds; \$2.5 million to support Rental Housing Tax Credits	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	Rental units constructed: 250 Rental Units rehabilitated: 250 Household Housing Units	24 rental, 58 new construction	16%	Construct 50 new affordable housing units and to rehabilitate another 50 units	24 rehabilitated, 58 new construction	82%
Create Permanent Supportive Housing Opportunities	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOME: \$1.5 million	Housing for Homeless added	Household Housing Unit	1000 households assisted	25 TBRA families assisted	3%	40 households moved into permanent supportive housing	25 TBRA families assisted	63%
Create/Preserve Affordable Owner Occupied Housing	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$1 million	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	Homeowner Housing Added: 125 Household Housing Units	2	2%	25 homeowner units created	2	8%
Improve and Construct Public Facilities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$3.2 million	Other	Other	35 projects	3	9%	11 local economic development projects	34 projects open or completed with prior year funds. In 2015, 2 fire stations and 1 senior center.	35%
Improve Community Water and Wastewater Systems	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$8.4 million	Other	Other	35 wastewater projects, 35 drinking water projects = 70 projects	0	0%	14 total: 7 water and 7 wastewater	No 2015 funds were allocated to water and wastewater. A total of 48 water and wastewater improvements using prior year funds were completed.	0%

Improve Stormwater Systems	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$3.5 million	Other	Other	35 projects	0	0%	7 stormwater systems	No project funded from 2015. Prior year: 13 flood drainage improvements, 8 solid waste disposal improvements	0%
Permanent Housing Placement	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$10,367	Other	Other	1	0	0%	Permanent housing placement support services for providers	0	0%
Preserve Affordable Owner Occupied Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$2.7 million	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 1,100 Household Housing Units	167	15%	225 households assisted with preservation, rehabilitation, visitability and accessibility improvements	167	74%
Prevent Homelessness	Non-Homeless Special Needs	ESG: \$72,000	Other	Other	500 individuals served	51	10%	100 households assisted through homeless prevention support	51	50%
Provide Housing Information and Placement Services	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$230,000	Other	Other	Other: 900 Households Assisted	303	34%	180 households with HIV/AIDS provided housing information and placement services	303	168%
Provide Operating Support for Shelters	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	ESG: \$1.7 million	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	50,000 adults and children served	6,917	13%	11,200 persons benefitted through operating support for shelters	6,917	63%
Provide Outreach to Persons who are Homeless	Non-Homeless Special Needs	ESG: \$123,942	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	1,200 adults and children served	830	69%	245 persons experiencing homelessness benefitted through outreach services	830	339%
Provide Planning Grants to Local Government/CHDOs	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$1.4 million	Other	Other	200 grants	18	0%	50 planning grants	18	36%
Provide Rapid Re-Housing	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	ESG: \$1.45 million	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 8,000 Households Assisted	1,354	18%	1,600 households provided rapid rehousing assistance	1,354	85%
Provide Services to HIV/AIDS Residents	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$1,500	Other	Other	Other: 1,400 Households Assisted	Included in TBRA and STRUM goal	0%	285 households with HIV/AIDS provided rental/mortgage/utilities assistance	Included in TBRA and STRUM goal	0%
Provide Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	ESG, funded with 2013/2014 carryover	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	1000 Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 1,000 Households Assisted	0	0%	200 households provided rental/mortgage/utilities assistance	0	0%
Support Community Capital Needs	Non-Housing Community Development	Section 108, amount TBD	Other	Other	0	0		Section 108 loan program, outcomes based on applications and TBD	0	0%
Support Community Development Activities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$655,548 administration; \$277,774 technical assistance	Other	Other	1 (CDBG Adminstrtaion and Technical Assistance)	0	0%	N/A; CDBG administration and technical assistance	0	0%

Support Community Revitalization	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$4 million Stellar Communities; \$1.4 million blight clearance; \$1.2 million Main St. revitalization	Other	Other	15 Stellar Community projects, 25 Brownfield/Clearance projects, 10 Downtown Revitalization projects	3	60%	3 Stellar Community projects, 5 Brownfield/Clearance projects, and 2 Downtown Revitalization projects		90%
Support Facilities Serving HIV/AIDS Residents	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$88,000	Other	Other	Other: 2,000 Households Assisted	0	0%	400 persons with HIV/AIDS benefitted through operations support of service providers	0	0%
Support Homeless Activities	Non-Homeless Special Needs	ESG: \$270,000	Other	Other	1	0	0%	Support of providers serving persons who are homeless	0	0%
Support Housing Activities	Internal Support	HOME: \$550,000 admin	Other	Other	1 HOME admin	0	0%	N/A; HOME program administration	0	0%
Support Program Delivery--STRUM	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$3,169	Other	Other	1	Combined with TBRA support goal	0%	240 persons with HIV/AIDS benefitted through operations support of service providers	Combined with TBRA support goal	108%
Support Program Delivery--TBRA	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$5,350	Other	Other	1	259	0%	N/A; administrative support for delivery of TBFA programs assisting persons with HIV/AIDS	259	0%
Support Workforce Development	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$1 million	Other	Other	20 Workforce Development/Skills Training projects	4	20%	4 Workforce Development / Skills Training projects.	4	100%

