

State of Nevada

2014 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the fifth Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the State of Nevada's 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan, a five-year plan addressing the State's housing and community development needs. The CAPER provides a review of the performance of each of the four formula programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the State of Nevada. Following is a summary of the CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs' accomplishments.

CDBG Program

The 2014 allocation from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to the State of Nevada's CDBG program was \$2,385,994.00. Of that award, \$147,719.88 was for CDBG program administration and \$23,859.94 was for training and technical assistance, leaving \$2,214,414.18 for competitive and set-aside grant projects. Program income of \$100,185.00 represented the payoff of two loans from the old revolving loan fund (RLF) program. This closed out that earlier RLF; the 2010 RLF program was structured as a grant program. An additional \$48,787.85 from recaptured funds and \$75,780.49 of the 2013 allocation increased the total amount available for grants to \$2,439,167.52.

The total amount drawn down from HUD and disbursed to grantees during Program Year (PY) 2014-15 was \$1,684,355.28. All funds came from the 2013 HUD allocation. All prior year Administration and Technical Assistance funds had been used by the end of the 2014 PY: \$50,157.21 remained of the 2014 administration allocation; \$15,545.36 remained of the 2014 TA funds as of June 30, 2015.

Of the 24 projects selected for CDBG funding:

- **Public Facility Grants:** 12 of 24 applications funded; \$1,603,562.52 CDBG funds; 65.74 percent of the 2014 grant funding;
- **Planning & Capacity Building Grants:** 4 of 24 applications funded; \$223,000.00 CDBG funds; 9.14 percent of the 2014 grant funding;
- **Public Services Grants:** 4 of 24 applications funded; \$322,605.00 CDBG funds; 13.23 percent of the 2014 grant funding;
- **Economic Development Grants:** 3 of 24 applications funded; \$240,000.00 CDBG funds; 9.84 percent of the 2014 grant funding;

- **Housing Grants:** 1 of 24 applications funded; \$50,000; 2.05 percent of the 2014 grant funding.

All (100 percent) of the 2014-15 projects fell under the Low – Moderate Income (LMI) National Objective. When all 2014 projects are completed, an estimated 91,651 individuals will have benefitted. Of the estimated beneficiaries, 77.1 percent are LMI, compared to 63.9 percent in 2013.

The State CDBG Program met its overall objectives for PY 2014-15, except for drainage projects, the area of job creation through specific infrastructure enhancements, and community assessments. Overall, the strategies and activities of the State CDBG Program are having a significant impact on needs identified by rural Nevada communities. Community needs are for public infrastructure, housing rehabilitation, small business development and planning, and capacity building at the local government level.

During the 2014 program year, 21 projects were closed: six PY 2012 projects; 13 PY 2013 projects and two PY 2014 projects were completed by June 30, 2015. An additional four (4) PY 2013 projects and one (1) PY 2014 project had expended all funds and are in the process of closing. Twelve (54.56 %) projects were delayed in submitting the first draw within the first nine months: this was 4.56 percent higher than in 2013. Significant delays were the result of: (1) bids coming in exceptionally high and, therefore, scope of work revisions were required; (2) project delay with the environmental reviews: delays involved SHPO; (3) and projects that required one invoice only for vehicles but delivery was past the March 31st date.

The Nevada State CDBG program experienced staffing changes in PY 2014-15. The position of Director of Rural Community Development/CDBG was eliminated and responsibilities were assumed by the Director of Rural Economic Development of the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED). Expanded responsibilities resulted in a title change of the latter to: Director of Rural Community & Economic Development; the change occurred October 2014. An additional staff change occurred in April/May of 2015, when the CDBG Program Specialist returned to her native state and hometown: Buffalo, New York. Three weeks later the new CDBG Program Specialist began work. She has been with the State of Nevada for over 10 years and has prior grant management experience. She was on board to participate in the 2015 CDBG Grant Administration Workshop held in Yerington on May 27th and 28th. Additionally, she attended HUD labor training in Las Vegas on June 23rd. The CDBG Program Administrator remains the same and has been with the program since September of 2011. Prior to working with the CDBG program in Nevada, she was the ESG Program Specialist in Nebraska for six years and was on the board of NeighborWorks, Inc. in Lincoln, NE. That non-profit utilized CDBG funds in neighborhood housing and homebuyer projects. Over the years, she has attended numerous trainings for HUD programs both in Nebraska and Nevada.

All staff members seek training that enhances Nevada's CDBG program. Training is an on-going process for CDBG staff members and grantees. CDBG staff members work with grantees in

providing technical assistance, guidance in closing grants, and compliance with state and federal regulations.

HOME Program

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

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

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program

In 2014 the Nevada Housing Division (Division) received an allocation of \$397,078 in ESG funds, which was an increase from the \$310,945 received in 2013, but was still much less than the \$691,790 received in 2012. The result of these continued cuts meant programs implemented in 2012 using ESG funds could not be fully maintained in 2014. As a result many programs were subsidized using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds. State ESG funds were awarded to local government and non-profit providers located in non-entitlement areas of rural Nevada, with a portion allocated to the City of Reno to support the Community Assistance Center that was funded in part using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds a number of years ago.

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

The remaining allocation was utilized by agencies to pay for costs associated with Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database requirements, and to provide limited financial assistance, along with housing relocation and stabilization services, for homeless prevention and rapid re-housing clients. As stated above, Low-Income Housing Trust funds were also allocated to ESG sub-recipients to provide rental assistance to eligible households

who were either homeless, or at imminent risk of homelessness, in rural and northern Nevada so that ESG funds could be used to offset costs of case management services.

A total of \$426,207.92 in remaining 2013 and 2014 ESG funds were spent this past year to support programs and services allowed under the Emergency Solutions Grant Program as follows:

- \$180,816.04 was expended for shelter operation and essential services. 3,030 adults and children were sheltered this past year in northern and rural homeless and domestic violence shelters, or in motels when shelters were not available;
- \$3,300.00 was expended for homeless prevention rental assistance activities. 23 adults and children who were at imminent risk of homelessness were provided direct rental assistance using ESG funds;
- \$10,336.48 was expended to pay for housing relocation and stabilization activities such as case management of homeless prevention clients;
- \$58,749.92 was expended for rapid re-housing rental assistance activities. 120 homeless adults and children were placed in housing;
- \$48,383.53 was expended for housing relocation and stabilization activities which provided utility and security deposits, and case management services, to homeless clients in the rapid re-housing program;
- \$111,836.81 for HMIS and Data Collection costs, which paid for the salaries of provider staff to enter client data into the mandated homeless database. In addition funds were allocated to the HMIS Lead Agency to pay for costs associated with maintaining the HMIS database; and
- \$13,085.14 was expended to offset a limited amount of administration costs for the Division and ESG sub-recipients.

All totaled 2,784 adults and 386 children (3 persons were missing this information) were provided shelter, rental assistance, utility assistance, security deposits, and case management assistance this past year. Of those assisted: 298 were veterans; 1,853 had at least one mental or physical health condition, including mental illness, alcohol abuse, drug abuse, chronic health condition, developmental disability, physical disability, or other unknown condition; 419 persons served were victims of domestic violence; and 400 persons served were identified as being chronically homeless.

1. OVERVIEW

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

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG),
- HOME Investment Partnership (HOME),
- Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and

- Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA).

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

Five-Year Consolidated Plan. This is a strategic plan for five successive program years. The plan contains analysis of data from a variety of sources and addresses housing and community development needs through goals and strategies for the five-year period. The current five-year plan for Nevada runs from 2010 through 2014. An RFP was issued in May 2014 for a consultant to assist with the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (A.I.). Five proposals for the Consolidated Plan and three proposals for the A.I. were received by the June 20, 2014 due date. The review and selection process that took place July 7, 2014 resulted in choosing Western Economic Services located in Portland, Oregon to develop the 2015 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, which includes the 2015 Annual Action Plan.

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

The 2013, 2014 and 2015 Annual Action Plans were submitted through the IDIS e-Con Planning Suite; a hard copy with State and Program Certifications and SF-424 forms for each year were also submitted to the HUD San Francisco office.

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

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

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

2. RESOURCES

2.1 RESOURCES AVAILABLE

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

In addition to CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds received from HUD, the State uses other funds to meet its housing and community development objectives. These additional resources are shown in Table A and are included in this report to provide a complete picture of the State's available resources in PY 2014.

During PY 2014, \$89,585,534 was available and utilized for affordable housing development activities and community improvements. Of this amount, \$6,009,170 (6.7 percent versus 8.0 percent in 2013) was provided by HUD to the four formula programs of CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and Section 8 Housing (Table A). The Section 8 housing is funded and operated separately from the formula programs. These resources were managed respectively by the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED), the Nevada Housing Division (NHD), the Nevada Health Division, and the Nevada Rural Housing Authority. This table does not include dollars that are leveraged by the units of local government (UGLGs). Leveraged and matching funds are reported in Section 2.2 and also in the individual program sections.

Table A: Summary of Resources from HUD and Other Sources FY 2014-15

Administrative Agency	Program	FY 2014 Funding (\$)
GOED	CDBG	\$2,385,994
Nevada Housing Division	HOME	\$3,017,887
Nevada Housing Division	ESG	\$367,078
Nevada Health Division	HOPWA	\$238,211
Nevada Housing Division	Low Income Housing Tax Credits 4%	\$0
Nevada Housing Division	Low Income Housing Tax Credits 9%	\$7,668,050
Nevada Housing Division	State Housing Trust Fund	\$3,500,000
Nevada Housing Division	Weatherization	\$0
Nevada Housing Division	Single Family Mortgage Bond Program	\$40,000,000
Nevada Housing Division	Multi-Family Mortgage Revenue Bond Program	\$23,500,000
Nevada Rural Housing Authority	Section 8	\$8,596,365
Nevada Rural Housing Authority	VASH vouchers	\$311,949
Total Funding		\$89,585,534

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

2.2. LEVERAGED AND MATCH RESOURCES

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

a. Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

Federal Law allows the State to retain two percent (\$47,719.88) plus \$100,000.00 of its annual CDBG allocation for program administration (\$147,719.88 for 2014-15). It also mandates that the State provides a non-federal match for the two percent. The match is to be documented at the same time that CDBG funds are drawn down for the State's administrative expenditures above \$100,000.00. During the July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015 period covered by this CAPER, the State provided more than the required amount of match.

Grantees anticipate leveraging CDBG funds with \$1,727,489.98 in funding from other sources (73.19% cash; 26.81% in-kind) for the PY 2014-2015 projects.

b. HOME Program

HOME match liability was met through a combination of State Trust Fund dollars invested and the tax exemption that is provided to projects when they expend HOME funds in a project. The State had \$32,287,321.00 in match that was carried over from the previous year. The HOME program match liability of \$895,977.00 was based on 25 percent (statutory requirement) of actual expenditures of actual program dollars spent during this time period. This resulted in the State carrying into the next fiscal year over \$32 million in available matching funds.

c. Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)

Regulations for the ESG program provides for a waiver of the State match requirement for the

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

In PY 2014 agencies expended a total of \$426,207.92 in ESG funds. A reported \$574,370 in match support, including in-kind and cash match sources, was reported. **Refer to the ESG IDIS Appendix for a copy of the match table.**

d. HOPWA

Currently, Northern Nevada HOPES, the sole recipient of HOPWA funds in Northern Nevada, receives an additional \$65,331 in direct service housing funds from Ryan White Part B to help supplement the housing assistance provided through the HOPWA grant award, to help alleviate client housing needs that are not being fulfilled by HOPWA funding. Additionally, funding for four case managers is leveraged through Ryan White parts B, C, and D. These leveraged funds allow the staff of Northern Nevada HOPES to provide comprehensive case management services to all clients receiving HOPWA housing services.

Northern Nevada HOPES has had a stable relationship with the Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board (NNCHRB) for five years. NNCHRB is a local non-profit organization that develops innovative affordable housing complexes for low-income individuals. NNCHRB dedicates 18 units at two of their developments to HIV positive clients of HOPES at over \$200 a month off the market rate, which equals to an approximate \$59,520 in leveraged funds. Combined, all of these sources provide \$124,851 in leveraged funds.

3. OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The resources shown in Table A represent the majority of resources that were available through the State of Nevada programs in PY 2014 to address various affordable housing and community development needs. All avenues for resources were pursued. An overview of the projects and accomplishments is provided below:

- Assisted four (4) rural communities with Public Service projects: a youth advocacy program in Churchill County; a refrigerated vehicle for food pick-up and delivery in the city of Elko and surrounding area; a vehicle for the mobile food pantry in Washoe County; access to health care in Washoe County.
- Contributed to twelve (12) Public Facilities projects in eight (8) counties and three (3) rural cities, ranging from senior center improvements to water projects.
- Provided funding to support four (4) Planning projects: a water master plan in Elko County; a wastewater treatment plan in Lyon County; a continuum of care planning project for rural Nevada; a master plan for the city of Wells.