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

In addition to the above PY2015 funds, the following CDBG activities were funded during PY2015 with prior year funding:

- Four blight clearance activities were funded from PY2014 CDBG totaling \$566,000;
- One downtown revitalization project was funded with P2014 CDBG totaling \$400,000;
- 25 water and sewer projects were funded with PY2014 CDBG totaling \$11.85 million;
- 12 public facilities projects were completed with 2009, 2010, 2013 and 2014 funds of almost \$7 million. These funds were largely allocated to neighborhood facility improvements, in addition to two fire stations, one senior center and one historic preservation activity.
- 13 planning studies were funded through a combination of unspent prior year funds.

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.

The State of Indiana determines its high priority needs through a combination of economic analysis on housing and community development conditions and input from stakeholders and residents. During the five-year Consolidated Planning cycle, the following have consistently been top needs: affordable housing to assist the state's lowest income households, community and economic development in rural Indiana, housing for persons with disabilities and housing for persons who are homeless. During the development of the 2015 Action Plan, water and sewer infrastructure improvements were identified as a top need by stakeholders. Stakeholders also prioritized housing and public infrastructure improvements to assist persons with disabilities live in integrated settings.

These priorities continued for PY2015. In PY2016, the state began exploring how to broaden its program areas to better meet the needs of underserved residents.

Based on stakeholder and public input, IHEDA has expanded its focus on using HOME to support rental housing, including allocating \$2.5 million for Rental Housing Tax Credit combinations. The agency also has a priority for Housing First projects. During PY2016, IHEDA began conversations with organizations serving migrant farm workers to better understand their housing needs. This effort was a result of public input into the 2016 Action Plan.

As mentioned above, a top priority of OCRA during PY2015 was improving deployment. Remaining funds from prior program years (PY2014, 2013 and 2014) were largely used to support wastewater and stormwater projects. OCRA also added a workforce development program in PY2016 to better meet needs of under- and unemployed workers. \$1 million was allocated to this activity.

In addition, two new programs for funding allocations were approved in July 2016: Public Services and Special Economic Development Activities. Unused 2012 funds will be moved to these programs (\$500,000 for special economic development activities and \$160,000 for public services).

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted).

91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG
White	1,069	242	353	N/A
Black or African American	21	181	161	N/A
Asian	8	6	5	N/A
American Indian or American Native	8	0	0	N/A
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	8	N/A
Total	1,106	429	0	N/A
Hispanic	0	2	29	N/A
Not Hispanic	1,106	427	489	N/A

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

Narrative

CDBG and HOME data in table CR-10 are pre-populated by IDIS.

For HOPWA reporting, the numbers in CR-10 include families of assisted individuals (i.e., include direct beneficiaries and others who indirectly benefit). HOPWA data are derived from Chart c. Race and Ethnicity in the stand-alone HOPWA CAPER. Multi-race HOPWA beneficiaries total 16; family members total 25. ESG subrecipients are not required to report race and ethnicity information.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available (5 year resources)	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	HUD	113,430,788	\$2,752,200
HOME	HUD	36,000,000	\$2,037,825
HOPWA	HUD	3,800,000	\$827,902
ESG	HUD	14,500,000	\$3,578,452

Table 3 – Resources Made Available

Narrative

CDBG amount expended is from IDIS report “CDBG Summary of Accomplishments” for PY2015. HOME Is from the “HOME Summary of Accomplishments” report for PY2015. HOPWA expenditures are from the HOPWA CAPER. ESG is from internal records.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

The State of Indiana does not prioritize the allocation of CDBG, HOME or ESG geographically. Instead, the State identifies the greatest needs for the State and nonentitlement areas overall and this information is used to guide the funding priorities for each program year. For local needs, the State relies on the information presented in block grant program funding applications.

OCRA’s CDBG scoring criteria consider community distress factors; communities with higher levels of stress as measured by several indicators will score higher on applications (factors include poverty level, vacant units, unemployment rate, labor force participation and home values). IHCD includes a preference for application that attempts to reach low- and very low-income levels of area median income.

ESG allocates emergency shelter and rapid re-housing activities statewide; homeless prevention and outreach activities are more targeted geographically.

The HOPWA grant does rely on a geographic allocation, determined through the Continuum of Care regions. Because IHCD allocates HOPWA to all ISDH-established care coordination

regions except Region 7, it was determined that IHCD A will fund one HOPWA project sponsor per every care coordination region. This will remain true for all care coordination regions. If a distinct eligible population with specific needs exists in a region (for example, homeless men in Lake County), IHCD A will work with the regional sponsor to tailor services to meet the needs of the population. In instances where the sponsor cannot meet these needs, the sponsor will have the ability to sub-grant a portion of its HOPWA award to another service provider.

HOPWA funds were allocated by region as follows:

REGION 1

Counties Served: Lake, Porter, LaPorte

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$200,334

REGION 2

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

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$143,598

REGION 3

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

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$134,025

REGIONS 4, 5, 6 AND 9

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

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

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

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

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$157,274

REGION 7*

Counties Served: Boone, Hendricks, Marion, Morgan, Johnson, Shelby, Madison

*Not served by IHCD A

REGION 8

Counties Served: Vermillion, Parke, Putnam, Vigo, Clay, Sullivan

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$34,000

REGION 10

Counties Served: Owen, Greene, Monroe, Lawrence, Brown, Bartholomew

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$84,000

REGION 11

Counties Served: Jackson, Jennings, Orange, Washington, Scott, Jefferson, Switzerland, Crawford, Harrison, Floyd, Clark

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$25,000

REGION 12

Counties Served: Knox, Daviess, Martin, Gibson, Pike, Dubois, Posey, Vanderburgh, Warrick, Spencer, Perry

2014-2015 HOPWA Award: \$179,090

Leveraging

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

The table below shows the HOME match for PY2015. The largest source of match is grants from the Federal Home Loan Bank. Several large grants were received by housing corporations to support affordable housing development. Donated cash, infrastructure and a variety of other sources were the second largest sources of HOME match funds. Land donations supported two housing developments.

HOME Match Amounts and Sources

Donated cash	\$752,863
Federal Home Loan Bank grant	2,560,082
Private grants	357,877
Volunteer labor	213,899
Donated professional services	36,304
Waived fees and permits	125,748
Donated land/buildings	423,000
Donated materials	31,009
Private financing	0
Trust fund loans	0
Required infrastructure	525,313
Bond financing	0
Other	712,810
Total Match:	\$5,738,906

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	5,738,906
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	5,738,906
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Table 6.
Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

Project Grantee	Donated Cash	FHLBGrant	Private Grant	Volunteer Labor	Donated Professional Services	Waived Fees and Permits	Value of Donated Land/ Building	Value of Donated Material	Private Mortgage Financing	Trust Fund Loan	Required Infrastructure	Bond Financing	Other	Total Match
(HAND) Hamilton County Area	\$0.00	\$894,140.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$894,140.00
Beech Grove Senior LLC	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$225,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$225,000.00
Blue River Services, Inc.	\$10,606.00	\$450,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$610,606.00
City of Columbus	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,173.50	\$25,173.50
City of Connersville	\$3,835.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$700.00	\$11,197.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,570.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,302.06
City of Decatur	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,566.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,566.00
City of Huntington	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$28,491.30	\$28,491.30
City of Knox	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,618.81	\$14,618.81
City of Linton	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$28,215.00	\$28,215.00
Community Action Program Inc of Western Indiana	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$27,472.33	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$55,313.00	\$0.00	\$7,714.67	\$115,500.00
Community Action Program of Evansville and Vanderburgh County, Inc.	\$0.00	\$19,750.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$33,500.00	\$63,250.00
Dale Community Apartments, Inc.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$96,584.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$28,415.50	\$125,000.00
DDG Walnut, LP	\$0.00	\$113,636.36	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$113,636.36
Fayette County	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,961.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,079.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,040.25
Fort Wayne Habitat for Humanity	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$184,833.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$484,833.50
Housing Partnerships, Inc. dba Thrive Alliance	\$114,908.10	\$78,500.00	\$47,500.00	\$100.00	\$398.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,500.00	\$264,906.85
Knox County Board of Commissioners	\$106,500.86	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$106,500.86
LaCasa, Inc.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$28,266.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$61,734.00	\$90,000.00
New Hope Services, Inc. / QMC, LLC	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$470,447.65	\$620,447.65
Pike County Progress Partners, Inc.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$470,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$470,000.00
Providence Housing Corporation	\$0.00	\$450,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$450,000.00
Rauch, Inc.	\$19,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$519,000.00
Shelby County	\$15,102.50	\$0.00	\$10,377.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,479.50
The Affordable Housing Corporation of Marion, Indiana	\$0.00	\$54,056.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$173,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$227,056.00
Town of Cambridge City	\$5,634.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,812.40	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,360.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,806.40
Town of Chesterfield		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,360.00	\$125.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,030.00
Town of Hope	\$11,202.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,202.00
Town of Odon	\$1,700.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,700.00
Vision Communities, Inc.	\$138,829.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,574.47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$148,404.26
Totals:	\$752,863.25	\$2,560,082.36	\$357,877.00	\$213,899.50	\$36,303.93	\$125,747.83	\$423,000.00	\$31,009.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$525,313.00	\$0.00	\$712,810.43	\$5,738,906.30