- Provided funding for three (3) Economic Development projects: an economic development plan for Churchill County; a business counseling plan for areas of rural Nevada; a revolving loan fund grant program for businesses in rural Nevada.
- Contributed to a housing rehabilitation project that is also funded by Nevada Housing Division.
- Provided 6 workshops/training opportunities to the CDBG-eligible units of general local government and conducted seven (7) on-site monitoring visits.
- Completed rehabilitation construction of nine (9) units for very low income households in White Pine County.
- Provided twenty-seven (27) households with down payment assistance. All twenty-seven were funded with HOME funds.
- Provided eight (8) homeowners with HOME rehabilitation funds.
- Provided rental subsidy and down payment assistance to three hundred and fifty-one (351) recipients. Fifty-one (51) of those recipients were disabled and two hundred seventeen (217) female heads of household using Housing Trust Funds.
- One hundred twenty-nine (129) households received additional Housing Trust Fund money for additional assistance with the weatherization program.
- Provided 146 of the most vulnerable homeless adults and children in rural Nevada with rental assistance vouchers using Housing Trust funds allocated to the Nevada Rural Housing Authority;
- 3,173 adults and children, including 400 chronically homeless, 298 veterans, 22 with HIV/AIDs, 694 with severe mental illness, 289 with chronic substance abuse, and 296 elderly in northern and rural Nevada received assistance using ESG and State Low-Income Welfare Set-Aside funds. A breakdown of activities included:
 - Rapid re-housing assistance to 82 homeless household in northern and rural areas;
 - Homeless prevention assistance to 4 households at imminent risk of homelessness using State ESG funds in rural Nevada; and 673 households using State Low-Income Housing Welfare Set-Aside funds statewide;
 - Emergency shelter assistance to a total of 3,030 adults and children in 5 homeless shelters and 2 domestic violence shelters in northern and rural Nevada. For areas without access to shelters, clients were place in motels using vouchers;
 - Of the 2,751 adults and children who exited both shelter and rental assistance programs:
 - 837 exited to a permanent housing destination (30%);
 - 375 exited to temporary destinations such as moving temporarily with friends, families, or into transitional housing for the homeless (14%);
 - 75 persons exited into an “institutional setting” such as foster care or foster group home, psychiatric hospital, substance abuse treatment facility, hospital, or jail (3%);
 - Remaining persons exited back into emergency shelters, safe havens, motels, or became homeless again. Note: A large number of clients

were missing this information from the shelters located in northern Nevada (20%).

- Of the 2,751 adults who exited the program:
 - 46.01% maintained or increased household income;
 - 14.50% received income from employment; and
 - 72.15% received non-cash income such as SNAPs, Medicaid/Medicare, WIC, TANF, etc.
 - Length of stay for all programs:
 - Average shelter stay in rural Nevada was 34.23 days in homeless shelter and 74.12 days in domestic violence shelter;
 - Average homeless shelter stay in northern Nevada was 50.50 days;
 - Average homeless prevention stay in rural Nevada was 135 days (2 agencies);
 - Average rapid re-housing stay in rural Nevada was 229.10 days (2 agencies); and
 - Average rapid re-housing stay in northern Nevada was 497.4 days (City of Reno only).
- 80% of HOPWA program participants remained adherent to their HIV treatment and medication regimen, thus increasing their health outcomes and overall quality of life.
- With the assistance of HOPWA funding eleven individuals classified as homeless were able to gain permanent housing.
- 36 of the clients placed in the reduced rent apartment units through HOPWA were at risk of becoming homeless.
- Two people on the HOPWA TBRA program were able to gain sufficient income that enabled them to become financially self-sustainable and transfer off of the TBRA program.

4. PROGRAM NARRATIVES

A. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

1. Resources

The State of Nevada received \$2,385,994.00 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) for the program year July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. This amount was \$69,991 or 3.0 percent more than the 2013 allocation of \$2,316,003.

Of the \$2,385,994 made available from HUD, \$147,719.88 was set aside for State administration (\$100,000 plus two percent); \$23,859.94 (or one percent) was set aside for training and technical assistance. The 2014 HUD allocation, less administration and technical assistance, plus \$75,780.49 of the 2013 allocation, \$48,787.85 of recaptured funds, and

\$100,185.00 from program income totaled \$2,439,267.12 available for 2014 Program Year projects. Set asides for the 2014-2015 program year totaled \$300,000 and were distributed as follows: \$50,000 each for business counseling and housing rehabilitation; \$100,000 for a revolving loan program; \$40,000 for the rural continuum of care; \$60,000 for an access to health care program.

In March of 2014, grant applications were considered by the CDBG Advisory Committee and 24 projects were recommended for funding. All funds were obligated by June 30, 2014.

2. Use of Funds

The total amount drawn down from HUD and disbursed to grantees during Program Year (PY) 2014-15 was \$1,684,355.28. All funds came from the 2013 HUD allocation. All prior year Administration and Technical Assistance funds had been used by the end of the 2014 PY: \$50,157.21 remained of the 2014 administration allocation; \$15,545.36 remained of the 2014 TA funds as of June 30, 2015.

Of the 24 projects selected for CDBG funding:

- 12 were public facilities and improvements (PF), valued at \$1,603,562.52;
- 4 were planning grants (PCB), valued at \$223,000;
- 4 were public service grants, valued at \$322,605;
- 3 were economic development (ED) grants, valued at \$240,000;
- 1 was a housing grant (HS), valued at \$50,000.00.

Of the 12 public facility type projects, five were water/wastewater improvement projects, one was an ADA accessibility upgrade to a public swimming pool, one was an ADA accessibility project for a social service facility, two were projects for senior centers, one was for sidewalk improvements near an elementary school, one was to redevelop a building for community use, another was for a fire district ambulance. The housing grant was for the rehabilitation of LMI owner-occupied housing in rural Nevada.

The planning grants were given to support two water and/or utility master plans, an economic development master plan, and the Nevada Rural Continuum of Care.

Four public service grants were given. One was to support access to health care; another to CASA; and two for vehicles to support food delivery to persons who have low income.

The three economic development grants were given to support small business development through the Nevada Small Business Development; provide additional funding to the revolving loan fund established in 2010 (Rural Economic Development Fund - REDF); and one to develop and implement an economic development plan for a county. The latter is based on a successful project in another county.

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

CDBG funds in Nevada are not awarded on a geographical basis, but are allocated annually on a set-aside and competitive basis. Certain funds are set aside at the Annual Forum for activities such as the Nevada Rural Continuum of Care and assistance to the Small Business Development Centers in rural Nevada. The balance of the HUD allocation is distributed among applicants who compete for the funds through an open competitive process.

The CDBG Forum occurs in the second half of the calendar year. The application review and allocation of funds takes place between January and April of the following year. The Annual Action Plan is prepared and submitted to HUD by the middle of May. Tables A and B summarize the actual funding allocation for the 2014-15 program year.

The majority of 2014-15 funds were obligated to public facilities and improvements (65.74 percent). This is typical of the Nevada CDBG program as well as throughout the nation. Other allocation percentages by category are shown in Table A. Leverage is shown in Table B.

Table A: CDBG Grants, 2014: Proposed Use of Funds, National Objectives & Beneficiaries

Beneficiaries & Location by Eligible Grant Category			Project: <i>Italicized</i> projects are funded with CDBG Set Aside funds.		HUD Nat. Obj.	Perf. Meas.	CDBG Allocation	% of Total
Benef.	LMI	%	Public Facilities:					
2,652	1,475	55.6	Douglas County	Eagle Gas Station Redevelopment Project	LMI-A	SL-3	\$88,700.00	
2,128	1,240	58.3	Douglas County	East Fork Fire District Ambulance	LMI-A	SL-3	\$80,000.00	
522	274	52.5	Esmeralda County	Fishlake Valley CC Well Construction/Improvements	LMI-A	SL-3	\$161,200.00	
1,764	1,204	68.5	Fallon	Outdoor Pool ADA Accessibility Upgrades, Ph. 2	LMI-A	SL-1	112,500.00	
6,553	3,395	51.8	Lyon County	Silver Springs Water Resource Plan	LMI-A	SL-3	\$77,000.00	
4,962	2,667	53.8	Mineral County	Installation of ADA Entrance & Parking	LMI-A	SL-1	\$54,393.00	
68	41	60.3	Pershing County	Imlay Sewer Improvements, Phase 1	LMI-A	SL-3	\$190,000.00	
445	445	100.0	Storey County	Senior Center Kitchen & Transportation Improvement	LMI-C	SL-3	\$25,000.00	
19,461	10,028	51.5	Washoe County	2 nd Avenue School Sidewalk Project	LMI-A	SL-1	\$205,304.00	
4,724	2,981	63.1	White Pine County	McGill-Ruth GID Ruth Test Well	LMI-A	SL-1	\$257,310.52	
494	283	57.3	Winnemucca	Pleasant Senior Center Expansion, Phase 2	LMI-C	SL-3	\$277,155.00	
714	714	100.0	Yerington	Sewer Video Inspection	LMI-A	SL-3	\$75,000.00	
44,487	24,747	55.6%	PUBLIC FACILITIES TOTAL				\$1,603,562.52	65.74%
Benef.	LMI	%	Public Service:					
46	46	100.0	Churchill County	Youth Advocate Program – CASA	LMI-C	SL-1	\$11,705.00	
3,739	3,739	100.0	City of Elko	FISH Refrigerated Vehicle	LMI-C	SL-1	\$70,000.00	
36,057	36,057	100.0	Washoe County	Vehicle Replacement for Mobile Pantry/Food	LMI-C	SL-1	\$180,900.00	
1,820	1,820	100.0	Washoe County	<i>Access to Healthcare in Rural Northern Nevada</i>	LMI-C	SL-1	\$60,000.00	
41,662	41,662	100.0%	PUBLIC SERVICES TOTAL				\$322,605.00	13.23%
Benef.	LMI	%	Planning:					
1,390	895	64.4	Elko County	Jackpot Storm Water Master Plan	LMI-A	SL-3	\$98,000.00	
799	688	86.1	Lyon County	Carson Highlands Wastewater Treatment Plan	LMI-S	SL-3	\$45,000.00	
1,820	1,820	100.0	Lyon County	<i>Rural Nevada Continuum of Care</i>	LMI-C	SL-1	\$40,000.00	
1,385	735	53.1	Wells	Master Plan Project	LMI-A	SL-3	\$40,000.00	
5,394	4,138	76.7%	PLANNING TOTAL				\$223,000.00	9.14%
Benef.	LMI	%	Economic Dev.					
3	3	100.0	Churchill County	Economic Development Plan	LMI-J	EO-3	\$90,000.00	
100	100	100.0	<i>Fernley</i>	<i>SBDC Business Counseling</i>	LMI-C	EO-3	\$50,000.00	
5	3	60.0	<i>Fernley</i>	<i>WNDD Revolving Loan Fund</i>	LMI-J	EO-3	\$100,000.00	
108	106	98.1%	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOTAL				\$240,000.00	9.84%
Benef.	LMI	%	Other: Housing					
4	4	100.0	<i>Nye County</i>	<i>RNDC Housing Rehabilitation</i>	LMI-H	DH-1	\$50,000.00	
4	4	100.0%	HOUSING				\$50,000.00	2.05%
91,655	70,657	77.1%	CDBG TOTAL				\$2,439,167.52	100.0%

Table B: CDBG Grants, PY 2014: Allocation of Funds and Leveraged Resources (US \$)

Community	Project	Total Project Cost	CDBG Award	Other Federal	State	Local Cash	Local In-Kind	Total Leverage
Churchill	Economic Development Plan	\$114,800.00	\$90,000.00	0	0	0	\$24,800.00	\$24,800.00
Churchill	Youth Advocate Program – CASA	\$77,518.00	\$11,705.00	0	0	0	\$65,813.00	\$65,813.00
Douglas	Eagle Gas Station Redevelopment Project	\$171,185.00	\$88,700.00	0	0	\$72,935.00	\$9,550.00	\$82,485.00
Douglas	East Fork Fire District Ambulance	\$160,000.00	\$80,000.00	0	0	\$75,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$80,000.00
Elko (city)	FISH Refrigerated Vehicle	\$75,000.00	\$70,000.00	0	0	\$5,000.00	0	\$5,000.00
Elko (county)	Jackpot Storm Water Master Plan	\$161,800.00	\$98,000.00	0	0	\$40,000.00	\$23,800.00	\$63,800.00
Esmeralda	Fishlake Valley CC Well Constr./Improvements	\$201,200.00	\$161,200.00	0	0	\$15,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$40,000.00
Fallon	Outdoor Pool ADA Accessibility Upgrades, Ph. 2	142,500.00	\$112,500.00	0	0	0	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
Lyon	Carson Highlands Wastewater Treatment Plan	\$53,000.00	\$45,000.00	0	0	\$5,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$8,000.00
Lyon	Silver Springs Water Resource Plan	\$91,500.00	\$77,000.00	0	0	\$5,000.00	\$ 9,500.00	\$14,500.00
Mineral	Installation of ADA Entrance & Parking	\$56,393.00	\$54,393.00	0	0	0	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Pershing	Imlay Sewer Improvements, Phase 1	\$190,000.00	\$190,000.00	0	0	0	0	0
Storey	Senior Center Kitchen & Transportation Impr.	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	0	0	0	0	0
Washoe	2 nd Avenue School Sidewalk Project	\$432,807.00	\$205,304.00	\$200,000.00	0	\$19,808.00	\$7,695.00	\$227,503.00
Washoe	Vehicle Replacement for Mobile Pantry/Food	\$330,671.00	\$180,900.00	0	0	\$51,148.00	\$98,623.00	\$149,771.00
Wells	Master Plan Project	\$45,000.00	\$40,000.00	0	0	\$5,000.00	0	\$5,000.00
White Pine	McGill-Ruth GID Ruth Test Well	\$291,500.00	\$257,310.52	0	0	0	\$34,189.48	\$34,189.48
Winnemucca	Pleasant Senior Center Expansion, Phase 2	\$657,225.00	\$277,155.00	0	\$76,075.00	\$303,995.00	0	\$380,070.00
Yerington	Sewer Video Inspection	\$155,000.00	\$75,000.00	0	0	0	\$80,000.00	\$80,000.00
		\$3,432,099.00	\$2,139,167.52	\$200,000.00	\$76,075.00	\$597,886.00	\$418,970.48	\$1,292,931.48
<i>Fernley</i>	<i>SBDC Business Counseling</i>	\$65,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$10,000.00	0	0	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
<i>Fernley</i>	<i>WNDD Revolving Loan Fund</i>	\$148,451.00	\$100,000.00	0	0	\$32,000.00	\$16,451.00	\$48,451.00
<i>Lyon</i>	<i>Rural Nevada Continuum of Care</i>	\$68,507.50	\$40,000.00	0	0	\$27,307.50	\$1,200.00	\$28,507.50
<i>Nye</i>	<i>RNDC Housing Rehabilitation</i>	\$371,000.00	\$50,000.00	0	\$321,000.00	0	0	\$321,000.00
<i>Washoe</i>	<i>Access to Healthcare in Rural Northern Nevada</i>	\$81,600.00	\$60,000.00	0	0	0	\$21,600.00	\$21,600.00
		\$734,558.50	\$300,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$321,000.00	59,307.50	44,251.00	\$434,558.50
TOTALS		\$4,166,657.50	\$2,439,167.52	\$210,000.00	\$397,075.00	\$657,193.50	\$463,221.48	\$1,727,489.98