CDBG MBE/WBE Report

State of Indiana Community Development Block Grant Program MBE/WBE Report 10/01/2014 thru 09/30/2015	
Total Contracts Awarded	169
CDBG Contracts	146
Disaster Contracts	23
Total Amount of Contracts	\$50,314,280
CDBG Contracts	\$33,769,280
Disaster Contracts	\$16,545,000
White Americans (Group 1)	
Total Contracts Awarded	161
Total Amount of Contracts	\$49,121,084
Black Americans (Group 2)	
Total Contracts Awarded	4
Total Amount of Contracts	\$858,440
Asian Americans (Group 5)	
Total Contracts Awarded	3
Total Amount of Contracts	\$315,395
Other (Group 6)	
Total Contracts Awarded	1
Total Amount of Contracts	\$19,361
WBE	
Total WBE Contracts	60
Total Amount of Contracts	\$6,783,653

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

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

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	200 permanently supportive units (HOME); 1,500 with RRH	1,354 with RRH
Number of non-homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	50 renters, 25 homeowners (HOME)	
Number of special-needs households to be provided affordable housing units	Through rehab assistance (see below), est. at 50 renters (HOME)	1,020 with RRH
Total		

Table 6 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through rental assistance	200 TBRA (HOME carryover)	25 TBRA families assisted with HOME; 106 TBRA families assisted with HOPWA; 192 families receiving STRUM assistance with HOPWA
Number of households supported through the production of new units	50 renters, 25 owners (HOME)	58 rental, 2 homeowner
Number of households supported through the rehab of existing units	50 renters, 200 owners (HOME, CDBG)	167 owners
Number of households supported through the acquisition of existing units		
Total		

Table 7 – Number of Households Supported

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

Both OCRA and IHCD faced challenges deploying funds during PY2015. The programs that were most successful—ESG and HOPWA—continued prior activities that had been successful in past years.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

As discussed above, ORCA has a deployment strategy to successfully spend prior program year and PY2015 funds within three years. IHCD is reviewing how to more efficiently deploy funds after a shift towards providing deeper affordability to very low income renters.

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

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	0	80
Low-income	0	44
Moderate-income	1,064	17
Total	1,064	141

Table 8 – Number of Persons Served

Narrative Information

Source of data for the Number of Persons Served table are Summary of Accomplishments for CDBG and Disbursements and Unit Completions report for HOME.

CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c)

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

Street outreach programs continued to be funded to better connect homeless persons and families to services including emergency shelter, mainstream services and medical care. More than 800 residents were assisted with street outreach during PY2015, almost double that in PY2014. The amount allocated to outreach remained about the same; however, the organizations funded were more effective in providing outreach services.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The State of Indiana addressed the emergency shelter needs of homeless persons through direct provision of funding to shelters and transitional housing providers to support operations. These funds were used by shelters and transitional housing providers for operating and maintenance costs, shelter lease costs, capital expenses, payment of utilities, purchases of equipment and furnishings, provision of security, as well as purchase of food. More than \$1.9 million of ESG was allocated for this support, slightly more than in PY2014.

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

The State continued to make Homelessness Prevention awards to prevent households from becoming homeless. Households are offered limited/one-time financial assistance to prevent the loss of housing as well receive connection to mainstream resources intended to build the household's safety net for future support needs.

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

Rapid re-housing activities include housing relocation and stabilization services and financial assistance with rent, utilities, arrears, and deposits. The function of these funds is to provide short-term assistance to individuals and families. The State offers shelters a version of RRH that did not include rental assistance, and instead covers one time assistance to support a direct

connection from shelter to permanent housing including housing relocation and stabilization services, utilities, arrears, and deposits.

Sub-recipients that receive RRHP funds are required to create a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with shelters in their region to further strengthen the connection from emergency housing to permanent options including rentals with short/medium term subsidy.

Sub-recipients implementing Rapid Re-housing and Prevention services in their communities continued to be in a learning process this year as they familiarized themselves with the program model. A goal for this upcoming year is to develop a learning environment for RRHP providers to learn and share best practices with one another on a quarterly basis. Another goal for the upcoming year is to provide training for all HMIS users on recent and upcoming data standard changes.

A persistent barrier to the transition to permanent housing is lack of employment. This remains especially difficult in rural areas. Emergency shelters also reported that clients face challenges in moving from the shelter into permanent or transitional housing within the 40-day timeframe, which was the objective. Lack of affordable housing availability continues to be a key factor in extended lengths of stay in shelter while the housing search is in process.

Approximately 1,350 individuals were assisted through RRH funds in PY2015; more than 1,000 had a special need. Most commonly, individuals assisted with RRH are victims of domestic violence or have severe and persistent mental illness.

CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing. IHCD is a Section 8 public housing authority (PHA) and the PHA serving the state's rural areas. IHCD is a high performing PHA.

Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership. IHCD continued the Section 8 HCVP Family Self Sufficiency Program (FSS). FSS is designed to enable families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency. By linking the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) vouchers with the help of both private and public resources, families are able to receive job training, educational services and other much needed assistance over a five year period. The goal is to eliminate the family's need for public assistance and enhance their ability to achieve homeownership, if desired.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs. N/A

CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)

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. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)

Indiana is completing an Assessment of Fair Housing, based on the state template that was released by HUD for public comment earlier this year.

Stakeholders, residents and public housing authorities were asked about barriers to housing choice in the surveys they completed for this Consolidated Plan. Stakeholders mentioned very few public policies and potential negative effects on affordable housing and residential development; instead, they had many suggestions for improvements to existing housing and community development programs and practices. The most commonly mentioned suggestions included:

- Setting aside additional funding for home modifications;
- Re-establishing Section 8 homeownership program at the state and local level;
- Expanding accessibility and visitability requirements of publicly funded projects;
- Expanding the number of days families can stay in shelters;
- Fund a bedbug removal program;
- Consistently investing in small communities to build capacity and address local needs;
- Continuing and expanding liaison presence in rural areas so communities are aware of the resources available from the state; and
- Expanding investments and resources in rural areas.

The State will consider these recommendations as it determines fair housing priorities.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

During PY2015, the state evaluated the need for a workforce development program, which is being initiated in PY2016. This program aims to assist residents in areas with low economic growth and limited employment.

IHCDA continued to provide capacity building and funding to assist extremely low income residents, residents with special needs and persons experiencing homelessness.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The Indiana Lead and Healthy Homes Program (ILHHP), of ISDH, has as its goal the elimination of lead poisoning as a public health problem, especially among young children whose health and development are most susceptible to the harmful effects of lead. The primary source of lead poisoning is lead-based paint. Effective January 1, 2010, ISDH has taken responsibility to implement and enforce the state and federal regulations concerning lead-based paint. The regulations are designed to eliminate environmental hazards by ensuring that trained lead

professionals are available to conduct the safe and effective elimination of the primary sources of lead poisoning.

Addressing the problem through existing and new housing rehabilitation programs is fundamental to reach the State and federal goal of eliminating childhood lead poisoning. Each recipient of a HOME award is subject to the HUD requirements of addressing lead-based paint hazards pursuant to 24 CFR Part 35. If a risk assessment is required, then all lead-based paint issues must be addressed. Lead-based paint controls and abatement costs are eligible activities in IHCD's HOME-funded rehabilitation programs.

Using HOME dollars, IHCD also funds lead-hazard mitigation training as part of the CHDO operating support.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

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

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

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

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

The State also utilizes the Section 3 requirement (a provision of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968). Section 3 applies to employment opportunities generated (jobs created) as a result of projects receiving CDBG or HOME funding through ORCA or IHCD, whether those opportunities are generated by the award recipient, a subrecipient, and/or a contractor. The requirements of Section 3 apply to all projects or activities associated with CDBG or HOME funding, regardless of whether the Section 3 project is fully or partially funded with CDBG/HOME. A detailed description of Section 3 requirements is included in

OCRA/IHCDA's award manual. A notice of Section 3 requirements is included in bid solicitations and is covered during the award trainings.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

During the program year, the state continued its initiatives to support institutional structure in nonentitlement areas and between the state and units of local government.

IHCDA used its weekly RED notices to announce training and grant opportunities to nonprofit and private sector partners. OCRA continued regional workshops to promote new initiatives. The audience includes civic volunteers, mayors, council-members, county officials, members of the Indiana General Assembly, Main Street organizations, local and regional economic development officials (LEDOs), community foundation staff, convention and visitors bureau staff, educators, and youth program coordinators. OCRA also hosts exchanges to help build capacity for organizations who are working towards revitalizing the downtown in their community. ESG subrecipients continued to be required to create MOUs with all shelter providers, housing agencies, supportive service and health care providers and provide a coordinated access point for housing and service delivery.

Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

OCRA and IHCDA continued regular outreach to its private and public sector partners through regional staff, workshops and training and opportunities for feedback about program requirements and structure (through regional meetings, surveys, etc).

The State's new Section 108 loan program was explored as another program that would reward and encourage innovative private-public partnerships.

Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)

Please see above.

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

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

CDBG Monitoring. OCRA conducts a monitoring of every grant project receiving HUD funds. Two basic types of monitoring are used: off-site, or “desk” monitoring and on-site monitoring. Desk monitoring is conducted by staff for non-construction projects. Desk monitoring confirms compliance with national objective, eligible activities, procurement and financial management. On-site monitoring is a structured review conducted by OCRA staff at the locations where project activities are being carried out or project records are being maintained. One on-site monitoring visit is normally conducted during the course of a project, unless determined otherwise by OCRA staff. Grants utilizing a sub-recipient to carry out eligible activities are monitored on-site annually during the 5-year reporting period to confirm continued compliance with national objective and eligible activity requirements. In addition, if there are findings at the monitoring, the grantee is sent a letter within 3 to 5 days of monitoring visit and is given 30 days to resolve it.

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

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

IHCDA Monitoring.

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

taken by IHCD, such as suspension of funding until appropriate corrective actions are taken or termination of funding altogether.

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

On-site monitoring review.

- Community Development Representative will contact recipient to set-up monitoring based on award expiration and completion/close-out documentation submitted and approved.
- Recipient will receive a confirmation letter stating date, time, and general monitoring information.
- On date of monitoring, IHCD staff will need: files, an area to review files, and a staff person available to answer questions.
- Before leaving, IHCD staff will discuss known findings and concerns, along with any areas that are in question.

Desk-top monitoring review.

- Community Development Representative or Community Development Coordinator will request information/documentation from award recipient in order to conduct the monitoring. IHCD staff will give approximately 30 days for this information to be submitted.
- IHCD staff will review information/documentation submitted and correspond via the chief executive officer the findings of the desk-top review. However, if during the course of the review additional information and/or documentation is needed, staff will contact the award administrator.

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

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

Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)

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

A copy of the notice announcing the availability of the CAPER for public review is appended to this section. The contained both English and Spanish.

The CAPER was available for public inspection and members of the public, including low and moderate income persons, were encouraged to review the CAPER online at www.in.gov/ocra or in hard copy between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday, September 15, 2016 through Monday, September 29, 2016 at the Indiana Office of Community & Rural Affairs, One North Capitol, Suite 600 in Indianapolis.

Residents were able to mail, email or verbally (via a toll-free number) communicate comments on the CAPER.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

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.

During the program year, the goals, objectives and priorities for the State of Indiana CDBG allocation did not change substantially. A workforce development program was added to activities to better address the priorities identified by stakeholders in areas of the state with high unemployment and slow economic growth.

CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

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.

Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 92.351(b)

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

Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 91.320(j)

CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)

Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Table for report on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments	157	192
Tenant-based rental assistance	114	106
Units provided in transitional housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	5	14
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	24	34
Total		

Table 9 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Narrative

The one-year and actual goals listed above reconcile with the HOPWA Performance and Planned Goal and Actual table in the HOPWA CAPER. The one-year goals differ slightly from what was anticipated during the development of the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. During PY2015, the State of Indiana was able to exceed all one-year goals for HOPWA except for TBRA; the actual TBRA performance was very close to the one-year goal.

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	INDIANA
Organizational DUNS Number	602667136
EIN/TIN Number	356000158
Identify the Field Office	INDIANAPOLIS
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Balance of State

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Ms.
First Name	Lori
Middle Name	
Last Name	Dimick
Suffix	
Title	Director of Community Services

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	30 South Meridian Street
Street Address 2	Suite 1000
City	Indianapolis
State	INDIANA
ZIP Code	46204
Phone Number	
Extension	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	Ms.
First Name	Emily
Last Name	Harrishears
Suffix	
Title	
Phone Number	
Extension	
Email Address	

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date	07/01/2014
Program Year End Date	06/30/2015

3a. Subrecipients

Subrecipient-Shelter/TH	City	State	Zip Code	DUNS No. (if known)	Victim services provider?	Nonprofit?	Faith based?	Award amount
A Better Way Services, Inc.	Delaware	IN	47308	168477347	Yes	Yes		\$33,638
Albion Fellows Bacon Center, Inc.	Vanderburgh	IN	47731	809045164	Yes	Yes		\$22,202
Alternatives Incorporated of Madison County	Madison	IN	46015	121578058	Yes	Yes		\$46,982
Anchor House, Inc.	Jackson	IN	47274	868966128	No	Yes		\$40,787
Bridges Community Services, Inc.	Delaware	IN	47302	937848968	No	Yes		\$43,165
Catholic Charities Terre Haute	Vigo	IN	47803	801457516	No	Yes		\$47,498
Citizens Concerned for the Homeless, Inc.	LaPorte	IN	46361	939126942	No	Yes		\$32,527
Columbus Regional Shelter for Victims of Domestic Violence, Inc. dba Turning Point	Bartholomew	IN	47202	163808355	Yes	Yes		\$38,206
Community and Family Services	Huntington	IN	46750	079563292	No	Yes		\$14,112
Community Service Center of Morgan County, Inc. dba WellSpring Center	Morgan	IN	46151	011428914	No	Yes	Yes	\$43,885
Coordinated Assistance Ministries, Inc.	Howard	IN	46901	867099376	No	Yes		\$47,498
Council on Domestic Abuse, Inc.	Vigo	IN	47802	801456146	Yes	Yes		\$45,433
Emmaus Mission Center, Inc.	Cass	IN	46947	839388295	No	Yes		\$43,110
Evansville Goodwill Industries, Inc.	Vanderburgh	IN	47715	074053174	No	Yes		\$27,709
Family Crisis Shelter, Inc.	Montgomery	IN	47933	027942635	Yes	Yes		\$19,276
Family Promise of Greater Lafayette, Inc.	Tippecanoe	IN	47902	010736434	No	Yes		\$31,839
Family Service Association of Howard County, Inc.	Howard	IN	46901	609952940	Yes	Yes		\$30,506
Family Service Society, Inc.	Grant	IN	46952	173427196	Yes	Yes		\$29,136
Gabriel's Horn Corporation	Porter	IN	46385	610976172	No	Yes		\$42,366
Gary Commission for Women	Lake	IN	46402	780268533	Yes	Yes		\$38,722
Genesis Outreach, Inc.	Allen	IN	46803	027725857	No	Yes		\$47,498
Goshen Interfaith Hospitality Network	Elkhart	IN	46526	962188272	No	Yes		\$20,188
Hancock Hope House, Inc.	Hancock	IN	46140	868118043	No	Yes		\$47,498
Haven House, Inc.	Lake	IN	46325	779940923	Yes	Yes		\$12,737
Heart House, Inc.	Dearborn	IN	47001	074468104	No	Yes		\$45,950
House of Bread and Peace, Inc.	Vanderburgh	IN	47713	33629861	No	Yes		\$29,330
Housing Opportunities, Inc.	Porter	IN	46383	143327901	No	Yes		\$56,654
Human Services, Inc.	Bartholomew	IN	47201/47226	098148802	No	Yes		\$44,401
Interfaith Hospitality Network of Greater Fort Wayne	Allen	IN	46805	24029030	No	Yes		\$33,043
Lafayette Transitional Housing Center, Inc.	Tippecanoe	IN	47904	612175166	No	Yes		\$56,476