Note: Projects in italics are set-aside projects

CODES: SL-1 = Suitable Living Environment/Accessibility
 SL-2 = Suitable Living Environment/Affordability
 SL-3 = Suitable Living Environment/Sustainability
 EO-1= Economic Opportunity/Accessibility
 EO-3 = Economic Opportunity/Sustainability
 DH-2 = Decent Housing

4. Program Objectives and Accomplishments

Community and economic development needs of rural Nevada were discussed in some detail in the Community Needs section of the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan (pages 66-75). Public facility and public service needs are highlighted as well as insufficient employment opportunities and inadequate workforce training opportunities.

The Strategic Plan component of the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan (pages 77-95) outlined how the state will address the housing and community development needs over the 2010-2014 plan period. Public facility needs included crisis facilities, youth centers, senior centers, and parks. Necessary infrastructure improvements, including federally-mandated upgrades, water and sewer lines and facilities, and solid waste disposal services, were also noted as high priorities. Investment in infrastructure results in the creation of short-term jobs and long-term benefits and helps create economic opportunities in Nevada's rural communities.

A number of priority needs were identified through the five-year planning process. They are:

- Develop and enhance administrative, technical, and managerial capacity among eligible entities of general local government. (Priority 12 per the Five-Year Plan)
- Assist rural communities in creating an environment where people can choose to lead healthy, prosperous lives. (Priority 13 per the Five-Year Plan)
- Provide access to improved community facilities by assisting with water, wastewater, drainage and road improvement upgrades and development projects. (Priority 14 per the Five-Year Plan)
- Enhance the quality of life through assisting with recreational spaces to serve low- and moderate-income people. (Priority 15 per the Five-Year Plan)
- Provide access to quality facilities to serve the elderly population throughout the rural service area. (Priority 16 per the Five-Year Plan)
- Provide access to adequate emergency services to benefit low- and moderate-income people throughout the rural service area. (Priority 17 per the Five-Year Plan)
- Provide a business assistance network to foster entrepreneurial development and provide business assistance to low- and moderate-income business owners and persons developing businesses. (Priority 18 per the Five-Year Plan)
- Provide employment opportunities for lower-income people. (Priority 19 per the Five-Year Plan)

In addition, the State has established a priority to funding well thought-out, well-planned projects that improve public health and safety in rural Nevada. The State is committed to assisting communities that utilize strategic planning. This is reflected in a priority funding for a rural community assessment set-aside.

A series of activities were proposed in the Consolidated Plan to meet the identified needs. These are listed and reported on in the following charts and narrative.

I. Community Development Programs:

Training Opportunities	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development (now the Governor's Office of Economic Development) will provide training in grant application and administration, advisory committee training workshops, and training through grant monitoring. Staff will also attend a number of training workshops in order to better serve the rural community.	25	# 12

PY 2014 Training Opportunity Accomplishments:

During the 2014-2015 program year, CDBG staff conducted the following workshops/training opportunities and monitoring visits:

Training/Meetings: Grantees

July 1, 2014 thru June 30, 2015

CDBG Grant Administration Workshop	Wells, NV; July 23, 2014
CDBG Application Workshop	Fallon, NV; August 7, 2014
CDBG Annual Forum	Eureka, NV; September 9-10, 2014
Consolidated Plan Focus Groups	Carson City, NV; November 5-6, 2014
Consolidated Plan/A.I. Webinars	Carson City, NV; November 17, 2014
Consolidated Plan/A.I. Webinars	Carson City, NV; December 15, 2014
Consolidated Plan/A.I. Webinars	Carson City, NV; January 13, 2015
Consolidated Plan/A.I. Public Input	January 27-28, 2015
CDBG Advisory Committee Training	Carson City, NV; February 12, 2015
CDBG Advisory Committee Deliberations	Carson City, NV, March 24-26, 2015
Public Hearings on Con. Pln. & 2015 AAP	April 1 through May 1, 2015
Public Hearing on Con. Pln. & 2015 AAP	Elko, NV; April 7, 2015
Public Hearing on Con. Pln. & 2015 AAP	Ely, NV; April 8, 2015
Public Hearing on Con. Pln. & 2015 AAP	Winnemucca, NV; April 16, 2015
CDBG Grant Administration Workshop	Yerington, NV; May 27-28, 2015
Grantee Monitoring	Fallon – 2 projects (July 10), White Pine County, Ely, Churchill County, Storey County, Nye County, Wells.

In addition to the above formal training opportunities, CDBG staff provided ad hoc training and technical assistance to grantees by telephone, e-mail, and correspondence from Carson City.

Staff attended or participated in six (6) training workshops and webinars in order to better serve the rural communities throughout the State of Nevada. This is far fewer than in the past because of reduction in staff size, funding available for travel, and time available. Additionally, more training is conducted via webinars than in the past. Workshops and training attended are as follows:

Training: Staff

July 1, 2014 thru June 30, 2015

COSCEA Manager's Meeting
HUD Federal Labor Training

Washington, D.C.; March 15-18, 2015
Las Vegas, NV; June 23, 2015

II. Community Assessments:

Community Assessments	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will conduct community assessments that include "visioning" workshops throughout rural Nevada to assist communities with strategic planning.	20	# 13

PY 2014 Community Assessments Accomplishments:

During PY 2014, no Community Assessments were submitted for funding.

III. Water/Wastewater Treatment Upgrades:

Water and Wastewater Treatment Upgrades	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in funding water projects and sewer improvements throughout the rural service area.	15	# 14

PY 2014 Water & Wastewater Treatment Upgrade Accomplishments:

Five (5) of the Public Facilities projects were for water and wastewater planning projects in PY 2014.

IV. Drainage Improvements:

Drainage Improvements	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in funding drainage projects to assist with flooding issues throughout the rural service area.	3	# 14

PY 2014 Drainage Improvement Accomplishments:

No drainage improvement projects were funded in PY 2014.

V. Roads, Streets, Curb and Gutter Improvements:

Roads, Streets, Curb and Gutter Improvements	Five Year Goal -	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in funding road, street, curb and gutter projects throughout the rural service area.	5	# 14

PY 2014 Road, Street, Curb & Gutter Improvement Accomplishments:

In 2014, there was one road, street, curb and gutter improvement project in Washoe County.

VI. Recreational Facilities and Upgrades:

Recreational Facilities and Upgrades	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in funding the construction and expansion of recreational facilities including public parks throughout the rural service area.	7	# 15

PY 2014 Recreational Facilities & Upgrade Accomplishments:

In 2014, there was one (a) ADA swimming pool upgrade.

Senior Centers:

Senior Centers	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in funding the construction of new senior centers as well as upgrades and renovations and ADA accessibility repairs to existing centers throughout the rural service area.	3	# 16

PY 2014 Senior Center Accomplishments:

In PY 2014, there were two (2) senior center projects: one (1) in Storey County and the other in the city of Winnemucca.

VII. Fire, Emergency Management and Health Services:

Fire, Emergency Management and Health Services	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in funding the construction of new fire and emergency management services as well as new health centers; upgrades to existing facilities and/or equipment for existing facilities including updated technology to assist low-income residents throughout the rural service area.	8	# 17

PY 2014 Fire, Emergency Management & Health Services:

In PY 2014, one county received for funds for a fire district ambulance.

VIII. Economic Development Programs:

Business Assistance and Microenterprise Business Development	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in funding a business assistance network and microenterprise business development program through credit for the establishment, stabilization, and expansion of microenterprises, technical assistance, advice, and business support services and general support to owners of microenterprises and persons developing microenterprises.	10	# 18

PY 2014 Business Assistance & Microenterprise Business Development Accomplishments:

In PY 2014, there were three (3) economic development projects: one for business counseling; one for loans to small businesses; another for an economic development plan and implementation.

IX. Job Creation:

Job Creation	Five-Year Goal	Priority # per Five-Year Plan
The Nevada Commission on Economic Development will participate in providing infrastructure or facilities that will assist in business expansion and development and will offer employment opportunities throughout the rural service area.	3	# 19

In addition to the 12 projects noted above, an additional 24 were funded that do not fit easily into the priorities as defined in the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan. The planning process for the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan attempted to more closely identify the priorities with the anticipated need.

PY 2014 Job Creation Accomplishments:

In PY 2014, no CDBG funds were specifically targeted at infrastructure to promote business expansion or development. However, the economic development plan and implementation has projected job creation with that project; the 2014 revolving loan fund project is required to create or retain jobs in rural Nevada; the business counseling and entrepreneurial training programs ultimately lead to jobs being created or retained. Additionally, infrastructure improvement projects funded by CDBG create short term construction and maintenance jobs.

All of the 2014-15 projects fell under the LMI National Objective. Of the 24 grant projects, two grantees had expended all PY 2014 grant funds by June 30, 2015 and closed out the projects. Another six of the 2013-2014 projects have expended all funds and are in the processing of closing. Twelve of the 24 projects had not drawn funds within the first nine months of the 2014 program year (March 31st) because of project delays based on a variety of factors.

Overall, it is expected that approximately 91,655 individuals will benefit from the completed PY 2014 CDBG grants. An estimated 70,657 LMI individuals (77.1%) will benefit. No activity funded by CDBG in PY 2014 will result in any permanent displacement of persons.

During PY 2014 staff members succeeded in closing a total of 21 grants. These closures were reported in IDIS and are summarized in Table C on the following pages. Fifty-seven grants were closed in 2011; 54 were closed in 2012; 27 were closed in 2013. The high number of grants closed during 2011 and 2012 relate to the nation-wide issue of grants with zero balances

remaining open because of lack of accomplishment data. Because of increased desk monitoring and technical assistance CDBG staff members believe that the number of open grants will remain at 40 to 50 with no grant open more than three years. With more intense grant management, closing 20 to 25 grants per year is deemed to be a normal rate of closure. Additionally, it is a goal of the Governor's Office of Economic Development: Rural Community & Economic Development Division to fund fewer but larger grants. As that occurs, there will be fewer projects to monitor and close each year. Over the past three years, the Rural Community & Economic Development Director has been working closely with regional development authorities, cities, and counties to collaborate on projects that will have greater impact for the communities and regions.

DRAFT

Table C: Summary of CDBG Accomplishments in terms of Beneficiaries from Closed Grants PY 2014-2015

Grant Year	Project Name	City/County	Date Closed	Beneficiaries	LMI Number	National Objective	Objective/ Outcome
2013	Public Buildings ADA Project	Churchill County	July 10, 2014	4,109	4,109	LMI-C	SL-1
2012	Pool Complex upgrades	Caliente	July 16, 2014	969	504	LMI-A	SL-1
2013	Outdoor Pool ADA Upgrades	Fallon	August 1, 2014	1,764	1,209	LMI-A	SL-1
2013	Kingston Water Tank Design & Engineering	Lander County	August 13, 2014	113	60	LMI-A	SL-1
2013	Lois Allen School Sidewalk Project	Washoe County	August 13, 2014	5653	3507	LMI-A	SL-3
2012	Hardie Lane Sidewalk Project	Fernley	August 27, 2014	946	683	LMI-A	SL-3
2013	Westside Sewer Design	Wells	September 4, 2014	1,385	735	LMI-A	SL-1
2013	Wells Avenue Improvements Design	Wells	September 4, 2014	1,385	735	LMI-A	SL-1
2013	Public Swimming Pool Renovations	Lovelock	September 11, 2014	1,951	1,007	LMI-A	SL-1
2012	Effluent Splitter Screen	Caliente	September 11, 2014	969	504	LMI-A	SL-2
2012	NRDC Community Assessment	West Wendover	September 15, 2014	4,724	2,981	LMI-A	SL-3
2012	RNDC Housing Rehabilitation	Lincoln County	December 2, 2014	4	4	LMI-H	SL-2
2013	Rural Nevada Continuum of Care	Fernley	November 18, 2014	375	375	LMI-A	SL-1
2013	Main Street Corridor Study	Fernley	November 24, 2014	4,646	3,354	LMI-A	EO-3
2013	Medical Outreach Response Event	Lyon County	October 30, 2014	500	500	LMI-C	SL-1
2013	Silver Springs Water System Master Plan	Lyon County	February 2, 2015	6553	3395	LMI-A	SL2
2013	Access to Healthcare Network	Churchill County	February 18, 2015	782	782	LMI-C	SL-1
2014	Fishlake Valley Community Center Water Well	Esmeralda County	April 24, 2015	522	274	LMI-A	SL-3
2013	Gepford Park Community Building	Washoe County	June 8, 2015	19,461	10,028	LMI-A	SL-3
2013	McDermitt Community Service Multipurpose Bldg.	Humboldt County	June 9, 2015	1275	744	LMI-A	SL-3
2014	Carson Highlands Wastewater Treatment Plan	Lyon County	June 11, 2015	799	688	LMI-A	SL-3
TOTALS				57,400	35,224	61.37% LMI	

Outcomes			
Objectives	Availability / Accessibility	Affordability	Sustainability
	(1)	(2)	(3)46
Decent Housing	DH-1	DH-2	DH-3
Suitable Living Environment	SL-1	SL-2	SL-3
Economic Opportunity	EO-1	EO-2	EO-3

NOTE:

Table C provides a summary of accomplishments for grants closing during the 2014 program year.

Table D: Summary of CDBG Beneficiaries from Closed Grants PY 2014-15 by Race and Ethnicity LMC, LMJ, LMH

Location	Title	White	African American	Asian	Am. Indian/ Alaskan	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Asian/ White	African American/ White	Am. Indian/ Alaskan & White	Hispanic	Other Multi Racial	Total by Race	Total Area-Wide Benefit
Churchill County	Public Buildings ADA Project	3583	73	131	197	16				366	109	4109	
Caliente	Pool Complex upgrades												969
Fallon	Outdoor Pool ADA Upgrades												1764
Lander County	Kingston Water Tank Design & Engineering												113
Washoe County	Lois Allen School Sidewalk Project												5653
Fernley	Hardie Lane Sidewalk Project												946
Wells	Westside Sewer Design												1385
Wells	Wells Avenue Improvements Design												1385
Lovelock	Public Swimming Pool Renovations												1951
Caliente	Effluent Splitter Screen												969
West Wendover	NRDC Community Assessment												4724
Lincoln County	RNDC Housing Rehabilitation	13			1					3		17	
Fernley	Rural Nevada Continuum of Care												
Fernley	Main Street Corridor Study												4646
Lyon County	Medical Outreach Response Event	375			13	12					100	500	
Lyon County	Silver Springs Water System Master Plan												572
Churchill County	Access to Healthcare Network	636		4	2			3		209	137	782	
Esmeralda County	Fishlake Valley Community Center Water Well												522
Washoe County	Gepford Park Community Building												19461
Humboldt Co.	McDermitt Community Service Multipurpose Bldg.												1275
Lyon County	Carson Highlands Wastewater Treatment Plan												799
	TOTALS	4607	73	135	213	28	0	3	0		349	5408	47134

Table E: Summary of CDBG Beneficiaries by Income Levels LMC, LMJ, LMH - Grants Closed in the 2014-15 Program Year

INCOME LEVEL	BENEFICIARIES
Extremely Low Income	0
Low Income	5408
Moderate Income	0
\$1,6Total:	5,408

NOTE:

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

5. CDBG Self Evaluation Considerations

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

As noted in the Executive Summary, the State CDBG Program met its overall objectives for PY 2014-15, except for drainage projects, economic development and job creation through specific infrastructure enhancements, and community assessments. The chart below lists the Project Activities funded through PY 2014 that address the priorities identified in the Consolidated Plan. The chart reflects progress made in addressing each priority. Some activities identified through the application process do not neatly correspond to the specific categories: they are included in the category that most closely reflects the project or listed as "Other."

The strategies and activities of the State CDBG Program are making a significant impact on identified needs of rural Nevada, especially in the areas of public infrastructure, housing rehabilitation, and planning and capacity building at the local government level. Annual applications reflect the needs identified by the local rural communities. At least 20 of the eligible 26 units of general local government apply annually for CDBG assistance, indicating that the grant program is considered worthwhile and valuable to rural Nevada. Refer to the chart on the following page that shows 2014 projects funded and the total of completed and/or planned projects for the 2010 through 2014 consolidated planning period.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES:	Five Year Goal	2014 Program Year	2014 PY: % to Total of Five Year Goal	Total # to Date: 2010-14	Number +/- Goal for 2010-14
Training/Workshops	25	6	24%	62	+ 37
Community Assessments (& Development)	20	0	0%	11	-9
Water/Wastewater (includes plans)	15	5	33%	40	+ 25
Drainage	3	0	0	1	-2
Roads, streets, curbs & gutters	5	1	20%	9	+ 4
Recreational Facilities & Upgrades (includes other physical structure upgrades)	7	1	14%	16	+ 9
Senior Centers	3	2	67%	7	+ 4
Fire, Emergency Management & Health (includes public services)	8	5	63%	22	+ 14
Economic development	10	3	30%	12	+ 2
Job creation	3	0	0%	0	-3
Other	0	7	n/a	9	+9
TOTALS	99	24		189	+90

What indicators would best describe the results?

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

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

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

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

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

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

The State does not propose changing this overwhelming priority use of CDBG funds. However, state priorities may affect how non-entitlement funds are prioritized in rural Nevada in order to coordinate recovery efforts. Additionally, funding for special purpose projects (the so-called 'set aside funds') may also undergo additional changes. With changes, good planning remains an on-going priority. The Consolidated Planning process is seen as an opportunity to engage stakeholders across the state with analyzing data, determining needs, and prioritizing projects throughout rural Nevada. As part of on-going training, the State CDBG management team will continue to assist units of general local government, through workshops and on-going technical assistance, in determining community needs and making stronger applications for CDBG grant funds. In 2014, a CDBG Grant Administration manual was finalized and used for the May 27-28 training. After some updating, the manual will be posted to the CDBG website. Future training is likely to be conducted through webinars.

Responding to changes in rural Nevada means continually evaluating CDBG programs. In past years the Community Business Resource Center (CBRC) handled the State CDBG revolving loan fund. This organization was dissolved in 2004-05 and economic development grant functions were taken over by CDBG staff. In 2010 a new pilot revolving loan fund was introduced, based at the local level and managed by a professional Community Development Financial Institution. It was funded a third year in PY 2012. As of March 15, 2013, all loan processes were completed and the grants were closed. Western Nevada Development District is operating the program for the 2013 and 2014 program years. Assessment of this new program has revealed that, while less complicated than the prior RLF, the program continues to be labor intensive. While that can be overcome, it is evident that the CDBG Revolving Loan Program is not as competitive as other small business loan programs available. This will not continue as a set-aside, although a community could develop such an application for the competitive funding available each year.

Changes in application procedures continue to focus on streamlining the process for applicants while maintaining the quality of an application's content. In late 2004 the State CDBG Program limited the number of grant applications that could be submitted by each eligible entity to three applications per year. In November 2005, this was reduced to two applications per entity (for PY 2006-07). In October 2007 grantees could submit only one application per year.

This latter limitation was intended to help communities prioritize how to use their CDBG funds, reduce administrative workload, and improve the overall quality of grant administration. The one-application rule was endorsed again at the 2009 CDBG Forum held at Stateline in September 2009. Moving to one application per year for competitive funds improved the

quality of applications, led to better grant administration and more timely expenditure of CDBG funds at the local level. It also helped CDBG staff in monitoring efforts. For 2011, 2012 and 2013, applicants were allowed to submit two applications once again. Plus they could submit a third application if the project served multiple areas. Applicants could also sponsor set-aside projects, which would bring the total number of applications higher. Some of the issues that one application resolved resurfaced and the number of applications allowed was a topic for discussion at the 2014 CDBG Forum held in Eureka on September 9th and 10th. In 2014 staff members closely monitored grant management as well as other factors to determine if the one-application rule or other guidelines need to be established for 2015 and beyond.

Other improvements targeted for 2014 were:

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

During the 2014 program year, the Program Specialist has been diligent regarding data entry into IDIS. To further increase the accuracy, CDBG staff members are in the final stage of revising the Project Benefits Report to clarify the report form(s) and accurately reflect the information required in IDIS for each type of project.

- 2) Finalize the revision of the policy and procedure manuals.

CDBG staff members developed a CDBG Manual that was used in the 2015 CDBG Grant Administration Workshop. However, additional requirements or new forms have been implemented since the manual was printed. Currently updates are underway. The intent is to post the manual to the CDBG web site no later than the Forum held September 15th-16th, 2015

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

CDBG is continuing to explore targeting specific topics, such as *Actively Furthering Fair Housing Choice*, in which current or revised resource materials are needed by program staff and/or grantees. In the case where resource materials do not exist, CDBG staff is seeking to research and develop materials.

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

Silver State Fair Housing provided Fair Housing Training specific to the HUD formula programs in 2013. Attendance at this training was a requirement for submitting any application for 2014.

Additionally, the CDBG monitoring form was revised in order to fully assess the status of the grantees' Civil Rights Policies and Procedures. Additional training and guidance will be conducted as needs are assessed.

5. Monitoring

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

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

During the past program year, seven (7) monitoring visits were conducted on-site. Monitoring on-site is considered an opportunity to work with grantees in a reciprocal manner. Staff learns more about the community and concerns the grantee may have; the grantee learns more about CDBG regulations and processes.

What is the status of grant program?

The total amount drawn down from HUD and disbursed to grantees during Program Year (PY) 2014-15 was \$1,684,355.28. All funds came from the 2013 HUD allocation. All prior year Administration and Technical Assistance funds had been used by the end of the 2014 PY: \$50,157.21 remained of the 2014 administration allocation; \$15,545.36 remained of the 2014 TA funds as of June 30, 2015.

As of May 2015, Nevada had a Ratio Expended Last 12 Months to Grant of 0.76. This represents late draw requests for reasons noted earlier. There are no serious issues with project: just a variety of delays. The Ratio Unexpended to Grant stood at 1.15 at the end of May 2015. The spending rate ratios are from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Line of Credit Control System (LOCCS) Report. Nevada is generally second or third best in the nation in these assessment ratios.

As with prior years, an effort has been made in this program year to update the accomplishments more accurately and close grants in a timely manner. In prior years this information was reported in PER tables. These tables were not required for the 2013 project year CAPER, as the 2013 Annual Action Plan was done in the IDIS e-Con Planning Suite. They have not been included in the 2014 report either.

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

Progress continued during PY 2014 in monitoring and closing-out of projects. In total, 21 projects were closed during the year. The goal is to have open grants from three years at the maximum (and few from the oldest year). At the end of the 2014 program year, no grants were open for PY 2012; nine grants were open for 2013 and six of the nine have drawn all funds and are in the closeout process. Twenty-two of the 24 2014 program year grant awards were open

as of June 30, 2015. One project has expended all funds and will close if all documentation is in order. For additional details on closed grants, refer to Table D on page 23.

In addition to closing out grant projects, the State of Nevada has closed out grant years 1995 through 2009 with HUD and is awaiting the determination on closing out 1982 through 1994, a period when current staff members were not with the program and all documentation has been destroyed according to the CDBG record retention schedule. Closeout Agreement for B-10-DC-32.0001 was submitted to the office June 12, 2015 and was approved. We anticipate closing grant years 2011 and 2012 in 2015 also.

At the end of June 30, 2015, there were 31 open grants: nine in PY 2013 and 22 in PY 2014. An additional 20 projects and activities have been setup for PY 2015 and will be funded when the HUD allocation is distributed. As noted, six of the nine 2013 projects are in the closeout process. While there were delays in implementing 2014 projects because of the need to re-bid or for delays in environmental review responses, all projects have made substantial progress; the majority will close on schedule or with one or two three-month extensions.

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

Are grant disbursements timely?

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

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

B. HOME Program

1. Investment of Resources

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

- Development of permanent supportive housing for homeless persons with disabilities.
- Prevention of eviction in order to prevent homelessness.

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

The total allocation received from HUD for the year was \$3,017,887.00. Total commitments to projects and programs from July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015 totaled \$3,017,887.00.

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

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

2. Analysis of Activity Goals

The goal of the State was rehabilitate eleven units of affordable rental units, to weatherize and rehabilitate ten to twenty units, provide down payment assistance for twenty home owners, assist 5-10 vouchers for households that are seniors or disabled and ensure equal access and opportunity to housing resources throughout the state and partner with fair housing service providers in order to offer casework, discrimination complaint investigation, education and outreach.

At the end of this fiscal year we completed nine units of rental housing units that were rehabilitated in White Pine County.

The Division was able assist twenty-seven (27) households in achieving homeownership and an additional eight (8) homes were rehabilitated using HOME and Housing Trust funds. The Division was able to provide three hundred and fifty-one (351) households with rental assistance and rental deposits using Trust Funds. The Division continues to fund Nevada Rural

Housing with Trust Funds in order to provide rental assistance and deposits.

The State also had goals to increase and preserve the supply of affordable housing available to the elderly, disabled, and large families, improve housing accessibility and safety and improve access special need populations have to services. This year three hundred and thirty-eight (338) tax credit units will be built for the elderly, and one hundred and ten (110) new construction family units. The State continues to make elderly and veteran housing a priority in its tax credit annual Qualified Allocation Plan. In addressing housing accessibility and safety, all new construction projects are ADA compliant. When Rural Nevada Development Corporation rehabilitates single family homes they ensure that the homes are brought up to code and if any accessibility requests are needed, they ensure that they are completed. The Division and Rural Nevada Development Corporation also refer persons who are in need of only a ramp to Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living. They have an office in Reno, Elko and Fallon. The Division works closely with many state agencies such as the Division of Developmental Disabilities and Aging Services. Although the Division is not involved in services related to populations with special needs, they are well informed as to what agencies may assist them when they do receive calls from people asking for help. One staff member is on the Governor's Mental Health Planning Advisory

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

3. Rental Projects

The Division completed one new HOME project this year. Highland Terrace apartment complex contains nine (9) HOME units and is an acquisition -rehabilitation project rental housing for seniors and disabled in Ely. This project also received Low Income Housing Tax Credits from the Division.

4. Owner-Occupied Housing

Through the State's regular year-round State Housing Fund funding cycle, a total of \$464,148.10 was awarded to Rural Nevada Development Corporation in HOME funds for down payment assistance and homeowner rehabilitation in the non-entitled rural areas. The total amount expended on homeowner rehabilitation this year was \$134,397.60. RNDC completed eight (8) homeowner rehabilitation projects this year. The amount expended down payment assistance was \$329,750.50. These funds assisted twenty-seven households the opportunity to achieve homeownership.

5. On-Site Inspections of Affordable Rental Housing

NHD has conducted the required monitoring of affordable rental housing units assisted under the HOME and Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program. During this period, the State conducted on-site monitoring of 59 HOME and Trust fund-assisted rental properties. There

were 177 tenant files reviewed for compliance to program regulations, and 177 units were physically inspected for compliance to Housing Quality Standards. The monitoring of HOME-assisted projects are conducted at the same time as the tax credit and bond program audits, and are incorporated into the annual monitoring schedule for those programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The State's HOME program has done a good job of ensuring that minorities have had access to HOME funds. As of last quarter's snapshot of the state, the rental projects have housed seventy-nine percent (79%) White households, one percent (1%) Native American households, one percent (1%) Black households and nineteen percent (19%) Hispanic households. The homebuyer projects have assisted ninety-six (96%) White households and four percent (4%) Black households.

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

8. Housing Units Produced

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

Table F: Priorities for Housing Units Produced

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

Table G: Rental Housing Units Produced vs. Goal

Type of Renter	HOME	Trust Funds	FY 2013 Goals	FY 2013 Actual	Five Year Goal	Five Year Goal Actual
Small Related (includes 3 homeless units)	4	0	0	0	50	71
Large Related	1	0	22	21	50	24
Elderly	1	0	0	9	30	72
Renters (All Others)	3	0	0	0		3
Special Populations	0	0	0	0	20	26
Grand Total	9	0	0	0	150	196

Table H: Housing Units Produced by Income Level

Assistance Provided by Income Group	HOME	Trust Funds	HOPWA	Tax Credits	Total Units Produced
Extremely Low Income, 0-30% MFI	11	0	102	0	113
Very Low Income, 31-50% MFI	6	0	6	448	460
Moderate Income, 51-80% MFI	19	0	3	0	22
Grand Total	36	0	111	448	595

Table I provides a summary of the homeownership projects funded in FY 2013 with non-entitled HOME and Housing Trust Fund.

Table I: Homeownership Units Produced with HOME and Trust Funds

Name of Project (Agency Name)	Funding Amount	Source	County Location	No. of Units	Type of Assistance	Population
Rural Nevada Development Corporation	\$329,751	HOME	White Pine	2	Down Payment Assistance	3-Single
			Elko	7		10-Single
			Nye	0		Parent
			Lyon	4		8-Related
			Churchill	2		Two Parent
			Lincoln	3		5-Elderly
			Mineral	1		1-Other
			Clark	2		
			Douglas	6		
Total	\$329,751			27		27

Of the twenty-seven (27) households assisted with Down Payment Assistance, sixteen (16) were single-female head of household.

Table J provides a summary of the owner-occupied housing rehabilitation projects funded in FY 2014 with HOME and Trust Funds.

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

Agency	Funding Amount	Source	County Location	Number of Units	Population
Rural Nevada Development Corporation	\$134,398	HOME	Churchill	1	4-Single
			Clark	2	3-Elderly
			Nye	1	1-Elderly
			Elko	1	
			White Pine	2	
			Lincoln	1	
Totals	\$134,398			8	8

Of the two households assisted with owner-occupied housing rehabilitation, four (4) were single-female head of household. Two (2) were disabled.

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

NHD sees that there is a great need for homeowner rehabilitation in the rural areas when it comes to worst-case housing needs. This program is the most time consuming program that we fund. This year we were only able to assist eight homes with homeowner rehabilitation because of staff turnover at the non-profit who administers the program. We hope to maintain or increase this level of assistance in the years to come. The Division continues to augment its weatherization program with Trust Funds and this year fifty (50) of the one hundred twenty-nine (129) households assisted were disabled households. NHD also sees the need to increase housing vouchers. Although, the need is great NHD has very limited resources to be used in the rural area. Therefore, in order to use NHD's Trust Funds in conjunction with their voucher program, NHD requires that those persons for families being assisted are either disabled or seniors on their waiting list.

10. HOME Activities in relation to Objectives in Annual Plan

OBJECTIVE: PROVIDE DECENT HOUSING (RENTERS)

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

Annual Goal: Approximate 20 units of production per year

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

Indicator: In FY 2014 the HOME program completed nine units (9) for low-income seniors.

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

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

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

Indicator: In FY 2014 the Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program allocated \$322,800 for Tenant Based Rental Assistance. NHD was able to assist fifty-one (51) elderly and

disabled households with rental subsidy and we provided three hundred and fifty-one (351) households with Tenant Based Rental Assistance and security deposit funds.

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

Annual Goal: Approximate 20 units of production per year

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

OBJECTIVE: PROVIDE DECENT HOUSING (OWNERS)

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

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

Outcome: Provide homeownership assistance to low and moderate income households

Indicator: In FY 2014 the HOME and Low-Income Housing Trust Fund programs spent \$329,750.50 to assist twenty-seven (27) households with down payment assistance.

OBJECTIVE: CREATE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT (RENTERS)

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

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

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

Indicator: In FY 2014 nine (9) new units were added to inventory that house very low income households.

OBJECTIVE: CREATE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT (OWNERS)

1. 1. Goal: Suitable Living Environment by enhancing suitable living environments through new and improved sustainability by providing rehabilitation to existing owner occupied housing units.

2. Annual Goal: Provide housing rehabilitation and weatherization to approximately 10-20 low-to-moderate income owner-occupied housing units.

3. Outcome: Units meeting energy star standards and number of low and moderate income households assisted.
4. **Indicator: In FY 2014 the Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program expended \$325,843 to rehabilitate and weatherize one hundred twenty-nine (129) units, resulting in lower energy costs for low-to-moderate income households.**
5. The following tables summarize the HOME program housing accomplishments for the 2014 program year.

Table K: Summary of Accomplishments HOME Program PY 2014

Priority Need Category	No. of persons served
Renters: 0 - 30% of MFI	8
31 – 50% of MFI	1
51 – 80% of MFI	0
Owners: 0 - 30% of MFI	6
31 – 50% of MFI	8
51 – 60% of MFI	7
61 – 80% of MFI	14
Homeless: Individuals	0
Families	0
Non-Homeless Special Needs	0
Total Housing	44
Total 215 Housing	44

Table L: Summary of Accomplishments HOME Program FY 2014

Total Housing	No. of persons served
White	42
Black or African American	1
Asian	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0
American Indian or Alaska Native & White	0
Asian and White	0
Black or African American & White	0
American Indian or Alaska Native & Black or African American	0
Other Multi Racial	0
TOTAL	44
Number listed above with Hispanic Ethnicity	8

11. HOME Self Evaluation Considerations

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

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

NHD feels that the activities and strategies are making an impact on the identified needs. The State's identified needs were multi-rental rehabilitation, homeowner rehabilitation, homebuyer assistance and new construction-multi-family. The Division completed one multi-unit project this year. This project is located in Ely. This project is also a tax credit project and consisted of acquisition rehabilitation. The Division has also funded five projects currently under construction. These projects, located in the City of Henderson, City of Las Vegas and three in the rural counties will add new units for families, seniors, veterans and those on the verge homeless. These projects are currently under construction and it is anticipated that they will be complete within the next 19 months.

What indicators would best describe the results?

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

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

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

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

What is the status of grant programs?

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

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

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

Are grant disbursements timely?

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

Are major goals on target?

Although the Division feels the major goals are on target, it is very hard to report on those goals. The Annual Plan only reflected the goals of the areas of the non-entitled area and project that we directly fund HOME funds and Trust Funds. Most of the bond and tax credit projects are located in Clark County. We will not be reporting on the HOME and Trust Fund projects that Clark County, Washoe County, and the City of Henderson are administering with State HOME and Trust Funds. However, we will report on the units that are receiving tax credits and Bond funding for informational purposes only and they will not be counted in our goal totals.

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

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

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

1. Investment of Resources

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

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

- 49.5% for operational costs for emergency and transitional shelters for the homeless and domestic violence victims, including motel vouchers in communities that lack access to homeless shelters. Of the amount funded, 17% was passed through the City of Reno to fund the Community Assistance Center shelters in Washoe County;
- 10% was allocated for essential services for homeless clients in emergency and transitional housing shelters;
- A limited amount (1.5%) was provided for homeless prevention case management to prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless.
- 14% of the 2014 award was allocated for rapid re-housing rental assistance and case management programs to place homeless individuals and families into apartments;
- 13.5% was allocated to reimburse agencies for costs of collecting and entering client data into the required Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database, and to pay for DV shelters to have access to the HMIS comparable database;
- 9% of the allocation was awarded to HMIS Lead Agency to offset costs of maintaining the HMIS database, to help offset costs of the HMIS database; and
- 2.5% of the 2014 allocation was used to offset administration costs for the Division and sub-recipients

Table L reflects the 2013 and 2014 grant awards by sub-recipient, along with the amount of the allocation that has been expended as of June 30, 2015.

Table L: Emergency Solutions Grant Program Allocation Summary

EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT PROGRAM PY 2013				CFDA NUMBER 14.231			ALL FUNDS WERE COMMITTED TO AGENCIES BY 09/01/2013. GRANT END DATE 06/30/15	
SUB- RECIPIENT	COUNTY	EMERGENCY/ TRANSITIONAL SHELTER 60% CAP (\$186,567)	HOMELESS PREVENTION	RAPID RE-HOUSING	DATA COLLECTION	ADMIN 7.5% CAP (23,320)	TOTAL AWARDED	PERCENT EXPENDED GRANT-TO- DATE
Carson City ADV	Carson	\$23,000					\$23,000	100%
ALIVE	Lyon	\$9,000					\$9,000	100%
Churchill County Social Services	Churchill	\$12,553			\$2,547		\$15,100	100%
City of Reno	Washoe			\$62,366.92	\$31,983.08		\$94,350	100%
Carson City Social Services	Carson		\$5,087.00	\$29,913	\$10,000	\$3,000	\$38,000	100%
Douglas County Social Services	Douglas	\$8,000					\$8,000	100%
FISH-Carson	Carson	\$27,000					\$27,000	100%
FISH-Elko	Elko	\$42,000			\$9,495		\$51,495	100%
Lyon County Health & Human Services	Lyon		\$8,700	\$19,350	\$8,700	\$6,450	\$43,200	100%
State Admin						\$1,800	\$1,800	100%
TOTAL		\$121,553	\$13,787.00	\$111,629.92	\$52,725.08	\$11,250	\$310,945	100%

EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT PROGRAM PY 2014				CFDA NUMBER 14.231			ALL FUNDS WERE COMMITTED TO AGENCIES BY 09/01/2014 GRANT END DATE 06/30/16	
SUB-RECIPIENT	COUNTY	EMERGENCY/ TRANSITIONAL SHELTER 60% CAP (\$220,246)	HOMELESS PREVENTION	RAPID RE-HOUSING	DATA COLLECTION	ADMIN 7.5% CAP (27,530)	TOTAL AWARDED	PERCENT EXPENDED GRANT-TO- DATE
Carson City Advocates	Carson	\$25,000			\$12,000		\$37,000	100%
ALIVE	Lyon	\$9,000			\$4,000		\$13,000	88.46%
Churchill County Social Services	Churchill	\$14,022			\$5,278		\$19,300	77.07%
City of Reno	Washoe			\$62,000	\$32,350		\$94,350	75.97%
Carson City Social Services	Carson		\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$2,000	\$17,000	0% *
Douglas County Social Services	Douglas	\$8,000					\$8,000	0% *
FISH-Carson	Carson	\$37,585			\$2,610	\$500	\$27,000	100%
FISH-Elko	Elko	\$463,224			\$12,000		\$75,224	97.32%
Lyon County Health & Human Services	Lyon			\$47,400	\$8,600	\$5,000	\$61,000	65.84%
State Admin						\$1,509	\$1,509	0%
TOTAL		\$218,831	\$5,000	\$52,400	\$81,838	\$9,009	\$367,078	76.82%

* Two agencies have not expended any 2014 funds as they were utilizing all 2013 allocations and also State Trust funds so that the trust funds could be used as match during the current year.

2. Analysis of Annual Goals

The annual goals impacting the ESG program were as follows:

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

The maximum amount allowed by program regulations (60%) was awarded to homeless shelters, domestic violence shelters, and transitional housing for the homeless to pay for shelter operation costs and case management. A total of 3,174 adults and children were provided access to shelter housing and services in rural and northern Nevada.

State ESG funds were also allocated for housing relocation and stabilization cost, which provided case management and other supportive services to the homeless and those at imminent risk of homelessness. A limited amount of ESG funding was provided for rental assistance, as agencies utilized State Low Income Housing Trust funds to provide most of the rental assistance needed for homeless prevention and rapid rehousing clients. All totaled 23

adults and children were prevented from becoming homeless, and 102 homeless adults and children were provided access to housing.

Funding was also provided for HMIS data collection support which allowed for agencies to enter client data into the statewide HMIS database, and to provide funding for the statewide HMIS system to provide financial support since two HUD grants were not awarded funding in the northern and rural Continua, and a small amount was used to pay for agency and state administrative costs.

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

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

4. ESG Self-Evaluation Considerations

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

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

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

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

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

- Agency staff actively participated in monthly Continuum of Care meetings; had input on the creation of 2014-2015 Performance Measures; provided input in the development of the RNCoC Strategic Plan; participated in annual homeless counts; participated in, and in some cases became the intake place for, the local centralized intake and referral system; and participated in the development of RNCoC/Rural ESG Written Standards.
- Veteran's Stand Downs were conducted in a number of rural communities. In addition Northern Nevada Veteran Resource Centers received supportive services grant for veterans in northern and rural Nevada, providing access to much needed assistance for homeless and at-risk of homelessness veterans and their families;
- Communities continued with its programs to address and end poverty. Through the Community Services Block Grant, social services agencies and community action agencies managed workforce development programs. Case managers worked one-on-one with clients to help them address barriers which were preventing employment. In addition, case managers coordinated job fairs and held weekly workforce strategy classes which were open to the public. In one community alone 60 Workforce participants obtained employment and 119 jobseekers who attended the job fairs also obtained employment;
- Rural Nevada Health Services Network conducted meetings to discuss, plan, and develop services in the healthcare network. Topics included:
 - Increasing the number of rural providers who accept patients utilizing the healthcare network;
 - Build GIS Google Maps with existing resources and providers for use by clients, providers and Network Leaders in identifying gaps and making decisions about co-location, increased services, and other efficiencies;
 - Support increasing numbers of veterans living in rural communities being able to access health care where they live;
 - Recruit and place increasing numbers of public health, social work, human development, and medical, nursing, and other allied health professions interns in rural communities;
 - Increase outreach to and placement of out-of-state dentists who can practice without a Nevada license (must be licensed in another state) if they volunteer their services within rural Nevada communities;
 - Support primary care/mental health providers and clinics offering expanded hours or "walk-in" spots in their schedules for individuals seeking help without prior appointments;

- Recruit and place/pair Community Health Workers and Community Paramedics in increasing numbers in rural areas; and
 - Workforce development-create a more effective pipeline for training and recruitment of paraprofessionals to fill in the gap of primary care providers and dentists.
- Communities held monthly Coalition Meetings and were trained on numerous topics and programs, including the following: “Wraparound in Nevada for Children and Families” which is a program that helps kids in state custody and their families find much needed resources; Kids in Transition Program; and various programs and services offered locally to assist low-income and homeless households, including the Salvation Army, Senior Care Services; The Children’s Cabinet; and United Way;
 - Communities discussed the impacts of discharging persons out of their programs without recourses to obtain housing or long-term stability during community coalition meetings. Meetings were held with local jails, hospitals, mental health providers, and other organizations to formalize community-wide discharge plans. One ESG recipient meets monthly with jail, hospital and mental health staff to identify the most vulnerable homeless clients and provided them access to housing and services provided through the ESG and other programs; and
 - The Governor’s Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) began meeting again this past year and a Strategic Plan was developed and approved by the ICH.

What indicators would best describe the results?

Although agencies struggled to meet some of the performance outcomes such as increased earned income and referrals to permanent housing, there have been improvements in these areas from previous years. Increased efforts by shelters to improve household income is occurring, and utilization of local coordinated intake and referral systems has resulted in 146 of the most vulnerable homeless being provided access to housing vouchers funded by the State Low-Income Housing Trust Fund program. Because of collaboration that occurred between local communities, the rural housing authority, and the Division, homeless and at-risk of homeless clients are being housed much sooner than would have occurred in past years.

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

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

The Division required that programs and services funded through the ESG program help with local efforts to address and end homelessness. Program objectives were created in partnership

with the northern and rural Continuum's of Care since these areas were funded with State ESG allocations.

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

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

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

Although the unemployment rate in Nevada has decreased to 6.9% statewide as of June 2015, there is still a need for viable employment with livable wages which would allow a household to live without the constant threat of housing instability. It has been challenging to improve the earned income of the homeless enough so that they can become stable in the long term.

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

The Nevada Rural Housing Authority's Section 8 program closed the waitlist due to an unusually high volume of applications received from out of state. This is causing agencies that would normally use ESG funds to provide rapid re-housing rental assistance to high-risk or vulnerable homeless clients to cut back. Program regulations and limited funding reduces the length of time program participants can be in ESG-funded programs, and clients will not be able to transfer into Section 8 when allocations are expended.

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

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

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

Finally, although the HMIS database has become a huge component in the overall success of

the ESG program, funding cuts and lack of other funds available to pay for agency staff to enter clients into HMIS has resulted in over 20% of the ESG annual allocation being used for HMIS-related expenses. This equates to approximately \$80,000 in funding that could be used to provide much need housing and services to the homeless and at risk of homelessness populations each year.

5. Monitoring and Grant Status

The frequency and method of monitoring ESG sub-recipients

The ESG Program Manager is responsible for the monitoring of ESG sub-recipients as reflected in the ESG's Policies and Procedures-Compliance Monitoring section. Each year a Risk Assessment Worksheet is completed to determine which sub-recipients require a monitoring visit in the upcoming year. In PY 2014 Division staff conducted four ESG on-site visits and there were no areas of improvement noted. Division staff also conducted on-site trainings of all sub-recipients as needed to review Emergency Solutions Grant Program requirements.

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

What is the status of grant programs?

All 2013 funds have been completely expended. 78.82% of the 2014 allocation awarded July 1, 2014 has also been expended. The balance of \$85,079.96 will be utilized by sub-recipients during the 2015 program year.

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

As of submission of this report two (2) agencies have expended less than 50% of their 2014 allocation. The following are summaries explaining delays in the timely expenditure of funds:

- Carson City Human Services-This agency 2013 grant funds, along with all match, during this past program year and have started using 2014 funds for clients already in the program.
- Douglas County-This agency was awarded a small allocation of only \$8,000 to pay for certain essential services for homeless clients utilizing state funding for motel vouchers, since the community does not have access to a shelter. The County utilized carryover ESG funds from 2013, and will expend 2014 funds this next fiscal year.

Are grant disbursements timely?

The Division has expended 76.82% of the 2014 allocation, and has processed drawdowns from IDIS at least quarterly as required by program regulations.

The ESG Sub-Recipient Award Agreement executed between the Division and all sub-recipients requires draw reimbursement requests be submitted at least quarterly. Agencies that fail to meet this requirement risk the recapture of their allocation. Most agencies submitted requests at least quarterly and are processed within seven days of receipt by the Division. Two agencies did not meet the draw reimbursement timeline requirements this past year and submitted narratives explaining the reason for delay, along with a plan to ensure all funds will be expended by the end of the grant period, with their annual reports.

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

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

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

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

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

In 2009, due to a dramatic decrease in existing housing sales throughout Nevada, the amount of revenue deposited into the Trust Fund account decreased substantially. The Trust Fund

account continued to see decreases in revenues until increases in the sale of existing homes this past year resulted in an increase in allocations.

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

The following table summarizes the allocation and clients served with Welfare Set-Aside funds, as reported by agencies from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015:

Table N: Welfare Set-Aside Program for Emergency Assistance

Agency	Award	Households Served 7/14-6/15	# Of Households at Poverty	Total # of adults and children
Clark County Social Services	\$328,600	307	233	964
City of Henderson	\$50,925	38	29	109
Washoe County Social Services	\$81,635	61	35	187
Carson City Health and Human Services	\$9,500	24	23	44
Churchill County Social Services	\$7,000	32	24	80
Douglas County Social Services	\$7,500	Not Reported		
Elko County Social Services	\$7,000	9	4	29
Humboldt County Indigent Services	Carry over funds only	Not Report		
Lincoln County	\$4,000	38	36	77
Lyon County Human Services	\$9,000	40	30	106
Mineral County (CAHS)	\$5,840	50	46	89
Nye County Social Services	\$9,500	28	14	50
White Pine County Social Services	\$4,500	16	12	25
TOTALS	\$525,000	643	486	1,760

7. Homeless Discharge Coordination

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

This past year one rural community created teams consisting of jails, hospitals, behavioral health departments, fire department emergency management staff, community health centers,

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

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

D. Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) – PY 2014.

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

HOPES is a federally qualified health center (FQHC) located in Reno, Nevada that provides coordinated medical care and support services to over 2,763 individuals. Since 1997, HOPES has been the only comprehensive HIV provider in northern Nevada. For 18 years, HOPES has provided medical, pharmaceutical, case management, and support services to persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA). In recent years, HOPES has added behavioral health, transportation, and medication delivery to its already robust list of services offered. In May 2014, HOPES received national Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) status recognition. Utilizing a healthcare team of medical providers, case managers, behavioral health specialists, pharmacists, and outreach workers, HOPES provides compassionate integrative care to PLWHA in northern Nevada. Their team-based approach to healthcare allows clients to access a range of comprehensive services in one central location. For medically underserved populations such as the LGBT community, drug users, sex workers, the homeless, and those living in poverty, their one-stop-shop healthcare model reduces barriers to care and increases the likelihood of maintaining long-term health. Northern Nevada HOPES serves all counties in Nevada except for Clark, Esmeralda, and Nye counties. Outside of the Reno/Sparks area, the geographic area that HOPES serves is primarily rural and frontier.

Northern Nevada HOPES currently provides integrative services to **655** HIV positive individuals living in northern Nevada. HOPES' HIV patients are largely low-income, with **60%** living at or below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level. **84%** are on antiretroviral therapy, **84%** are viral load suppressed, **9%** are co-infected with hepatitis C, **26%** are homeless, and an estimated **30%** are still uninsured after Affordable Care Act implementation. **46%** are MSM, **16%** are female, **19%**

are Hispanic and **8%** are African American. Approximately **10%** of HOPES HIV positive clients live in rural areas.

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

The staff at Northern Nevada HOPES has been specially trained in HIV treatment, and remain up to date on HIV treatment recommendations. Many of the HIV positive individuals presenting at Northern Nevada HOPES are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. HOPES utilizes HOPWA funds to provide housing services to these individuals, thus increasing their likelihood of being retained in care and adherent to their medication regimen. All clients receiving HOPWA funded services are asked to apply for all public assistance/subsidy programs they are eligible for, and when approved for said programs, are transitioned from HOPWA services to the new subsidized program. Currently the local Section 8 housing program is closed and is not accepting applications. The HOPWA program at Northern Nevada HOPES is overseen by Ivan Trigueros, the Social Services Coordinator.

This past year, 112 unduplicated HIV positive individuals were served with HOPWA funds; 7 people were served through the TBRA program, 98 through STRMU, and 21 people were served through PHP service. Thirty individuals received more than one HOPWA service (i.e. STRMU and PHP). Of the individuals served through the TBRA program, two were able to independently sustain their own housing and transition off of the program. Five individuals served by TBRA remain on the program and will continue to need TBRA funding assistance in the future. Many of the individuals continuing on TBRA are undocumented and/or live on fixed Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) incomes, and therefore; do not anticipate their financial status changing in the near future. Of the 98 people receiving STRMU funds, 45 have stabilized their financial and housing situations and will not need further assistance. It is anticipated that 15 of the clients who received STRMU assistance this past year will likely need additional STRMU assistance in the future in order to maintain their stable housing arrangements. All of the clients receiving HOPWA funded services maintained contact with their case manager consistent with the schedule specified in his or her individualized service plan. Additionally, all clients maintained a housing plan with their case manager. Ninety individuals receiving HOPWA assistance remained compliant with their medical treatment. Fifty-two clients accessed and maintain health insurance, many of whom HOPES case managers helped enroll during ACA open enrollment. Thirty-six maintained a source of income while on the program. The individuals who did not maintain a source of income experienced negative events such as the loss of a job, loss of temporary employment, and/or discontinuation of unemployment assistance. Twenty percent of clients accessing HOPWA services identified as Latino, 10% identified as African American, 3% as Asian, 12% as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 65%

identified as White/Caucasian . Ninety-six percent of clients receiving HOPWA assistance had incomes between 0-30% of the area median income, and 4% had incomes between 31-50% of the area median income. No client served had an income above 50% of the area median income. Throughout the year, six individuals identified as chronically homeless prior to accessing HOPWA services and five individuals served were homeless veterans, totaling 11 homeless individuals served through HOPWA funds.

HOPES maintains a waitlist for all eligible individuals seeking assistance. At the end of the grant year 9 individuals remained on the TBRA waitlist, 6 on the STRMU waitlist, and 27 individuals continue to wait for a reduced rent apartment unit operated by the Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board. In the past year, HOPES has begun collaborating with Nevada LaBelle, a local apartment complex who reserves all of its 18 units to HOPES at a reduced rate (\$350 a month for a studio). All of the units are currently occupied and there are three people on the wait list. When openings are available for any of the above mentioned programs, HOPES calls clients in order they were placed on the list. If any individual no longer meets eligibility requirements or no longer needs assistance, their name is removed from the list and HOPES contacts the next client on the wait list.

Finances among clients are a huge barrier. More clients qualify for Medicaid and most don't see the reason to stay with RWPB until it is too late. There's a provider effort across the state including entry points with eligibility staff to convey to clients the need to recertify every six months to maintain eligibility and access to wrap around services. Maintaining and producing documentation is always an issue with clients during the recertification process; especially when clients can also receive housing services through the RWPB program while they are on the waiting list or need other housing assistance. Clients also have difficulty getting into housing because of their eviction history and credit history. Unfortunately, motels are the only ones that will take them and HOPWA won't pay for motels. We have found Nevada LaBelle and NNCHRB will work with clients.

Other barriers the project sponsor Northern Nevada HOPES has encountered that impacts their ability to effectively assist clients with housing stability are: housing affordability, housing availability, criminal justice history, economic stability, and RWPB eligibility. Housing affordability is a major concern for PLWHA in northern Nevada. Families and single adults, working or not, often have difficulty obtaining affordable housing. According to the National Coalition on Low Income Housing, Nevada ranks 41 of 52 areas in Fair Market Rents (FMR). In Washoe County (the greater Reno-Sparks area), fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment is \$930, 217% of the state minimum wage. In order to afford this level of rent and utilities without paying more than 30% of income on housing, a household must earn \$37,200 annually. However, minimum wage workers earn a yearly wage of \$17,160. In order to afford the FMR for a two-bedroom apartment, a minimum wage worker must work 92 hours per week, or the household must include 2.3 minimum wage workers working 40-hours per week. Even if a minimum wage worker rents a one bedroom apartment, the average rent is \$844, which is still more than 30% of their income. In fact, the average wage for a renter is \$14.35 an hour, nearly double minimum wage, and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) is only \$698 a month in

Nevada. As a result of the economic downturn and high housing costs, many PLWHA have very few options for housing sustainability. The HOPWA program assists these low-income individuals with locating and sustaining affordable housing.

Clients of HOPES have experienced great difficulty locating and maintaining employment that provides a livable wage. Many clients have minimal marketable job skills, have poor employment history, have criminal records, are undocumented or experience mental illness and substance abuse problems that limit their ability to seek and maintain employment. Additionally, many clients of HOPES are too ill or sick to maintain a 40-hour work week. Finally, low-income clients of HOPES do not have reliable sources of transportation and therefore have to take public transportation to their jobs when they do find employment. Along with the financial burden that this places on low-income clients, Reno's public transportation is ineffective with buses often running behind and the commute being very lengthy. It is not unheard of for it to take 1.5 hours to get somewhere on public transportation that it would take 15 minutes to drive. All of the factors described above negatively impact HIV positive individuals living in Reno, Nevada from obtaining and retaining steady employment.

Difficulty obtaining stable employment has negatively impacted their ability to independently sustain housing, resulting in poor rental history and/or homelessness. To help overcome this barrier the staff at Northern Nevada HOPES maintains strong working relationships with community based organizations and housing providers who will often overlook poor rental history and/or criminal background and agree to house a client despite their past. Additionally, through these working relationships case managers are able to assist clients in locating housing where they feel safe and free of discrimination and prejudice, which is unfortunately something that many clients still face. Through case management services and volunteer activities, HOPES provides its clients with individualized resume building and job seeking skills instruction. Through this opportunity clients learn how to create an effective resume and learn how to navigate the online-world of employment seeking. Clients with mental health and substance abuse issues that impede their ability to sustain employment are referred to the HOPES Behavioral Health department for individual and group treatment and support.

Finally, as mentioned above, remaining RWPB eligible can be difficult tasks for many HIV positive individuals living in HOPES service area. Many clients live day to day, never knowing where their next meal will come from or if they will continue to have a roof over their head. For these clients, remembering to update their RWPB on time, or locating all of their needed documentation can be a daunting task. Although HOPES Case Managers work with these clients, providing reminders and assisting in gathering up the needed documentation, many clients get discouraged and choose not to follow through and seek alternatives elsewhere.

The goal for the 2013-2014 fiscal year was to provide assistance to 155 individuals through HOPWA funded services; however the program did not meet its goal and total of 112 unduplicated individuals were served. HOPES has identified two reasons for not meeting its yearly goal. As mentioned above, HOPES has begun a new partnership with Nevada LaBelle. With the addition of this new partnership, HOPES now has 36 units reserved for HOPES clients

at a reduced rate. Because of this opportunity, more clients of HOPES are able to financially sustain their own housing without need for long-term housing support. The second, and most important reason for HOPES not achieving its goal, is with the increasing number of HIV positive individuals having access to health insurance, less clients are remaining up to date on their Ryan White Part B eligibility, which is a recommendation in order to be eligible for the HOPWA program as well as being able to receive Housing Assistance through the RWPB program. HOPES has recognized a trend this past year of ineligible clients requesting rental assistance, but having to wait months to gather the required RWPB documentation and become eligible. HOPES will need to assess which documents are taking longer to receive in order to assist clients accordingly. All of the individuals currently on the STRMU wait list are pending approval of their RWPB eligibility in order to receive assistance from both programs. In the interim, HOPES Case Managers continue to work with individuals to establish monthly budgets, locate community resources and affordable housing, as well as long-term and temporary employment.

Even though HOPES did not meet its goal for number of individuals served, HOPWA funds assisted HOPES in greatly improving the lives of 112 clients, and 111 beneficiaries. As previously mentioned, funding assisted 11 previously homeless individuals in accessing and sustaining adequate housing. This was accomplished through the coordinated effort of case managers, behavioral health, and clinic staff. Additionally, 80% of HOPWA program participants remained adherent to their HIV treatment and medication regimen, thus increasing their health outcomes and overall quality of life. All 36 of the clients placed in the reduced rent apartment units were at risk of becoming homeless. Providing this valuable opportunity to clients prevented their need of using HOPWA funds and increased their chances of sustaining adequate and affordable housing.

Northern Nevada HOPES has an established relationship with the Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board (NNCHRB) for four years. NNCHRB is a local non-profit organization that develops innovative affordable housing complexes for low-income individuals. NNCHRB dedicates 18 units at two of their developments to HIV positive clients of HOPES at over \$200 a month off the market rate, which equals to an approximate \$59,520 in leveraged funds. HOPES new partnership with Nevada LaBelle, who provided 18 units to HOPES clients at \$200 off the market price has leveraged HOPES an additional \$59,520 in funds. Northern Nevada HOPES received \$65,331 in direct service housing funds from Ryan White Part B to help supplement the housing assistance provided through the HOPWA grant award. Additionally, HOPES received \$19,876 from Ryan White Part B to help cover the costs of case management services for clients receiving housing services. Combined, all of these sources provide \$217,651 in leveraged funds. HOPES is in the process of finalizing an MOU with a local low-income apartment complex, Park Manor, who will dedicate 9 units to clients of HOPES for approximately \$100 less than the regular price. Along with providing more subsidized units to clients, HOPES anticipates this partnership leveraging additional funding next year.

During the recent ACA enrollment, many health programs continue to transition clients to Medicaid and Health Exchange. During the last enrollment, three people enrolled into exchange and four people enrolled into Medicaid. An ongoing process is in place for screening

for potential Medicaid and Health Exchange eligibility. Once determination is established and client is enrolled, the eligibility vendor billing department notifies HOPES when clients fall off the program and notifies HOPES Case Managers (CM). CM's get a monthly list from the eligibility vendor of who has expired from the RWPB program and CM's work to engage clients. On occasion, RWPB clients do not provide health insurance statements and consequently the eligibility vendor terminates paying for their premiums. HOPES will need to work on educating clients to ensure they maintain their coverage as well as their eligibility. HOPES participates on a monthly basis meetings with NVPCA to discuss enrollment issues, updates, changes, upcoming events and any other pertinent activities.

Since October 2013, the project sponsor Northern Nevada HOPES, has been actively enrolling their HIV positive clients into Medicaid and/or the Federal Insurance Exchange. HOPES currently has three employees trained to enroll individuals into the Federal Exchange, and an additional four that enroll clients into Medicaid. Enrolling clients into health insurance on-site at HOPES enabled HOPES staff to successfully ensure that HIV positive clients have access to insurance. HOPES has established processes to identify individuals eligible for insurance and enroll them during their regularly scheduled appointments. Since implementing its insurance enrollment program, HOPES has seen many previously uninsured PLWHA have access to insurance and the healthcare benefits it provides. However, in the past year HOPES has seen PLWHA start to fall off of their insurance due to a variety of factors. These individuals continue to need ADAP funds in order to access their HIV medication. It is anticipated that in the future, HIV positive individuals will continue to need assistance with insurance premiums and medication co-pays. Without this assistance many HIV positive individuals will experience great difficulty maintaining stable housing due to the premiums and copays associated with their health insurance.

5. RURAL NEVADA CONTINUUM OF CARE (RNCOC)

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

A. Accomplishments

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

- Successful submission of grant applications to HUD on behalf of the RNCOC;
- Conduction of the point in time (PIT) count process and results;
- Provided specific profiles for each county in the balance of state related to homelessness in the PIT report;
- Conducted ongoing training and orientation of providers in the RNCOC to enhance utilization of HMIS;

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

B. Actions

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

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

Topics addressed during technical meetings included:

- Implementation and ongoing process of local coordinated intake and referral systems, including discussions on what works/does not work;
- Sharing of discharge planning processes;
- Review of utilization rates and bed coverage reports for agencies participating in HMIS;
- Discussion regarding HMIS statewide issues and updates;
- Provided updates on statewide CoC and Governor's Interagency Council on Homelessness meetings;

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

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

6. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Nevada Housing Division is the largest producer of affordable housing in Nevada. This year the Division developed four hundred forty-eight (448) new affordable units using its Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program. These projects will house all low-income families. There were two (2) multi-family bonds issued this year which represents an additional four hundred and nine (409) units. We were able to make three hundred twenty-seven (327) single-family loans.

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

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

7. ACTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHER FAIR HOUSING

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

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

In 2013, activities relating to Nevada’s Voluntary Compliance Agreement were completed: (1) the Section 504 Self-Evaluation and (2) the Four-Factor Analysis and Plan for Limited English Proficiency. Both packets of documents were completed and submitted prior to the September 30, 2013 completion date of the Voluntary Compliance Agreement. Staff members worked on the development of templates for the 26 eligible entities to use in conducting the Four-Factor Analysis at the local level. Because of staff turnover this was not completed before the end of the 2014 program year but should be completed by December 2015.

Work continues on collecting the rates of participation based on race, ethnicity, gender and disability in each funded program. Staff and grantees have been trained with respect to the collection and reporting for racial, ethnic gender and disability characteristics of waiting lists applicants and participants in the HOME and NSP programs. And CDBG is finalizing revisions of the Project Benefits Reports to accurately capture the data required for each project type. While CDBG has no waiting lists, data collection and reporting are monitored for accuracy and completeness.

Additionally, the completed ADA reviews of the buildings that house CDBG and housing programs were completed by the State of Nevada during the 2014 program year. The state reviews are more stringent than the HUD reviews and additional modifications were required. Most alterations have been completed at both locations (GOED & NHD); updating is an on-going process. State reviews are conducted on a scheduled basis by the State for all owned and leased properties.

In May of 2014, Nevada Housing Division posted a Request for Proposals (RFP) from consultants for assistance with the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and a new Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice to inform the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. (The selected consultant reviewed the prior AI and subsequent communications to ensure past impediments were reviewed and discussed.) The RFP’s were due June 20, 2014; the consultant(s) was selected in early July and the planning processes began shortly thereafter. The process of developing the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, the 2015 Annual Action Plan, and the Analysis of Impediments to

Fair Housing Choice consumed a great deal of staff time with focus group meetings, on-site meetings with stakeholders, as well as a series of webinars. These documents were submitted to the San Francisco HUD office by the May 15th, 2015 due date. Priorities and action plans will be implemented over the next five years.

NHD works diligently with the developers of affordable housing in the rural areas to ensure that the development of affordable rental housing is outside of minority areas. This year the Division saw one project completed. The projects are located at 110 JV Walker and 115 W Highland in Ely. Additionally, twenty-seven households were assisted in achieving homeownership. None of the homes were located in a minority area. Of the twenty-seven (27) households assisted, sixteen (16) were female head of households. When assisting a disabled person who is living on social security, the non-profit informs the borrowers of the Rural Development program. This program allows the homeowners to receive interest rates as low as one percent. These interest rates allow persons with low-incomes to achieve the dream of homeownership.

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

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

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

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

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

To help address this situation the Division's Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program identified the need for projects that could house the lowest income tenants, including projects serving persons with physical or developmental disabilities, individuals and families who are homeless,

and veterans. Tax credits were awarded to projects throughout the state which will provide affordable housing to these populations.

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

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

Finally, an allocation of funding is awarded to social services agencies across the state which is used to provide emergency rent and utility assistance, security deposits, and mortgage payments if needed, to households earning less than 60% of the area median income so that they don't become homeless due to eviction.

8.1 Lead Based Paint Goals (Also in IDIS)

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

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

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

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

CDBG:

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

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

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

- Community Action Agencies (CAA's) participated in community coalitions which were used to identify and address critical community needs affecting low-income individuals and families in areas such as unemployment, homelessness, mental health issues, and drug abuse. Community coalition agendas addressed improved coordination of services, prioritization of needs, and the establishment of common goals;
- CAA's collaborated with other community partners in the areas of joint planning, cross-referrals, shared case-management, and resource coordination;
- The GMU and the CAA's adopted the Nevada Service Directory Model, which consisted of a standardized intake assessment across 12 domains such as employment, housing, and transportation which each client completed. The intake was scale-based and

measured client status in each domain using 5 level scale: thriving, safe, stable, vulnerable, and in-crisis. The intake assessment results were used to determine the type of services that the client received, which included any combination of the following: direct services provided by the CAA, information and referral, and case management. Clients receiving case managing created goals and plans to track progress on domain scales;

- CAA's established an agency Data Model which contained an extensive list of information and referral sources that were used to link clients with services the agency was not able to provide. The CAA's maintained ongoing relationships with their network of referral agencies through meetings and phone contact. Linkages were developed and gaps in services were addressed;
- CAA's expanded employment services to families and individuals, and coordinated with employment partners to provide training and workshops. Clients were registered with Job Connect and other partner agencies;
- CAA's served as the intake site for the State's Energy Assistance Program. Clients were screened and referred to emergency assistance programs as part of the intake process;
- Activities that prevented child abuse and neglect;
- Parent education classes and workshops;
- Hunger One-Stop Shop programs and other food security programs;
- Independent living programs;
- Mental health therapy services were provided to northern and rural Nevada youth between the ages of 13-17. SoS (Signs of Suicide) screening tools and educational curriculum were used to provide mental health services;
- In northeastern Nevada a non-profit organization provided short-term quality care for children with special needs, offering a "gift of time" to families, enabling them to enhance the quality of their lives;
- Eligible children who were screened and identified as lacking access to affordable healthcare were linked to Medicaid or NV Check-up;
- Funded a program that provided behavioral health services to pediatric patients who were poor, uninsured or underinsured, and who were enrolled in Medicaid;
- Improved access to wellness and healthcare services in rural areas, focusing on low-income households that were medically underserved;
- Funded projects which assisted very low-income adults with disabilities at risk of institutionalization or homelessness in locating available housing; completing applications; and moving into and/or remaining in their accessible, affordable housing unit with community-based supportive care services; and
- Provided funding to the Crisis Call Center-First Call for Help via the statewide 2-1-1 system.

8.3 Institutional Structure and Intergovernmental Cooperation (Also in IDIS)

Intra- and inter-governmental cooperation has occurred for many years throughout the State of Nevada. The State is committed to continuing its participation and coordination with federal, state, county, local agencies, and the private and nonprofit sectors in order to serve the needs

of low-income individuals and families across Nevada. The Governor's Office of Economic Development, Department of Business and Industry, and the Department of Health and Human Services collaborate with various entities to continually improve coordination.

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

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

Actions taken in PY 2014 to enhance coordination and promote further development of that institutional structure included:

- Continued to support cross-jurisdiction economic development regions;
- CDBG provided funding for the Rural Continuum of Care (RNCOC). The continued financial support by the State CDBG office to the RNCOC Steering Committee supported funding to pay for consulting services that facilitated the grant process throughout PY 2014. Efforts by the Steering Committee, with help from the facilitator sponsored by Storey County CDBG staff, resulted in an estimated \$700,000 in HUD Continuum of Care Supportive Housing dollars for individuals who are homeless and chronically homeless in rural Nevada ;
- Provided annual training workshops and on-going technical assistance to CDBG grantees;
- Supported planning collaboration efforts, such as Strengthening Economies Together (SET), in CDBG non-entitlement areas;
- Participated in quarterly meetings with other funders to maximize limited resources (CDBG, USDA, EPA, other collaborative funders);
- HOME continued to work with the staff of the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program to ensure that the HOME funds were used to leverage this program;
- The ESG Program Manager continued participation in the Rural Nevada Continuum of Care (RNCOC) Steering Committee and is the Homeless Management Information System Steering Committee chairperson. The ESG Program Manager also developed Performance Standards and Written Standards for use by both the ESG and Continuum of Care programs;
- Continued funding of State HOME and State Low-income Housing Trust Funds to Consortiums and local jurisdictions to supplement HOME and ESG entitlement funding;

- Ongoing meetings between members of the Rural Nevada Continuum of Care, the Reno Area Alliance for the Homeless, and the Southern Nevada Continuum of Care to address unmet needs and issues of the homeless throughout Nevada;
- Meetings with HOME Consortiums and local jurisdictions, local housing authorities and other service providers occurred to address affordable housing issues;
- Funding was provided by the Division to non-profit housing providers and local jurisdictions to subsidize weatherization funding throughout Nevada;
- Continued funding of State Low-Income Housing Trust Funds to Nevada Rural Housing Authority for TBRA program for senior clients on the Section 8 waitlist, as well as funding for a Security Deposit Program;
- Also provided State Low-Income Housing Trust funds to Nevada Rural Housing Authority as part of the rural coordinated intake and referral system. 146 of the most vulnerable adults and children were provided housing vouchers until they could exit into the Section 8 program;
- The Division continued with the National Foreclosure Mitigation Grants and provided funding to Housing Counseling Agencies in northern, rural and southern Nevada;
- Division staff participated in local homeless point-in-time counts; so-chaired the RNCOC Steering Committee; participated in Rating and Ranking of rural Continuum of Care applications; and attended statewide homeless conference calls;
- The Housing Division provided ESG funding to the Homeless Management Information System lead agency to ensure that the HMIS system oversight, user support, and data quality oversight would continue for the northern and rural Continua since two HUD grants were not funded to support the mandated database.

8.4 Public Housing Initiatives

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

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

- Security Deposit Program- assisted one hundred ninety-eight (198) families using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds received from the Housing Division;
- Provided fifty (50) elderly and disabled households TBRA Vouchers using State Low-Income Housing Trust funds received for the Housing Division;
- Housing Choice Voucher Home Ownership Program – 7 unduplicated families participated in the HCV Home Ownership program;
- Provided 146 homeless persons/104 households with State Trust-funded housing vouchers as part of the rural coordinated intake and assessment system

- Assisted 113 homeless Veterans and their families through the VASH (Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing) Program;
- Weatherization Assistance Program – Completed weatherization of 129 units. Completed 99% pass rate from Nevada Housing Division monitoring.
- HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program served 1,467 low income families through HUD funding and 63 veterans with VASH vouchers; and
- NRHA staff chaired the Continuum of Care Steering Committee and was selected to serve on the Governor’s Interagency Council on Homelessness. Their active participation and willingness to resolve issues helped homeless service providers in rural Nevada to assist homeless clients with access to Housing Choice Vouchers.

8.5 Weatherization

The Low Income Weatherization Program’s mission is to reduce, when possible, the fuel or electricity required for heating and cooling for low-income eligible households. This mission is accomplished through energy conservation and management strategies, as well as general repairs to dwelling units. Most of the applicant households receive other social services in addition to weatherization services. During FY 2013 \$4,565,288.00 in funds was spent to assist eight hundred eight (808) to reduce their energy costs.

8.6 Multi-Family Tax Exempt Bond Production

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

Agate Avenue II Apartments	\$12,500,000
Summerhill	\$11,000,000

8.7 Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Production

Table O provides a summary of the multifamily housing units awarded Low Income Housing Tax Credits 2014.

Table O: Low Income Housing Tax Credit Projects

Project Name	Tax Credits Awarded (\$)	City	County	LI Units	Total Units	Project Type	Population
Highland	612,748	Ely	White Pine	36	36	New Construction	Family Housing
Winterwood II	934,565	Las Vegas	Clark	65	80	New Construction	Senior Housing
Mixed Income	866,657	Las Vegas	Clark	48	48	New Construction	Senior Housing
Westcliff Pines 2	989,863	Las Vegas	Clark	40	40	Acquisition/ Rehabilitation	Senior Housing
Westcliff Pines 3	659,679	Las Vegas	Clark	40	40	New Construction	Senior Housing
Westcliff Heights	558,884	Las Vegas	Clark	58	80	New Construction	Senior Housing
Juniper Village	716,367	Reno	Washoe	44	44	New Construction	Family Housing
Winchester	657,149	Elko	Elko	30	40	New Construction	Family Housing
Bonnie Lane	1,000,000	Las Vegas	Clark	65	65	New Construction	Senior Housing
Parkway Vista	672,178	Gardnerville	Douglas	30	30	New Construction	Senior Housing
TOTAL	7,668,050			456	503		

9. PROGRAM ASSISTANCE BY RACIAL AND ETHNIC BREAKDOWN

The following table provides a summary of the race and ethnicity of Nevada households and persons assisted with housing, homeless and community development activities in PY 2014.

Table P: Race and Ethnicity of Households/Clients Served

	HOME	CDBG*	ESG	HOPWA	Welfare Set-Aside	Trust Funds**
White	42	4607	2,227	81	370	410
African Amer./Black	1	73	493	14	199	26
Asian	0	135	42	0	2	2
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	213	115	0	23	16
American Indian/Alaska Native & White	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0	28	30	1	7	0
Asian & White	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black/African American & White	0	3	0	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native & Black/African American	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Multi-Racial	0	349	87	0	42	24
Refused	0	0	171	0	0	0
Unknown	0		8		0	0
TOTAL	44	5408	3,173	96	643	478
Hispanic Ethnicity	8	578	377	24	64	51

* The CDBG figures are based on information from the original grant applications and/or IDIS data for projects funded for 2013 with National Objectives of LMC and LMH only.

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

10. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Citizen participation is a vital component of the Nevada formula grant programs. The State encouraged citizens, including low to moderate income and those with disabilities to comment on the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report for Federal Year 2014. The draft report was sent out to 26 eligible rural entities and other stakeholders in the state for publication and comment on August 30, 2015. The public was advised, through Public Notices in three newspapers (Elko Daily Free Press, Pahrump Valley Times, and Reno Gazette Journal), that the draft report would be available at rural city and county offices throughout the state. Copies of the Public Notices are attached. The Public Comment Period ran from September 2nd through September 16th, 2015.

11. ATTACHMENTS

- (A) Acronyms
- (B) ESG Supplement
- (C) HUD Form 40107, 40107-A and Contract Activity Report
- (D) Public Notice Advertisements and Affidavits
- (E) e-Con CAPER Download
- (F) Tabular Summaries of HOPWA

DRAFT

DRAFT

ATTACHMENTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT A

ACRONYMS

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

ATTACHMENT B. ESG Performance Standards Outcomes

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

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

Results #7	29% of Rapid Re-Housing households were households with at least one adult with children
Objective #8	Prevent homelessness for families and unaccompanied youth (HP Only)
Outcome #8	At least 25% of <i>homeless prevention</i> program participants served will included families and/or unaccompanied youth
Results #8	88% of Homeless Prevention households were families.
Objective #9	Projects will serve “harder-to-serve” homeless populations
Outcome #9	At least 10% of persons served by program at entry into shelter or other program provided with ESG funds will have at least one of the following issues: mental illness, alcohol abuse, drug abuse, chronic health condition, HIV, developmental disabilities, physical disabilities, or are chronically homeless
Results #9	33% of homeless persons served were “harder-to-serve” populations
Objective #10	Increase the number of veteran’s provided referral to permanent housing
Outcome #10	25% of homeless veterans served will be provided referral to permanent housing
Results #10	59% of homeless veterans served accessed permanent housing
STATE ESG PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Northern CoC)	
Objective #1	Reduce the average length of stay in emergency shelter
Outcome #1	The average length of stay in the shelter is less than 75 days
Results #1	Average length of stay in shelters was 51 days
Objective #2	Increased discharge to permanent housing from emergency shelters
Outcome #2	At least 25% of homeless clients placed in permanent housing upon discharge from shelters
Results #2	Average for three shelters-36.67% of persons exited to a permanent destination
Objective #3	Increase income for rapid re-housing clients
Outcome #3	25% of clients will have increased income at exit from RRH programs
Results #3	Of the 27 adults who exited, 17 exited with income = 63%
Objective #4	Increased housing retention for rapid re-housing clients
Outcome #4	75% of clients placed in permanent housing will remain in that housing after 7 months
Results #4	100% of clients placed in PH remained after 7 months and did not become homeless again
Objective #5	Increased discharge to non-ESG assisted housing
Outcome #5	75% of clients receiving rapid re-housing assistance will transition to non-ESG funded permanent housing
Results #5	24 of 30 persons who exited went to PH = 80%



Prepared by the Governor's Office of Economic Development
808 West Nye Lane, Carson City, NV 89703
Office & TDD Telephone (775) 687-9900

Partner Agencies:

State of Nevada's Housing Division
State of Nevada's Health Division

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

The *FY 2014 State of Nevada Consolidated Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)* represents a collaborative effort between the Governor's Office of Economic Development: Community Development Block Grant Program, the Department of Business and Industry: Nevada Housing Division, and the Department of Health and Human Services: Health Division. This document outlines the State's affordable housing and community development resources, funding objectives, and actions by the State to meet those objectives during the past fiscal year.

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