Middle Way House, Inc.	Monroe	IN	47402	618230130	Yes	Yes		\$56,476
New Hope Family Shelter, Inc.	Monroe	IN	47402	020268549	No	Yes		\$46,982
North Central Indiana Rural Crisis Center	Renneselaer	IN	47978	169942344	Yes	Yes		\$16,065
Ozanam Family Shelter Corporation	Vanderburgh	IN	47710	804034270	No	Yes		\$32,863
Prisoner and Community Together, Inc.	Washington	IN	47167	152210808	Yes	Yes		\$34,198
Safe Passage, Inc.	Ripley	IN	47006	140652936	Yes	Yes		\$22,034
Shalom Community Center, Inc.	Monroe	IN	47402	135405962	No	Yes		\$56,476
Sheltering Wings Center for Women	Hendricks	IN	46122	019051510	Yes	Yes		\$42,852
St. Elizabeth Catholic Charities	Floyd	IN	47150	956744064	No	Yes		\$40,271
St. Jude House, Inc.	Lake	IN	46307	832895655	Yes	Yes		\$34,076
Stepping Stone Shelter for Women, Inc.	LaPorte	IN	46361	878870542	Yes	Yes		\$29,429
Stepping Stones, Inc.	Monroe	IN	47402	198381159	No	Yes		\$55,995
The Caring Place, Inc.	Porter	IN	46383	628118382	Yes	Yes		\$22,649
The Center for Women and Families, Inc.	Floyd	IN	47172	099768152	Yes	Yes		\$29,946
The Salvation Army	Tippecanoe	IN	47904	169829884	No	Yes	Yes	\$55,995
United Caring Shelters, Inc.	Vanderburgh	IN	47708	861222677	No	Yes		\$44,401
Vincent Village, Inc.	Allen	IN	46806	960257947	No	Yes		\$30,978
YWCA Northeast Indiana	Allen	IN	46805	088730833	Yes	Yes		\$61,956
YWCA of Evansville, IN Inc.	Vanderburgh	IN	47708	841695950	No	Yes		\$47,174
YWCA of Greater Lafayette	Tippecanoe	IN	47901	103638276	Yes	Yes		\$32,011
YWCA North Central Indiana-Elkhart Safe Haven	Elkhart	IN	46517	084576065	Yes	Yes		\$34,076
Total								\$1,939,275

Subrecipient-Rapid Rehousing/Homeless Prevention	City	State	Zip Code	DUNS No. (if known)	Victim services provider?	Nonprofit?	Faith based?	Award amount
Aspire Indiana, Inc.	Noblesville	IN	46060	121585822	No	Yes	No	\$75,000
Aurora, Inc.	Evansville	IN	47714	111338609	No	Yes	No	\$250,000
Brightpoint, Inc. dba Community Action of Northeast Indiana	Fort Wayne	IN	46853	0-51965374	No	Yes	No	\$214,333
Continuum of Care Network of NWI	Gary	IN	46402	171507770	No	Yes	No	\$110,063
Housing Opportunities, Inc.	Valparaiso	IN	46383	143327901	No	Yes	No	\$228,705
Human Services, Inc.	Clifford	IN	47201	0-98148802	No	Yes	No	\$217,895
Lafayette Transitional Housing Center, Inc.	Lafayette	IN	47904	612175166	No	Yes	No	\$202,792
Shalom Community Center, Inc.	Bloomington	IN	47402	135405962	No	Yes	No	\$250,000
Total								\$1,548,788

Subrecipient-Outreach	City	State	Zip Code	DUNS No. (if known)	Victim services provider?	Nonprofit?	Faith based?	Award amount
Aurora, Inc.	Evansville	IN	47714	111338609	No	Yes	No	\$38,550
Citizens Concerned for the Homeless	Michigan City	IN	46361	93-912-6942	No	Yes	No	\$12,687
Shalom Community Center	Bloomington	IN	47402	135405962	No	Yes	No	\$39,152
Total								\$90,389

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	24
Children	27
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	51

Table 11 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	784
Children	569
Don't Know/Refused/Other	1
Missing Information	0
Total	1,354

Table 12 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	1,942
Children	1,071
Don't Know/Refused/Other	6
Missing Information	0
Total	3,019

Table 13 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	829
Children	1
Don't Know/Refused/Other	1
Missing Information	0
Total	830

Table 14 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4+. Transitional Housing

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	436
Children	166
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	602

Table 15 – Household Information for Transitional Housing

4. DV Shelter Assistance

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	2,199
Children	1,707
Don't Know/Refused/Other	32
Missing Information	5
Total	4,266

Table 15 – Household Information for DV Shelter Assistance

4. Day Center

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	654
Children	109
Don't Know/Refused/Other	1
Missing Information	2
Total	766

Table 15 – Household Information for Day Center

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	7,743
Children	4,472
Don't Know/Refused/Other	25
Missing Information	0
Total	12,240

Table 16 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	4,236
Female	6,109
Transgender	9
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	207
Total	10,561

Table 17 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	3,755
18-24	1,078
25 and over	5,725
Don't Know/Refused/Other	36
Missing Information	4
Total	10,598

Table 18 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans	586	0	30	166
Victims of Domestic Violence	6,908	8	275	2,494
Elderly	340	0	24	88
HIV/AIDS	48	0	3	15
Chronically Homeless	1,372	0	86	304
Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill	4,782	8	268	1,349
Chronic Substance Abuse	3,012	1	87	767
Other Disability	3,740	6	247	1,003
Total (unduplicated if possible)	20,788	16	1,020	6,186

Table 19 – Special Population Served

CR-70 - ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

8. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units – Rehabbed
Number of New Units – Conversion
Total Number of bed - nights available
Total Number of bed - nights provided
Capacity Utilization

Table 20 – Shelter Capacity

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

The Balance of State C of C has established the following performance standards for ESG grantees, the majority of which were met or exceeded during PY2015:

- ESG program sub-recipients that are emergency shelters are funded for operations, essential services and financial assistance: 50 percent of persons will discharge to permanent housing, 25 percent will increase their income. **PY2015 outcome: 65 percent discharged into permanent housing (excludes individuals for whom outcome was not known).**
- ESG program sub-recipients that are Transitional Housing programs that have activities: operations, essential services and financial assistance: 69 percent will discharge to permanent housing, 50 percent will increase their income. **PY2015 outcome: 68 percent discharged into permanent housing.**
- ESG rental assistance program sub-recipients: At discharge from program, 82 percent persons assisted will still be permanently housed. 65 percent of persons will increase their income. **PY2015 outcome for grantees with RRH activities: 95 percent discharged into permanent housing.**
- ESG program sub-recipients that have outreach component: 50 percent of identified caseload will be permanently housed; 50 percent identified caseload will increase their income. **PY2015 outcome: 40 percent discharged into permanent housing.**

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015*
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	33,882	
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	7,364	
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	22,039	
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	43,677	Not collected	
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	43,677	63,285	

Table 21 - ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

* included in Rapid Re-housing grant

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing*

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	67,686	0	
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	1,731,430	1,052,602	1,548,788
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	1,799,116	1,052,602	1,548,788

Table 22 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

*includes homeless prevention

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Essential Services	448,426	652,258	
Operations	1,156,617	1,105,775	1,939,275
Renovation	0	0	
Major Rehab	0	0	
Conversion	0	0	
Subtotal	1,605,043	1,758,033	1,939,275

Table 23 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Street Outreach	0	89,609	90,389
HMIS	175,976		
Administration	29,003		

Table 24 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2013	2014	2015
	3,623,812	3,475,401	3,578,452

Table 25 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2013	2014	2015
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds			
Other Federal Funds			
State Government			
Local Government			
Private Funds			
Other: In-kind and cash donations	\$1.83 million	\$1.85 million	
Fees			
Program Income			
Total Match Amount	\$1.83 million	\$1.85 million	

Table 26 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2012	2013	2014
	2,759,638	3,623,812	3,578,452

Table 27 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities