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CAPER Overview

Oregon Housing and Community Services Department (OHCS) is the lead agency responsible for facilitating the development and implementation of Oregon’s Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan and CAPER.

The 2016 Consolidated Annual Performance Report (CAPER) is the first reporting document for Oregon’s 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan period. The report describes and evaluates how the State of Oregon invested formula funds received from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to meet Oregon’s affordable housing and community development needs from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016.

The 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan is available at the following link: http://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/pages/consolidated-plan-five-year-plan.aspx

The information included in this report has been prepared and provided by the following three agencies for the programs each agency administers.

Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS)
- Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
- HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)

Oregon Business Development Department (OBDD)
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Oregon Health Authority (OHA)
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
Goals and Outcomes (CR-05)

The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) is submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to provide a summary of the program year’s performance for the four formula grants, Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), against the objectives set out in the strategic plan section of the 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan, and the 2016 Action Plan. The primary HUD goals for the use of these program funds is to provide decent housing, create suitable living environments and expand economic opportunities.

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan.

Highlighted below are some of the major initiatives that were executed in 2016 in an effort to meet HUD’s goals for the four programs, provide decent housing, suitable living environments, and expand economic opportunities, and as part of Oregon’s effort to carry out its 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan Strategic Plan, and 2016 Annual Action Plan:

- OHCS launched the Local Innovation and Fast Track (LIFT) Housing Program. The LIFT Housing Program’s objective is to build new affordable housing for low income households, especially families,
- On June 30, 2016, Oregon released a new source of funding; the Mental Health Housing Fund,
- In March of 2016, Oregon awarded $9.35 million to a network of nonprofit organizations, which comprise the Oregon Individual Development Account (IDA) Initiative, in communities across Oregon,
- OHCS approved funding for construction and preservation of 2,410 housing units
- Three hundred and thirty two homeownership opportunities were created through the Oregon Bond Loan,
- Over 16,000 Households that were homeless, or at-risk of homelessness, were served through Housing Stabilization programs,
- Nearly 82,000 households were provided with energy assistance, and
- Almost 12,000 households received foreclosure prevention assistance through the Oregon Homeownership Stabilization Initiative (OHSI)
- In 2016, the Oregon CDBG program was used to fund:
  - Four public works projects;
  - Three community facility projects;
  - Four housing rehabilitation projects and,
  - One microenterprise project

Detailed program goal and outcome can be found in Tables 1a and 1b below.
Table 1a details each program’s goals as outlined in the 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan, and Oregon's performance in meeting each of those goals for program year 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source / Amount</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Expected – Program Year</th>
<th>Actual – Program Year</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Administration</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatively further fair housing</td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Housing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Microenterprise Assistance</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Public Works</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Public/Community Facilities (SL1)</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Public/Community Facilities (SL3)</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG-Community Capacity/Technical Asst (1%)</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHDO Operating Support Grant</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund affordable housing</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Housing Trust Fund</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Rental units constructed</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>170.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent and divert people from becoming homeless</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>241.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness Prevention</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide people with HIV/AIDS supportive housing</td>
<td>Supportive housing for people with HIV</td>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs created/retained</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>136.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce homelessness</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>349.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless Person Overnight Shelter</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>123.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>158.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1a - Accomplishments – Program Year
Table 1b details each program’s goals as outlined in the 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan, and Oregon’s performance in meeting each of the five year goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source / Amount</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Expected – Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Actual – Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Other - Administration</td>
<td>CDBG: $1,705,578</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOME $2,775,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmatively further fair housing</td>
<td>Other - Fair Housing</td>
<td>HOME: $375,000</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Emergency Projects</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $0.00</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Housing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>CDBG: $11,014,400</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Microenterprise Assistance</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $1,159,411</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Public Works</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $29,564,969</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Public/Community Facilities (DH1)</td>
<td>Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td>CDBG: $1,500,000</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Public/Community Facilities (SL1)</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $7,365,874</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG - Public/Community Facilities (SL3)</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $7,365,874</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG-Community Capacity/ Technical Asst (1%)</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG: $602,789</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1b - Accomplishments – Strategic Plan to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHDO Operating Support Grant</th>
<th>Affordable Housing</th>
<th>HOME: $1,575,280</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund affordable housing</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>HOME: $21,413,790</td>
<td>Rental units constructed</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>45.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Trust Fund: $15,000,000</td>
<td>Rental units rehabilitated</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent and divert people from becoming homeless</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>HOME: $5,365,985</td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>48.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESG: $2,260,648</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness Prevention</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide people with HIV/AIDS supportive housing</td>
<td>Supportive housing for people with HIV</td>
<td>HOPWA: $1,937,370</td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs created/retained</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added</td>
<td>Household Housing Unit</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce homelessness</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>ESG: $6,604,637</td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>69.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless Person Overnight Shelter</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>24.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>31.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote: Table 1 – CDBG Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date

- OBDD does not anticipate future disasters but will ensure that CDBG funding is available to address any needs that meet the CDBG program requirements should they arise.
- For CDBG Actual Program Year – The actual number funded is based upon the awards made during the program year. The final actual outcomes/accomplishments from each grant awarded by the state will be collected when the grant activities are complete and the grant contract between the city/county and the state is administratively closed and reported in IDIS as part of the CAPER.
- Each grant recipient is allowed a specified period of time to complete the CDBG funded activities and this time period varies by type of grant. This time period is referred to as the Project Completion Date (PCD). The state allows PCD extensions if the local circumstances warrant the extensions. Each PCD extension is reviewed on a case by case basis. A summary of the standard PCD time periods are:
  - 1 year PCD – Applies to microenterprise assistance grants and housing center grants.
• 2 year PCD – Planning grants, final design only grants, construction only grants, off-site infrastructure grants and housing rehabilitation grants.
• 3 year PCD – Final design and construction activities combined into one grant.
• The state may select activities/priorities for the 2016-2020 CDBG programs from the table above. The proposed outcome and performance measure requirements, performance indicators, and the short and long term goals for each activity will only be triggered if the activity is actually offered by the program.
Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. This section includes an assessment of how the jurisdiction’s use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

This section includes an overview of Oregon’s progress in achieving the goals outlined for each program in the 2016 Annual Action Plan as reflected in Tables 1a and 1b below.

**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)**

In 2016, top priority needs for the CDBG program included public works, community facilities, and housing. Priority needs were based on responses and information received through public outreach and consultation with advocacy groups, non-profit partners, and topical research. Oregon placed an emphasis on a project’s readiness to proceed and the party’s capacity to move forward with a well-developed project. Following is a summary of the CDBG program goals and outcomes for the 2016 program year:

- Housing Rehabilitation: Six projects, four funded
- Microenterprise Assistance: Three projects, one funded
- Public Works: Two projects, four funded (exceeded goal)
- Public/Community Facilities (SL1): One project, two funded (exceeded goal)
- Public/Community Facilities (SL3): One project, one funded Community Capacity/Technical Assistance: Three projects, three funded

Oregon altered the funding targets outlined in the 2016 CDBG MOD for the following reasons:

- Projects are funded based on the types and quantity of applications received and the availability of funds in accordance with the priorities determined and allocated during the 2016 open and competitive application rounds.
- Nineteen CDBG project applications were received; totaling $22,240,154. The limited CDBG resources allowed twelve out of nineteen projects was funded.
- The number of applications received supported the program priorities, specifically public works, for communities throughout Oregon.

**HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)**

HOME 2016 funding priorities were designed to specifically address objectives of increasing and preserving the states affordable housing resources, and providing rental assistance directly to the communities. HOME funds were used to provide rent assistance, develop multifamily
housing, and to support Community Housing Development Organizations in meeting the goals and objectives established. In 2016, Oregon exceeded the goals for the HOME program in all categories.

- **HOME Multifamily Rental**

  A total of 197 Multifamily Rental Units were completed during 2016. Annual goals were exceeded.

  Fund Affordable Housing – Rental Units Constructed
  Proposed for 2016: 60 units
  Actual for 2016: 136 units

  Fund Affordable Housing – Rental Units Rehabilitated
  Proposed for 2016: 40 units
  Actual for 2016: 61 units

- **HOME Tenant Based Rental Assistance (HOME TBRA)**

  The 2016 funding priorities for HOME Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) were to provide rental assistance to stabilize housing for very low income households at risk of becoming homeless. The amount of HOME TBRA allocated to subgrantee was based on four criteria: the percentage of households in a subgrantee’s service area with housing burden, severe housing burden, income below federal poverty level, and income at or below 50 percent median household income.

  Prevent and divert people from becoming homeless:
  Proposed for 2016: 400 households
  Actual for 2016: 966 households

  The projected number of households served was reduced to 400 to account for a drop in HOME funding from HUD. To compensate for the smaller allocations, many OHCS subgrantees used HOME TBRA funds to pay shorter term costs such as security and utility deposits and budget less funds for longer-term rental assistance. This allowed subgrantees to serve more households than anticipated.

**Housing Trust Fund (HTF)**

Oregon did not receive a Housing Trust Fund allocation until January of 2017. HTF, a new federal affordable housing production program, will be leveraged with other federal and state funding and made available through OHCS’ annual LIHTC and HOME NOFA in January 2018 as an additional source of funding for multifamily rental housing projects to serve extremely low income (ELI) households.

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**

OHA helps people living with HIV/AIDS create a continuum of stable, sustainable housing through the Oregon Housing Opportunities in Partnership (OHOP) program. The OHOP program met the objectives identified in the 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan by assisting households in establishing and maintaining a stable living environment, reducing the risks of homelessness, and improving access to HIV treatment...
and other health care and support. The OHOP Program used HOPWA formula funding to provide Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA), permanent housing placement in the form of deposits, supportive services through housing case management, and housing information to individuals on the program waitlist.

One of the primary goals of the OHOP program is to increase client engagement in, and access to care and support for people with HIV/AIDS. In 2016, clients served with HOPWA housing assistance under the OHOP Formula Grant continued to achieve very high levels of housing stability and reduced risks of homelessness. All outcomes were assessed directly from client-level service utilization data obtained through collaboration with the Part B Ryan White Program HIV/AIDS surveillance system, and Low Income Housing Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) program database. In 2016, the OHOP program provided assistance to 168 unduplicated households through the HOPWA Formula Grant. Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) served 75 households, 106 households received supportive services, deposit assistance was provided under Permanent Housing Placement Services for 50 households, and 62 waitlisted households received housing information.

The HOPWA program goal for 2016 was to provide:

- Fifty five clients with tenant based rental assistance.

The OHOP Formula Grant exceeded the 2016 goal, providing TBRA to 75 households. Outcomes from those services included:

Seventy seven percent of households served with TBRA continued in the program or left the program to stable permanent housing situations, including self-sufficiency in private housing or other housing subsidy programs (primarily Section 8).
- One hundred percent of households had a housing plan for maintaining or establishing stable on-going residency.
- One hundred percent of clients had verified recent contact with a Ryan White case manager for ongoing supportive services.
- Ninety six percent of clients saw a health care provider for HIV/AIDS care.
- One hundred percent of clients had access to medical insurance or health assistance.
- Seventy two percent of clients successfully accessed or maintained qualification for sources of income.

Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)

The 2016 funding priorities for ESG funds were to prevent and divert people from becoming homeless; addressing the priority need for rent assistance and related costs necessary for people at-risk of homelessness to secure, and retain, permanent housing. ESG funds used to reduce homelessness, addressed three priority needs: rapid rehousing with supportive services, rent assistance and shelter beds, and homeless services. In 2016, Oregon exceeded the goals for the ESG program in all categories. Prevent and divert people from becoming homeless:
• Proposed for 2016: 1,700 persons  
• Actual for 2016: 1,746 persons  
The actual number served was three percent higher than projected.

Reduce homelessness through rapid rehousing:  
• Proposed for 2016: 400 persons  
• Actual for 2016: 1,398 persons  
Vacancy rates and high rents negatively affected the success of extremely low-income households in obtaining permanent housing. With these barriers in mind, OHCS estimated a low rate of re-housing. To address the poor availability of rental housing, many subgrantees dedicated staff to networking with landlords and helping clients with housing searches. These efforts resulted in a larger number of participants obtaining housing than projected.

Reduce homelessness through shelter:  
• Proposed for 2016: 6,200 persons  
• Actual for 2016: 7,653 persons  
Due to extreme weather conditions, and other unexpected situations, shelter use, including hotel/motel vouchers and transitional shelter, were maximized to assist the homeless population in both the urban and rural counties in the state, resulting in shelter use that was 23 percent higher than anticipated in 2016.

Reduce homelessness through street outreach:  
• Proposed for 2016: 760 persons  
• Actual for 2016: 1,201 persons  
Data shows the number of persons contacted through street outreach was 441 more than proposed for 2016. This was due to a number of circumstances; including increased opportunities for contact and more comprehensive Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) reporting.
Racial and Ethnic Composition of Families Assisted (CR-10)

The table below details the number of families and beneficiaries, by race and ethnicity, assisted using HUD-Funded programs during calendar year 2016. For 2016, all programs combined served approximately 1.7 percent of Oregon’s estimated below poverty level population, and .26 percent of Oregon’s total population. Oregon endeavors to serve a larger percentage of this population in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>ESG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or American Native</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The following additional data is collected for these programs, and populations:

HOME:
American Indian/ Alaskan Native and White: 8
Asian and White: 2
Black/African American and White: 1
Other Multi-Racial: 10

ESG:
Multiple Races: 500
Don’t know/refused: 236
Information missing: 69

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
The ethnicity/race data reflected above for the CDBG program, outlines the projected families and beneficiary ethnicity breakdown identified in the application received. Actual numbers will be reported upon project completion and closeout.

HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
The HOME, and HOME TBRA, OHCS’ Multifamily rental program, collect race and ethnicity data from the project owners. This data is based on self-reporting from tenants who occupy HOME assisted units. OHCS staff enters the information into the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) at project close-out.
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
Oregon Housing Opportunities in Partnership (OHOP) collects race and ethnicity data from participants. This data is based on self-reporting. The numbers in Table 2 above are somewhat reflective of the prevalence of HIV among race and ethnicity. The Oregon Health Authority estimates that 6,969 people with diagnosed HIV infection were living in Oregon at the end of 2015. Of the 6,969 Oregon residents living with HIV, 88 percent were male and 75 percent were White.

Recent demographic trends show that new HIV diagnosis rates are nearly five times higher among Black and African Americans than White and 1.8 times higher for Hispanic than for White non-Hispanics.

The Oregon HIV/Viral Hepatitis/Sexually Transmitted Infections Integrated Planning Group (IPG) is an advisory group to the HIV/STD/TB Section of the Oregon Health Authority. One of IPG’s objective is to eliminate disparities in new HIV diagnosis rates and focus on HIV testing and linkage to care among Latinos.

Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)
OHCS invested substantial staff time to improve current HMIS data collection, and will continue to do so in 2017. One anticipated use of the data is to have dialog with subgrantees about race and ethnicity of persons served compared with the racial composition of eligible persons in their service areas, resulting in OHCS having a better understanding when and why a subgrantee’s service provision might be uneven and offering resources and tools subgrantees can use to address imbalances.

The Parks at Eastlake and Aspen Villas, Bend, Oregon
Workforce Housing/40 units
Funding: HOME and LIHTC
Year Completed: 2016
Resources and Investments (CR-15)

Resources made available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Resources Made Available</th>
<th>Amount Expended During Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Public - Federal</td>
<td>12,055,779</td>
<td>11,712,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Public - Federal</td>
<td>6,301,123</td>
<td>7,848,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>Public - Federal</td>
<td>1,773,057</td>
<td>436,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>Public - Federal</td>
<td>387,474</td>
<td>1,617,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Housing Trust Fund</td>
<td>Public - Federal</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Resources Made Available

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
The amount above includes 2016 grant allocation and recaptured grant repayment less one percent, and state administration funds allowed by the CDBG program.

Geographic distribution and location of investments
Oregon does not define geographic priorities when allocating funds identified in this plan. In lieu of Table 4, Geographic Distribution and Location of Investments, the information, and tables, below identify where program projects were located.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
2016 CDBG Awards were made as follows:
- Microenterprise Assistance – City of Independence
- Public Works – City of Idanha, City of La Pine, City of Seneca, City of Mt. Vernon,
- Public/Community Facilities – Josephine County, City of Roseburg, Coos County
- Housing Rehabilitation – City of Newberg, City of Veneta, City of Lebanon, City of Pendleton

HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
Geographic priorities for the HOME Program are not designated by OHCS. The following is a list of HOME assisted Multifamily Rental Projects completed in 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birchwood</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grande Plaza</td>
<td>La Grande</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parks at Eastlake and Aspen Villas</td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>Deschutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IronHorse Lodge</td>
<td>Prineville</td>
<td>Crook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Heights</td>
<td>The Dalles</td>
<td>Wasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alona Place</td>
<td>Junction City</td>
<td>Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz Avenue Apartments</td>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Deschutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOME Table 4a
HOME assisted Multifamily Rental Projects that received funding reservations in 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silvertowne</td>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Glen 2</td>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowbrook II</td>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOHA Preservation Project</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>Clatsop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky Meadows</td>
<td>Klamath Falls</td>
<td>Klamath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochoco School Apartments</td>
<td>Prineville</td>
<td>Crook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOME Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO) Operating Grants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHDO</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmworker Housing Development Corporation</td>
<td>Marion, Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Team</td>
<td>Clatsop, Columbia, Tillamook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk Community Action Corporation</td>
<td>Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent dePaul</td>
<td>Lane, Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborworks Umpqua</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction was used to address the needs identified in the plan.

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**

The delivery of HOPWA services is based on prioritization of need, not geographic location. The allocation of expenditures can vary from year to year. The 2016 expenditures, based on the four regions of service delivery, are found in table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Actual Percent of TBRA Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Northwest (Clatsop, Lincoln, Marion, Polk, Tillamook Counties)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Central (Lane County)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Southern (Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, Lake Counties)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Eastern (Baker, Benton, Crook, Deschutes, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Hood River, Jefferson, Linn, Malheur, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wasco, Wheeler Counties)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOPWA Table 4d
Leveraging

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

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)

During 2016, the CDBG program leveraged $4,486,626 in matching funds from federal, state and local sources. The State CDBG program does not have a matching funds requirement.

HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Multifamily Rental Housing Development

2016 OHCS HOME Commitments (funded projects):

- Five multifamily rental projects received HOME commitments and are currently under way
- HOME funding committed: $6,331,963
- Non-HOME funding awarded: $29,713,630
- Total project cost for all five projects, including all funding sources: $36,045,593
- HOME leverage was $5.69 on the dollar for five HOME funded projects

2016 OHCS NOFA Total Reservations:

- Thirteen multifamily projects received OHCS NOFA Reservations
- Total OHCS resources (includes LIHTC Annual Allocation): $12,104,246
- Oregon Affordable Housing Tax Credit program: $6,600,000
- Total Project cost for all thirteen projects, including all funding sources (public and private): $131,994,810

2016 OHCS NOFA Reservations to HOME Projects (not yet funded):

- Six multifamily projects received HOME reservations
• HOME Funding Reservations: $5,520,772
• Non-HOME funding reservations for HOME Projects: $4,223,009
• Total proposed project costs for all six projects including all funding sources (private and public): $40,168,781
• HOME Leverage is potentially $7.28 on the dollar for the six HOME projects

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
While the primary housing need for persons living with HIV/AIDS in Oregon’s balance of state continues to be long-term rental assistance, the OHOP formula program assures appropriate supportive services through the leveraged Ryan White Program and through funds provided by Oregon Housing and Community Services’ Energy Assistance Program. In 2016, the Ryan White program contributed the majority of leveraging with a total of $296,786.13. Clients receiving OHOP formula funded TBRA in 2016 also received:

• Health insurance premium payments, drug and health care provider visit co-pay assistance through the state’s AIDS Drug Assistance Program (valued at $65,531.59).
• Coordinated services through Ryan White case management providers (valued at $177,616.54).
• Ryan White support services include, emergency housing, transportation, food assistance, and emergency medical assistance (valued at $37,803).
• Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) payments through Oregon Housing, and Community Services (valued at $15,835).

HOPWA does not have match requirements, does not generate any program income, and will not use land or property that is publicly owned.

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Subgrantees of ESG funds are expected to provide 100 percent match consisting of documented resources in the following match source categories:

• Other federal funds
• State government
• Local government
• Private funds

Agencies who have difficulty providing 100 percent match may request OHCS waive some, or all, of the match requirement.

The total ESG match reported in 2016 was $2,229,453.46.
### Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No. or Other ID</th>
<th>Date of Contribution</th>
<th>Cash (non-Federal sources)</th>
<th>Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges</th>
<th>Appraised Land/Real Property</th>
<th>Required Infrastructure</th>
<th>Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor</th>
<th>Bond Financing</th>
<th>Total Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17140</td>
<td>09/16/2016</td>
<td>7,807</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17194</td>
<td>01/21/2016</td>
<td>17,615</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17195</td>
<td>01/27/2016</td>
<td>29,148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17274a</td>
<td>03/18/2016</td>
<td>409,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>409,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17274b</td>
<td>03/07/2016</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17280</td>
<td>08/17/2015</td>
<td>575,145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>575,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17311</td>
<td>09/14/2016</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17318</td>
<td>10/04/2016</td>
<td>637,479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>637,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBRA</td>
<td>12/31/2016</td>
<td>300,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

### HOME Program Income

**Program Income** – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period $</th>
<th>Amount received during reporting period $</th>
<th>Total amount expended during reporting period $</th>
<th>Amount expended for TBRA $</th>
<th>Balance on hand at end of reporting period $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,138.00</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$11,138.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 – Program Income

### Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises

- **Minority Business Enterprises** – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Minority Business Enterprises</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaskan Native or American Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contracts**

- Dollar Amount
  - $21,981,795
  - $67,575
  - $21,914,220
- Number
  - 6
  - 1
  - 5

**Sub-Contracts**

- Number
  - 189
  - 0
  - 2
  - 0
  - 8
  - 179
- Dollar Amount
  - $16,938,333
  - $273,390
  - $471,048
  - $16,193,855

**Total**

- Women Business Enterprises
- Male

- Dollar Amount
  - $21,981,795
  - $67,575
  - $21,914,220
- Number
  - 6
  - 1
  - 5

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Contracts</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>183</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>173</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>$16,938,293</td>
<td>$2,033,504</td>
<td>$14,904,789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Owners of Rental Property</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Minority Property Owners</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alaskan Native or American Indian</td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocation and Real Property Acquisition</th>
<th>Parcels Acquired</th>
<th>Businesses Displaced</th>
<th>Nonprofit Organizations Displaced</th>
<th>Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,867,567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$63,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Displaced*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Minority Property Enterprises</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alaskan Native or American Indian</td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No permanent displacement

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition
Affordable Housing (CR-20)

This section includes an evaluation of Oregon’s progress in meeting its specific goals of providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units</th>
<th>One-Year Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>995</strong></td>
<td><strong>2636</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 – Number of Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of households supported through Rental Assistance</th>
<th>One-Year Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of households supported through The Production of New Units</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units</td>
<td>N/A¹</td>
<td>N/A¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>995</strong></td>
<td><strong>2636</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

The difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals is discussed in this section.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)

The goal of the CDBG program, as it relates to affordable housing, is to provide decent housing and suitable living environments to low and moderate income people. The CDBG program’s 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan goal is to fund 30 housing rehabilitation projects by December 31, 2020. In 2016 the State accepted, and funded, four Housing Rehabilitations projects which will assist and rehab approximately 112 households.

HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
The HOME program does not set specific goals for units provided for homeless, non-homeless, and special-needs populations, and therefore does not collect this data. While multifamily rental projects house homeless, non-homeless, and special-needs tenants, these tenant categories are not named as priorities for funding in the NOFA.

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**
The HOPWA program helps people with HIV/AIDS create a continuum of stable, sustainable housing. The OHOP program met the one year goal by assisting households in establishing and maintaining a stable living environment; reducing the risks of homelessness, and improving access to HIV treatment and other health care and support. The program goal set for 2016 was to assist 55 households through tenant based rental assistance. In 2016, OHOP assisted 75 households; exceeding the program goal by 36 percent.

**Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.**

**Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)**
For 2016, the CDBG program achieved approximately 80 percent of the annual target. For 2017, the state will enhance its activities related to housing by seeking opportunities to collaborate with other affordable housing organizations, including OHCS.

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**
Although the program exceeded the goal of serving 55 households with tenant based rental assistance; the funding allocation was too little to meet the identified needs as evidenced by the stagnant wait list. OHOP will continue to collaborate with other service providers throughout the OHOP service area.

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

**Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)**
Due to the type and nature of applications received and projects funded, the state CDBG program does not track the extremely low and very low income persons served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons Served</th>
<th>CDBG Actual</th>
<th>HOME TBRA Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low-income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13 – Number of Persons Served*
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS serves people earning at or below 80 percent of MFI. The majority of participants are earning zero to 30 percent of MFI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Area Median Income</th>
<th>Households Served with HOPWA Housing Subsidy Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0-30% of area median income (extremely low)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 31-50% of area median income (very low)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 51-80% of area median income (low)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOPWA Households Served Table

Alona Place, Junction City, Oregon
Workforce Housing/40 units
Funding: HOME and LIHTC
Year Completed: 2016
Homeless and Other Special Needs (CR-25)

In this section, Oregon evaluates its progress in meeting specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:

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

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**
In addition to HOPWA funding, OHA receives HUD funding through another grant; Continuum of Care dollars through the Rural Oregon Continuum of Care (ROCC). Funding through the ROCC provides permanent supportive housing to households who meet HUD’s definition of homelessness. In addition, Ryan White funding may be used to provide emergency housing for case management clients in the form of hotel and motel vouchers. OHOP works in close coordination with homeless service providers through participation on the ROCC and other planning bodies.

**Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)**
Ten percent of OHCS subgrantee activity funded with ESG was direct outreach to unsheltered persons. OHCS convened a meeting of the state’s Continuums of Care with discussion focusing on aligning our homeless efforts into a single statewide system. OHCS will continue to work with the Continuums to make progress in this area. This coordination of effort and shared data will increase subrecipients’ ability to identify and engage homeless persons, provide them with assessment through HMIS systems and facilitate a quicker, more efficient process to end their homelessness.

**Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons**

**Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)**
Sixty-five percent of the total persons assisted with ESG-funded activities were provided essential services while in shelter, or assessed and placed in either shelter or transitional shelter. A total of 235,038 shelter bed-nights were provided. Additionally, through coordinated entry programs, subrecipients were able to determine services that would best meet the person’s needs, and expand the types and volume of resources available to their clientele by referring them to local partner agencies for services not available to the ESG subrecipient.
Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)
Fifteen percent of persons served through the ESG program received homeless prevention services to facilitate households’ abilities to retain their housing, including, but not exclusive to: rent subsidy, case management, completion of housing stability plans, and landlord mediation services. OHCS is working with Continuums of Care and other state agencies to better align our efforts and our data to identify the best ways to determine the service needs of populations not easily tracked, such as youth and the formerly institutionalized, in addition to other vulnerable populations. The ability to access shared data will help Oregon agencies identify and address systemic barriers experienced by our poorest, or potentially displaced, populations and assist us in work together with our partners to provide effective services.

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

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
Funding homeless shelters and shelters for victims of domestic violence are priorities of the CDBG program. Two CDBG projects awarded in FY2016, or assisted with FY2016 funds, for person with special needs under Community Facilities included a Senior Center/Food bank in Josephine County and a Head Start in Roseburg. OBDD continues to collaborate with the Governor’s Regional Solution Teams to provide technical assistance to address homelessness at the project development level.

Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)
Twelve percent of persons assisted with ESG-funded activities were rapidly re-housed or received other housing assistance. Subrecipients offered case management, help locating available rental units, payment of housing-related costs, and other services to ESG clients as an integral step in securing housing and stabilizing households. Lack of affordable housing is a barrier to rehousing in Oregon. Landlords are more inclined to rent to households who have steady income and less financial, health,
and employment barriers that are typical of the highest need homeless populations. OHCS developed and submitted to HUD a request that would allow the fair market rent (FMR) to be waived in the counties in which the local housing authority currently uses a rent cap above the HUD FMR. This situation currently occurs in 32 of Oregon’s 35 counties, involving 18 of 21 Public Housing Authorities. The waiver would provide homeless and at-risk persons who have access to ESG-funded rent assistance the same opportunity to secure safe and affordable housing as they would have using a Public Housing Authority Housing Choice Voucher. OHCS’s waiver request was submitted to HUD in December 2016.
Public Housing (CR 30)

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing:

Oregon, through OHCS, contributed financial or community resources to the following Public Housing projects:

**Daggett Townhomes and Moonlight Townhomes:** OHCS provided 4% LIHTCs, tax-exempt conduit bond loans, OAHTCs Daggett Townhomes provides 24 units for families at or below 60 percent AMI in Bend, Oregon and the Project Sponsor is Housing Works (the Central Oregon Housing Authority). Moonlight Townhomes provides 29 units for families at or below 60 percent AMI in Bend, Oregon and the Project Sponsor is Housing Works.

**The NOHA Preservation Project:** This project preserved 52 units of affordable housing on the northwestern Oregon coast, in three different sites in Warrenton. These projects are currently owned by Clatsop County Housing Authority, but will be acquired by the Northwest Oregon Housing Authority.

**Newbridge Place:** This is a new construction project being built by the Housing Authority of Jackson County in Medford, OR. There will be a total of 64 units in this property, 63 of which will go to households at or below 50 percent of AMI. The Housing Authority is putting 12 project-based vouchers into this project and there will be 12 units of permanent supportive housing for vets with the use of VASH vouchers.

**Ochoco School Apartments:** This project will provide 29 units of affordable housing to households at or below 50 percent of AMI in Prineville, OR. Housing Works, the Central Oregon Housing Authority is the sponsor and will provide seven project based vouchers at this property.

**Richardson Bridge Apartments:** The project will preserve 32 units of affordable housing in Eugene, OR. The Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County (HACSA) has a large inventory of scattered-site, single-family homes purchased for public housing during the recession in the early 1980s, a time when it was less expensive to purchase these homes than build new multi-family housing. These structures now have significant capital needs, and HUD and HACSA agree that it is inefficient, both in terms of repair and ongoing management costs, to continue their inclusion in HACSA's public housing program. As a result, HUD and HACSA have entered into a RAD Agreement which will provide long-term housing assistance payments for replacing 112 single-family, scattered site public housing units. The success of this RAD agreement with HUD is contingent on an initial 12 units being placed and funded through this Richardson Bridge rehabilitation; the long term impact of this project will be both in the successful preservation of the Richardson Bridge housing resources but also in the ability to move forward with the RAD agreement and long term affordable housing subsidy for the community.
Sky Meadows: This is a new construction project that will create 37 units affordable to households at 40-60 percent AMI in Klamath Falls, OR. The Klamath Housing Authority is one of the sponsors and will provide eight project based vouchers.

In addition, OHCS engaged Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) in local discussions about housing needs and opportunities through:

- Health and Housing Forums
- Regional Solutions Housing Meetings
- The Statewide Association of Public Housing Authorities’ meetings,
- The Housing Choice Advisory Committee which oversees the implementation of Oregon’s source of income protection law and the Landlord Guarantee Fund

**Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership**

**Oregon Individual Development Account:**
The Oregon Individual Development Account Initiative was created in 1999 by the Oregon State Legislature to bring together state agencies, private non-profit, and tribal partners, and private contributors, to create opportunity in Oregon. Today, the Initiative is composed of the State of Oregon, under the leadership of Oregon Housing and Community Services Department and the Oregon Department of Revenue, and a host of private partners and contributors working together to help Oregonians achieve their dreams. The Initiative is managed by a statewide 501(c)3 organization, Neighborhood Partnerships.

Participants are Oregonians with low incomes. They enroll through one of many non-profit organizations located in all corners of the state, set a goal and begin saving. Once the participant’s goal is reached and all parts of the savings plan are completed, every dollar saved by a participant is matched by the Initiative, typically three dollars for every one dollar saved. Private contributors provide the matching funds through a state tax credit. Initiative participants may benefit from matched funds to help them purchase a home, fulfill an educational goal, develop and launch a small business, restore a home to habitable condition, or purchase equipment to support employment.

Oregon residents twelve years of age and older who have low incomes and modest net worth may be eligible for the program. Residents work with a participating non-profit organization to define and reach their goals.

In March of 2016, Oregon awarded $9.35 million to a network of nonprofit organizations, which comprise the Oregon Individual Development Account (IDA) Initiative, in communities across Oregon.
A total of 1,043 participants graduated from the IDA program in 2016. Thirty six percent of those graduates used the IDA program to reach a higher education goal, with 28 percent saving toward a home purchase. The table below details the 2016 accomplishments of the IDA program.

### Asset Class for Graduates of the IDA Program in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of total Graduates by Asset Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-Start or expand</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Renovation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase technology or equipment to secure or retain employment</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles – Purchase and repairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Savings Account</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1043</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Homeownership Centers

Oregon has 18 homeownership centers located throughout the state. The Homeownership Centers are funded through the Homeownership Ownership Assistance Program which receives funding from a state document recording fee. The centers increase successful homeownership, access to affordable housing, and housing related services for very low to moderate-income families. Services include assistance with pre-purchase homebuyer education, financial coaching and pre-purchase homebuyer counseling and financial literacy education, foreclosure counseling, IDA access, and down payment assistance.

In 2016, Homeownership Centers helped Oregon families purchase 705 homes.

January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016

- Completed Home Buyer Education Course: 1618
- One on One Pre-purchase Counseling: 2703
- Number of homes purchased: 705
- Total purchase price of homes purchase: $115,166,900
- Average purchase price: $163,357
- Opened IDA: 251
- Ethnicity: 1,576 Hispanic, 6928 Non-Hispanic
**Down Payment Assistance Program:**
The Down Payment Assistance Program is administered by participating organizations for low and very low-income families and individuals, with a particular focus on low-income, first-time homebuyers. The programs are funded through the state's document recording fee and give qualified buyers who have completed a homebuyer education program up to $15,000 for down payment or closing costs. To be eligible, participants must complete a homebuyer education class, and have an income that does not exceed 80 percent of area median income.

January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016

- Total clients receiving funds: 103
- Amount funded to clients: $815,600
- Average Purchase DPA Amount: $7,918
- Average Purchase Price: $182,928
- Income Levels: ≤50% AMI – 13 clients, 51% to 79% AMI – 90 clients
- Ethnicity: 37 Hispanic, 76 Non-Hispanic, 5 Unknown (this includes co-borrowers)

**Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs**
There were no public housing authorities (PHAs) located in Oregon designated as troubled by HUD in 2016. However, if a PHA had received a designation as troubled, the PHA would have worked directly with HUD to resolve the issues.
Other Actions (CR-35)

This section captures actions taken to remove or reduce the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment.

Market forces put acute pressure on the number of affordable units available for low income families and individuals. In addition, many local policies, such as land use decisions, and fees and growth restrictions, further limit where and how many affordable units can be built. Limitations on how federal money may be used, and state legislative decisions, create barriers to building affordable housing.

2016 Legislation:
Oregon’s 2016 legislative session showed significant support for the work being done to address Oregon’s housing crisis with the following bills:

- **SB 1582** provided guidance for the Local Innovation and Fast Track (LIFT) Housing Program, a new funding program established in the 2015 legislative session.

- A package of four housing bills was signed by the governor: ([HB 4143](#)) provides limited protections for tenants; ([SB 1533](#)) lifted the ban on inclusionary zoning in certain circumstances; ([HB 4079](#)) authorizes a pilot program to consider expanding the urban growth boundary to allow for development of affordable housing; and lastly, ([SB 1573](#)) made changes to the voter approved annexation process.

Additional resources were committed to support OHCS’ work:

- $8 million to the Emergency Housing Account and $2 million to the State Homeless Assistance Program for immediate assistance to help those experiencing or at risk of homelessness throughout the state ([SB 5701](#));

- $2.7 million to the Oregon Foreclosure Avoidance program to provide access to foreclosure counseling and legal assistance. Ten percent of these resources will be “unscheduled” and will need action by Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) and the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) should we need these funds ([SB 5701](#)); and

- $2.5 million in lottery bonds for the preservation of affordable rental housing ([HB 5202](#)).

Other bills passed during the 2016 session that impacted Oregon families included:
• **HB 4019**: This bill made minor changes to the Oregon IDA Initiative. The bill fixed a problem that fiduciary organizations have when they are helping people to save for college. Prior to this bill, the savings and the matching funds had to be kept in separate 529 college savings plans in perpetuity. This bill allowed the matching funds to roll into the same 529 account as the savings upon graduation. HB 4019 went into effect on January 1, 2017.

• **HB 4042**: This bill created a pilot program within the Department of Human Services for people who have a disability and are homeless, and are waiting for their federal disability determination. This pilot program would provide up to 200 people with assistance paying for housing while they wait for their federal disability determination.

• **HB 4081**: This bill extended the sunset on a property tax exemption that benefits nonprofits that provide affordable housing.

• **HB 4110**: This bill increased the amount of Earned Income Tax Credit for families with kids under three. The percentage increased from eight percent of the federal credit to 11 percent of the federal credit.

• **SB 1507**: This bill capped the maximum amount of credit an individual can receive through the Oregon IDA initiative at $500,000.

**Regional Solutions Teams**

OHCS staff attended regular meetings of Regional Solutions Teams across the state. The various teams’ focus included responding to community issues, to advancing opportunities for developing workforce housing, and building relationships with the Department of Land Conservation and Development to ensure jurisdictions are planning for affordable housing. In 2016, the Regional Solutions Team, working in La Pine, adopted a Regional Housing Collaborative group to assist all jurisdictions in Central Oregon. This model may be adopted by cities in other regions.

**Community Partnerships**

**Integrator Program**

The Integrator program has continued to establish strong partnerships with communities in need of more affordable housing. OHCS Integrators participated as partners in the following groups and activities:

• **Accelerator Program (IAP) Team**: The team’s purpose is to enhance and develop, in state level, cross-systems partnerships that result in more housing opportunities for higher needs populations. In 2017, the IAP team intends to work to develop a data sharing agreement that will help to more effectively serve their mutual clients.

• **An OHCS Integrator met with OHA/HOPWA and Mid-Columbia Housing Authority, Linn-Benton Housing Authority, Central Oregon HA and Willamette Neighborhood Housing Services to discuss housing opportunities. This partnership resulted in project set asides and placement of HOPWA program participants in Wasco, Linn, Benton, and Deschutes Counties.**
• The AMPAC, Olmstead, Innovation Accelerator Program, Coordinated Health Partnerships Advisory Council groups convene partners, identify needs and make policy recommendations that result in more supported housing placements for those exiting institutions or coming out of chronic homelessness. The State of Oregon recently entered into a Performance Plan with the United States Department of Justice. The Performance Plan requires that the State make 2,000 Supported Housing placements by 2019.

• In 2016, the Governor’s Re-entry Council discussed strategies to initiate the Criminal Justice Commission’s (CJC) Short Term Transitional Leave (STTL) program as a strategy to reduce costs; releasing inmates 90 days prior to their scheduled release date. Inmates are eligible for STTL if they have secured stable and adequate housing upon release. Further, OHCS’ Integrator connected with counties to determine the current housing supports being provided; connecting county corrections with housing providers around the state to develop housing strategies.

• The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Expansion Pilot Program Rulemaking Advisory Committee is in the process of examining Needed Housing Measures under Goal 10. The Committee looked at cities and their adoption of the Needed Housing Measures. The next step is to determine which cities have adopted the tools; and for those who haven’t, encourage them to adopt the tool.

• Senate Bill 969 established a task force on reentry, employment and housing. The task force began meeting in 2015 to explore opportunities to improve outcomes related to reentry efforts; seeking opportunities to reduce barriers. In 2016, seventeen counties received investments through the Justice Reinvestment grant program; creating housing Programs in their counties. These programs differ by county; Clackamas County offers three months of free housing for each person released, Hood River County sets aside funds to pay for hotel rooms.

• An OHCS Integrator also worked with the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) and the Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) to develop a catalogue of the Housing Support Programs, and to gather information about the local capacity for housing to serve this population.

• An OHCS Integrator is a member of the SB 969 Interim Taskforce on Re-entry, Employment and Housing: The taskforce met to explore opportunities to improve outcomes related to reentry efforts, and to reduce barriers; such as the adoption of a Certificate of Good Standing program similar to the one piloted by Mercy Corps NW. A Certificate of Good Standing helps landlords and property managers identify people with criminal histories with documented indicators of successful rehabilitation. (i.e. Reference letters, PO approval, evidence of sobriety) Based on programs throughout the nation, a Certificate helps individuals seeking housing be more competitive rental applicants in the private housing market.

• In 2016, an OHCS Integrator worked to connect housing and service providers with community corrections programs; working closely with the Director of Community Corrections in Wasco County to make a direct connection with Bridges to Change a re-entry housing and service provider. Based on this connection, Bridges to Change will be providing housing for men releasing from prison in Wasco County.
Agriculture Workforce Housing Facilitation Team (AWHFT)
Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) is designated as the primary state agency for agriculture workforce housing information. The Agriculture Workforce Housing Information is located on the OHCS website at the following link: [http://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/Pages/agriculture-workforce-housing-facilitation-team.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/Pages/agriculture-workforce-housing-facilitation-team.aspx).

The AWHFT provides an ongoing discussion forum for stakeholders concerned with Oregon’s agriculture workforce housing. Team members include a number of state and federal agencies, developers, growers, local planning agencies, and other interested parties. In 2016, OHCS convened six AWHFT meetings. The team worked to address agriculture workforce housing needs, tax credit legislation, and creation of an agriculture workforce housing mapping tool. The mapping tool will be available in 2017, and accessible on the agriculture workforce pages at the link above.

Housing Choice Advisory Committee
HB 2639 expanded protections under Oregon State law to residents who receive local, state, or federal rent subsidies, including Section 8 or Housing Choice Vouchers. It changed the law to include local, state, or federal housing assistance as a protected source of income, which means that tenants cannot be denied residency solely based on their use of a voucher or other rental assistance to pay the rent. The bill also created a Housing Choice Landlord Guarantee Fund to provide financial assistance to landlords to mitigate damages caused by tenants. The Housing Choice Advisory Committee convened four times in 2016; discussing and sharing best practices for maximizing participation by landlords and tenants in the Housing Choice Voucher Program and developing strategies and outcome measures for gauging the effectiveness of the Housing Choice Voucher Program. In the 2017 legislative session, legislation is pending to make the Housing Choice Landlord Guarantee Fund more cost effective and improve administration.

Manufactured Communities Resource Center
OHCS’ Manufactured Communities Resource Center (MCRC) staffs are trained in mediation techniques. Staffs advise landlords and tenants on ways to communicate when disputes arise, assist with ongoing disputes, and make referrals to Community Dispute Resolution Centers (CDRCs). In 2016, MCRC staff fielded almost 2,000 intake calls; referring 29 cases to CDRCs across the state.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs
The research performed for the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) has shown housing inequities and disparities most often are experienced by people of color and people with disabilities. Households of color are more likely than white households to have lower incomes, and are disproportionately represented in the number of low income households with housing instability. Additionally, Oregon’s population is quickly aging, and the population of people with disabilities continues to grow, meaning more accessible units are needed to allow seniors and people with disabilities to live independently. This section describes some of the actions taken by Oregon in 2016 to address obstacles to meeting the needs of Oregon’s underserved populations.
In 2016, OHCS launched the Local Innovation and Fast Track (LIFT) Housing Program. The LIFT Housing Program's objective is to build new affordable housing for low income households, especially families. The Oregon Legislature committed $40 million of general obligation Article XI-Q bonds to fund the LIFT program. Using this new funding source allows Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS), and its partners, to add to the supply of affordable housing, in particular, for historically underserved communities. Throughout May and June of 2016, OHCS Integrators traveled to 23 Oregon counties, hosting roundtable discussions to explain this new program, and the program’s application requirements. On September 2, 2016, the LIFT Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released, and on November 18, 2016 the Housing Stability Council approved funding for 13 projects from the 2016 9% LIHTC and HOME NOFAs. Together these projects represent 550 new units that will provide both new housing resources and housing security to households across the state.

On June 30, 2016, OHCS released a new source of funding for the 2016 NOFA Mental Health Housing Fund. Applicants could request Mental Health Housing Funds for up to 25 percent of the total development costs of a proposed project, regardless of the population served. Up to 25 percent of the units in a building or complex of buildings could be reserved for tenants with Serious Mental Illness (SMI). In 2016, Oregon made available $20 million in Mental Health Housing funds; awarding $3.5 million. The balance of funds is anticipated to be available in early 2017.

In 2016 one of the greatest barriers for meeting underserved needs in Oregon was the lack of affordable housing. HUD’s fair market rent (FMR) requirements for subgrantees utilizing ESG funding did not reflect the actual housing market in most Oregon communities. In December of 2016, OHCS submitted a request to HUD to allow a waiver of the FMR in the counties in which the local housing authority used a rent cap above the HUD FMR. In 2016, 32 of Oregon’s 35 counties fell into this category. In addition, 18 out of 21 Public Housing Authorities operated their Housing Choice programs using payment standards, for one or more bedroom sizes that exceeded the FMRs for their area. The waiver will provide homeless and at-risk persons, who have access to ESG-funded rental assistance through Community Action Agencies, the same opportunity to secure safe and affordable housing as they would have using a Public Housing Authority Housing Choice Voucher.

**Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards**

The State of Oregon requires all applicants and subgrantees, including affordable housing projects, developers and service providers, to conduct all related work and deliver all related services in accordance with the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act and 24 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 570.487(c). Grant recipients, subgrantees, applicants, project owners, and any others who apply for, or receive HUD funding, must certify compliance with all applicable lead-based paint (LBP) requirements as a part of their contracts and agreements. In addition, department staffs have opportunities to continue their LBP education by attending HUD sponsored trainings on healthy homes, LBP rules, repairs, and technical assistance.
**Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)**

Oregon Business Development Department (OBDD) developed procedures to eliminate the hazards of lead poisoning due to the presence of LBP in housing assisted with Community Development Block Grant funds. In accordance with the Lead Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (Title X) the State established a certification program for inspectors and contractors and accrediting programs for trainers. All purchasers and tenants of CDBG assisted emergency homeless shelters, transitional housing and domestic violence shelters constructed prior to 1978 receive a notice about the potential hazards of LBP. Grant recipients must keep documentation of the notifications in their local project file.

**HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)**

Oregon strategies to address LBP hazards, and increase access to housing without LBP hazards include:
- Inspection of funded properties for LBP hazards
- Monitoring properties, or informing property owners of monitoring requirements
- LBP education and training for staff and partners
- Notifying purchasers and tenants of potential hazards

The HOME Program multifamily property portfolio does not currently include any projects with hazards of lead poisoning. However, properties constructed prior to 1978 may be subject to requirements for assessment, evaluation, and mitigation of LBP, per federal regulation 24 CFR Part 35. OHCS compliance officers determine if monitoring for LBP is required and, if necessary, implement, or advise property owners of monitoring requirements.

**HOME Tenant Based Rental Assistance (HOME TBRA)**

The HOME TBRA program requires a visual assessment for lead based paint hazards as part of the Housing Quality Standards inspection for each potential rental unit if the unit was built prior to 1978, and the household includes a child under age six. If a visual assessment reveals lead-based paint, the rental owner must complete paint stabilization, clean-up and clearance activities before the household is allowed to occupy the unit. All adults receiving TBRA in 2016 were given the brochure “Protect Your Family from Lead in Your Home”. Additionally, subgrantees were required to exchange information with the local health department about children at risk for lead-based paint poisoning.

**Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)**

All shelters assisted under ESG funding and all housing occupied by program participants are subject to the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act and lead-based paint regulations found in 24 CFR part 35, subparts A, B, H, J, K, M and R. Subgrantees must provide the lead hazard information pamphlet to any resident who will be residing in a unit built before 1978. The tenant must receive the pamphlet before moving into the unit. For units older than 1978 which will house one or more children under the age of 6, landlord and tenant must complete a Lead-Based Paint Disclosure form. A visual lead-based paint assessment must be completed by a person trained in this inspection process.
Actions Taken to Reduce the Number of Poverty-Level Families

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
CDBG funds indirectly provide assistance to low-income communities by providing grant funds for water and wastewater projects that maintain or reduce the user rates and provide access to safe and sanitary water and wastewater services. While these funds do not directly reduce the number of poverty-level families, it provides the low- income communities the ability to focus on economic development of the area.

HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
The HOME program does not reduce the number of poverty-level families, but provides opportunities for poverty-level families to live more affordably in housing units with reduced and/or subsidized rents.

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
OHOP clients, as part of their participation in Ryan White funded case management, are screened for employment readiness, and when appropriate, referred to employment service providers such as Vocational Rehabilitation, Work Source, and Ticket to Work offices. Furthermore, HIV Community Services fund an employment program through the community based provider HIV Alliance to help clients with their vocational goals. Finally, with other resources, OHOP continued to fund an innovative housing program called Elevate. Elevate provides medium term housing to individuals who are actively working towards a financial stability goal such as finding a new job, going back to school, or contributing to an Individual Development Account (IDA).

Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)
Subrecipients may use ESG funds to pay for case management when the subrecipient is providing services for street outreach, shelter, and housing relocation and stabilization. Subrecipients offered case management and other services to ESG clients as an integral step in providing households with the opportunity and foundation to move out of poverty.

Additionally through the requirement to use coordinated entry, subrecipients were able to expand the types and volume of resources available to their clientele by referring them to local partner agencies for services not offered by the ESG subrecipient. Following are examples of the services provided:

Case management activities:
- Applicant intake and assessment
- Eligibility evaluation
- Counseling
- Developing, securing and coordinating services
- Developing and assisting the participant with a housing stabilization plan, and
- Monitoring and evaluating participant’s progress.
Essential services that help participants move out of poverty:

- Landlord mediation programs
- Employment assistance and training
- Credit repair
- Legal services
- Housing search and placement
- Physical and mental health care assistance
- Substance abuse treatment
- Educational services
- Life skills training
- Transportation
- Referral to other assistance opportunities

**Actions taken to develop institutional structure**

Oregon’s institutional delivery structure system’s strengths are through collaboration and coordination with our partners. Oregon has a very strong Continuum of Care network of Community Action agencies, food pantries, shelters, and health providers. The Oregon Housing Stability Council and the Community Action Partnership of Oregon are key partners that work to ensure a statewide continuum of housing and services for low-income households, the people experiencing homelessness and special needs populations.

In 2016, Oregon worked with partners in a collaborative effort to enhance coordination and implementation of the Consolidated Plan, and the actions planned to address the priorities in the plan.

In 2016, the Oregon State Housing Council was renamed "Oregon Housing Stability Council" by the Oregon Legislature, and increased its membership to nine. On the recommendation of the Director of OHCS, the Council sets policy and approves, or disapproves, rules and standards for programs, and approves, or disapproves, loans and grants, and carries out the provisions of ORS 456.567; and ORS 456.571.

A Coordinated Entry system was developed and implemented by Oregon Continuums of Care, and supported by OHCS. The standard assessment tool identified need, eligibility, support, and availability of services, allowing acceleration of assessment and placement. Through a network of case management, community based support systems, financial and rent assistance, and self-sufficiency opportunities, homeless and at-risk households were linked to services designed to help them obtain or retain housing stability.

The Statewide Coordinated Statement of Need (SCSN) and Comprehensive Plans submitted to the United States Department of Health and Human Services, HIV/AIDS Bureau provided a collaborative mechanism to identify and address significant care and treatment issues related to the needs of people
living with HIV/AIDS, and to maximize coordination, integration, and effective linkages across all Ryan White Program sections.

In 2016, OBDD provided technical assistance to help cities and counties navigate CDBG program requirements.

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

The Oregon Legislature approved an expansion of the Oregon State Housing Council, now known as the Oregon Housing Stability Council, to nine members and charged Council with meeting the tremendous need for the provision of affordable housing for lower income Oregonians. This change resulted in enhanced coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. The Housing Stability Council and the Community Action Partnership of Oregon are key networks that work to ensure a statewide continuum of housing and services for low income households, people experiencing homelessness, and special needs populations.

Community Action Agencies provided information and referrals to the public and were key participants in their respective Continuums of Care (COC), which enabled them to be a community hub for linking low-income people to mainstream supportive services. The CAAs maintained partnerships with systems of care to ensure coordination, and to avoid duplication of services.

OHCS delivered rental assistance services through the statewide network of CAAs, which is also the statewide system for delivery of anti-poverty services, including the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG). The CAAs worked extensively with governmental entities, nonprofits, mental and physical health providers, schools, public safety providers, and others to design, implement, and deliver programs and services to low-income individuals and families.

Oregon’s COCs designed and implemented a coordinated entry process; a tool that works to access both visible and hidden barriers. By reaching across disciplines the tool increased the possibility of touching upon a cross section of life skills support, substance and alcohol abuse treatment, anger management, counseling, and other areas that helped people maintain housing stability.

**Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)**

Migrant farmworker and Hispanic services are provided through a member of the CAA network who works closely with Hispanic families to provide advocacy, employment training, housing and other social services. Additionally, the CAAs are active participants in their local and regional homeless Continuums of Care (CoC). Four of Oregon’s CoCs have CAAs as their applicant agency. The balance of state has the CAA’s association, Community Action Partnership of Oregon (CAPO), as their applicant agency. The remaining two CoCs have community action staff engaged in the governance structure. This strong engagement with continuums provides another avenue for developing strong partnerships with
homeless and housing providers including, PHAs, Community Development Corporations (CDCs), domestic violence providers, and state, county and local social, health and education service providers. Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice

Oregon’s 2016-2020 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) identified various impediments and barriers experienced to fair housing choice, and suggested actions to address those impediments. Based on the AI, Oregon developed a 2016-2020 Fair Housing Action Plan (FHAP). The plan details the actions Oregon prepared to focus on over the 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan period.

The 2016 FHAP Report outlines the actions Oregon took in 2016 to address the research findings and impediments identified in the AI. Oregon’s 2016 FHAP Report is included as Attachment F.

The 2016-2020 FHAP is included as Section VIII of the AI, and may be accessed at the following link: http://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/DO/docs/2016-2020-Oregon-Analysis-of-Impediments-Fair-Housing-Choice-Report.pdf

Iron Horse Lodge, Prineville, Oregon
Affordable Housing for Seniors/26 units
Funding: HOME and LIHTC
Year Completed: 2016
Monitoring (CR-40)

The following section describes the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in 2016 in furtherance of the 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan, and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

CDBG projects were formally monitored at least once during the project schedule. Monitoring was scheduled when approximately 50 percent of the grant was drawn down by the recipient. All construction projects, microenterprise assistance, and housing rehabilitation projects were monitored on-site. Technical assistance (TA), public works planning and final design only grants may have been monitored through a desk review after the OBDD’s Regional Coordinator made a determination that this level of review was appropriate. A decision to make a desk review or on-site review for the technical assistance (TA), public works planning and final design grants depended upon the following risk factors:

- Whether the recipient had successfully completed a CDBG project in the past;
- Whether the grant administrator had successful experience with previous CDBG projects;
- The record for the particular project (i.e., timely submission of required information, project on schedule, accurately prepared cash request, cooperative relationship with recipient etc.). More than one on-site monitoring visit was made if OBDD determined that is was necessary. Factors reviewed for this determination included, but were not limited to, program complexity and “High Risk” projects. “High Risk” projects included projects that generated a large amount of program income, housing rehabilitation, economic development, and local grant administration capacity
- Recent problems with the project;
- Past monitoring findings; and
- Projects that were behind schedule.

The CDBG monitoring procedures, as described within this section of the CAPER, can be found within Chapter 11 of the Grant Management Handbook at http://www.orinfrastructure.org/Infrastructure-Programs/CDBG/Handbooks/ and in the CDBG Performance Evaluation Report (PER), Attachment H.

The IDIS 11.4 release “flagged” projects are considered by HUD to be behind schedule or slow moving projects. OBDD developed remediation plans for these projects. The plans were then submitted to HUD for approval. When a proposed remediation plan was not approved by HUD, OBDD worked with HUD to either develop a revised remediation plan, or to determine the next action that needed to be taken for
that project. The IDIS PR59 report, “CDBG Activities at Risk Dashboard”, provides the most recent list of flagged projects. The PR-59 report is available from OBDD upon request.

During 2016, OBDD monitored nine CDBG projects where 11 findings and concerns were documented. All of the grant sub-grantees addressed the findings and received a Findings Cleared letter.

**HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)**

This section includes the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations:

The OHCS Asset Management and Compliance (AMC) section monitored each HOME property on a regular basis to ensure that the HOME program requirements were met and that properties, owners, and agents complied with grant, and or loan agreements. The HOME property owner is ultimately responsible for the ongoing compliance of HOME program regulations and standards during the entire period of affordability. Marketability of the property, regulatory compliance, and asset management are all essential AMC HOME compliance components.

AMC staff reviewed and approved all new and changing management requests. All property documents and attachments (e.g., leases, house rules, and tenant selection criteria) were reviewed to ensure HOME program compliance. HOME rent increases and changes were approved by OHCS prior to implementation. For HOME properties that contained ten units or more, audited financial statements were collected and reviewed by OHCS Asset Managers. The Asset Manager reviewing the financials assigned the property a risk rating based on the information submitted as well as other factors taken into consideration, such as the last physical and file review rating, tenant complaints received, or change in Management.

On-site property reviews were conducted throughout the period of affordability to determine if the property met the appropriate property standards and to verify that owners submitted appropriate information regarding rent, occupancy, and unit mix. Properties were inspected in accordance with HUD regulations and the Uniform Physical Conditions Standards (UPCS). The first on-site inspection for newly funded properties occurred within 12 months of a project’s completion. Ongoing monitoring frequency was based on a risk assessment of each individual property to determine if the on-going inspections (physical and/or file review) would occur every one, two, or three years. If any deficiencies were identified for inspectable items, a follow-up on-site inspection was conducted, or documentation was requested to verify that the finding had been satisfactorily addressed. Health and safety deficiencies identified during inspections were required to be corrected immediately (within 24-72 hours of the date of inspection). Properties identified with health and safety deficiencies were put on a more frequent inspection schedule. For properties with one to four units, the inspectable items for each building with HOME-assisted units, and 100 percent of the HOME units, were inspected. For properties with more than four HOME-assisted units, the inspectable items for each building with HOME-assisted units and at least 20 percent of the HOME-assisted units in each building, but not fewer than four units in each property, and one HOME-assisted unit in each building were inspected.
In addition to the site and file inspections, a comprehensive desk audit was completed for each HOME property. These compliance desk audits verified the owner’s compliance through the required Certification of Continuing Program Compliance (CCPC) process. By certifying compliance, owners certified that HOME-assisted units complied with program regulations. Owners were required to maintain records that demonstrated compliance through submission of a HOME monitoring report via the CCPC, at the time of inspection, or when it was requested by a compliance officer. Owners of HOME-assisted units, or their representatives, were required to perform annual inspections of the units. Individuals at each property, responsible for HOME compliance and performing site inspections, applied the required property standards of HUD and HOME program regulations as well as OHCS handbooks and memorandums as guidance.

As noted in the previous section on actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards, properties constructed prior to 1978 may be subject to requirements for assessment, evaluation, and mitigation of lead-based paint. Compliance officers are certified in lead based paint guidelines to determine if monitoring for lead-based paint is required. If necessary, compliance officers implemented, or advised property owners of monitoring requirements.

Property owners were required to establish initial and ongoing tenant eligibility using the current HUD Handbook income and asset calculation methods, in combination with HUD’s published annual income and rent limits. OHCS compliance officers reviewed at least 20 percent of the tenant files for those tenants living in HOME-assisted units. File audit standards adhered to are detailed in 24 CFR Part 5. Additional HOME compliance expectations and guidance are written in the OHCS HOME Compliance Manual located on the OHCS website.

Additional support, for owners and management agents, was provided through training by OHCS. OHCS offered trainings at conferences and other large industry meetings. Small group trainings were held for partners that were noted to need additional guidance. Compliance officers also provided additional one-on-one training to agents during property inspections whenever requested.

**HOME Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)**

OHCS provided ongoing compliance monitoring for each CAA and PHA administering TBRA funds. In 2016, 17 monitoring reviews were conducted of CAAs’ and PHAs’ overall operations to ensure that TBRA funds were expended in accordance with all federal program requirements. On-site review of agency procedures and client files were also performed. OHCS provided training for programmatic requirements while onsite, by conference call, or through webinars.

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**

The Oregon HIV/Viral Hepatitis/Sexually Transmitted Infections Integrated Planning Group (IPG) is an advisory group to the HIV/STD/TB Section of the Oregon Health Authority. The group assists with developing a statewide plan for providing prevention and care services for HIV, viral hepatitis, and other sexually transmitted infections. Memberships are inclusive of statewide stakeholders including both
providers and consumers of HOPWA funded housing services. The IPG meets quarterly and is responsible for development of a strategic plan, every three years, which includes goals pertaining to housing assistance. The updated implementation plan for the IPG may be accessed at the following link:


### HOPWA Monitoring Activities Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description/Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Financial Tracking Review</td>
<td>OHOP program management met monthly with the program Financial Operations Analyst to review individual grant expenditures to date and rate of spending. When needed and allowable adjustments were authorized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDIS Draw and Review</td>
<td>Centralized State accounting staff initiated draws from the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) which were reviewed by program financial staff prior to submission. Draws typically occurred monthly, but at a minimum were done once a quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Client File Review and Quality Management</td>
<td>A Client File Review was conducted annually using a tool developed by the program which includes questions from the HOPWA monitoring standards, program policy and procedures and other applicable HUD regulations. An annual client file review summary report was prepared and presented to staff. Action plans for resolution were developed when applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program Evaluation                                | Program evaluation was conducted periodically and included information related to housing stability for people living with HIV in the State. Evaluation reports can be found at the following link:  

### Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

OHCS provided ongoing compliance monitoring for each Community Action Agency (CAA) receiving ESG funds. In 2016, 16 ESG on-site reviews were conducted. Monitoring was used to verify that recipients of assistance were income eligible and met the HUD definition of homeless as outlined in the 24 CFR Parts 91 and 576 of the ESG Rule. In 2016, the CAAs’ overall operations were reviewed to ensure that ESG funds were expended in accordance with all federal program requirements. OHCS provided training for programmatic requirements while onsite, on call, or through webinars.

### Citizen Participation Plan:

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

Oregon’s Citizen Participation Plan requires a fifteen day public comment period, public notices posted in newspapers and on the OHCS website, and via e-mail to partners. Specific details about these citizen participation activities are included in Attachment G of this plan.

### Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)

The Community Development Block Grants’ (CDBG) citizen participation requirements for applicants are included in chapter six of the CDBG Method of Distribution.
HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
Oregon’s Citizen Participation Plan requires a fifteen day public comment period for the CAPER. The HOME program reporting is included in the CAPER document, and is available for review at that time.

Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)
OHCS convened a meeting of the state’s Continuums of Care with discussion focusing on aligning our homeless efforts into a single statewide system. OHCS will continue to work with the Continuums to make progress in this area.

Alona Place, Junction City, Oregon
Workforce family housing/40 units
Funding: HOME and LIHTC
Year Completed: 2016
The following section specifies the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction’s CDBG program objectives and indicates how the jurisdiction changed its program as a result of its experiences.

The public works activities and community facility activities were identified as high priority projects in the 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan. Of the CDBG funds awarded in 2016, 23.78 percent were for community facilities projects that benefited 1,668 persons. Public works projects equaled 62 percent of funds awarded, and benefited 2,492 persons. CDBG funds awarded for housing rehabilitation projects amounted to 13.66 percent, and benefited 302 persons and rehabilitated 132 housing units. Refer to Table’s I, V, and VI of the CDBG PER, Attachment H, for more details.

The indicators for CDBG need were identified by the type and number of applications received for funding in 2016. Based upon the number of applications received, public works, community facilities, and housing rehabilitation were of the highest need.

In 2016, Oregon funded:

- Four public works projects;
- Three community facility projects;
- Four housing rehabilitation projects (four remained unfunded due to insufficient available funds); and,
- One microenterprise project

Oregon obligated its 2016 CDBG funds for activities in accordance, as much as possible, with the targets set in the 2016 Annual Action Plan for the 2016-2020 Oregon Consolidated Plan.

Oregon exceeded the annual allocation funding targets in the following categories:

- Public Works: Target was 51 percent. During 2016 the state obligated 62 percent.

Oregon did not exceed the annual allocation funding targets in the following categories:

- Community Facilities: Target was 28 percent. During 2016 the state obligated 23.78 percent.
- Microenterprise Assistance: Target was two percent. During 2016 the state obligated 0.55 percent.
- Housing Rehabilitation: Target was 19 percent. During 2016 the state obligated 13.66 percent.

Because the CDBG is one of the remaining large funding sources for grant programs, the demand for funds has been trending upward for the past several years. In 2016 this was illustrated by the applications received in one quarter that far exceeded the entire CDBG annual allocation by nearly two to one.
Oregon’s CDBG program continued to contribute to Oregon’s economic recovery by creating jobs, assisting microenterprises, improving infrastructure, providing housing rehabilitation, and constructing essential community facilities. The primary obstacle to successfully addressing the demands has remained the lack of funding even when coordinating funding for infrastructure projects with other agencies, such as the US Department of Agriculture’s Rural Utility Service, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Lottery funded Special Public Works Fund, Water/Wastewater Financing Program, and others. The estimated demand for funding in 2016 was $22.2 million, far exceeding the 2016 allocation amount available for projects of $11,712,681.

Oregon does not have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants.
HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) (CR-50)

This section includes the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the HOME program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations, an assessment of HOME affirmative marketing actions, and an assessment of coordination with LIHTC and outreach to minority-owned, and women-owned businesses.

Results of On-site Inspections

In 2016, OHCS inspected a total of 176 HOME funded properties, and 806 HOME assisted units. Approximately 972 Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS) violations, and 257 Health and Safety Violations were noted and reported to the owners or agents of the subject properties. All but one property corrected the noted violations within the allotted amount of time (24 hours to 30 days depending on the violation). Due to financial issues, this property is being closely monitored, with a follow-up plan in place to address roofing, siding and windows.

Of the 972 total UPCS violations noted in 2016, the most common violations identified were trimming of vegetation from exterior siding or roof of buildings, missing or inoperable sink pop-ups, pressure washing of siding or parking areas, inoperable or failing range ventilation fans, damaged door frames, cleaning of gutters, and moss on roofs. Of the 257 exigent health and safety (EHS) findings, the most common items included inoperable ground fault circuit interrupters (GFCIs), inoperable smoke detectors, and inadequate heater clearance.

During the file reviews and desk audits, the most common program findings included missing student forms or VAWA information. In addition, it was noted that there is industry confusion when determining rent for voucher holders and calculating rent when a unit was mixed with other funding sources. Areas identified for training in 2017 are similar to 2016 including; renting to HOME student households, lease wording and prohibitions including VAWA requirements, and general education regarding calculating rents.

In 2016, OHCS provided twenty one-on-one trainings and technical assistance to partners identified as needing additional training. In addition OHCS participated in two large industry trainings. Approximately 200 partners and staff were trained during these industry sessions.

Assessment of the affirmative marketing actions for HOME units

All projects funded through OHCS are required to submit Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing (AFHM) plans to ensure the affirmative marketing of available units. OHCS establishes AFHM expectations within the program
compliance manual. Staff reviews the AFHM plan before it is implemented and requires that it is updated at least once every five years. In addition, if projects are having issues with vacancy, the plan is revisited to identify additional actions that could be expanded on to equitably reach the market. Failure to correct all non-compliance could result in increased monitoring and reporting requirements, extension of the affordability period, repayment of the HOME grant or loan, or other legal remedies and may also affect the Owner’s eligibility for future financing from OHCS under any or all of its programs. Further, OHCS may require the management Agent be replaced. Data on the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics

No HOME Program Income was utilized during 2016. There are no projects and no owner or tenant characteristic to report.

Assessment of Coordination with LIHTC and Outreach to Minority-owned and Women-owned Businesses (MWESB)

OHCS received a small amount of HOME Program Income from annual interest on multifamily loans. Program Income received was utilized to fund program activities in accordance with the Consolidated Plan. In 2016, a portion of the state’s HOME funds were offered within the NOFA that leveraged the 9% LIHTC. Within that NOFA, 35 percent of the available LIHTC was set-aside to fund preservation projects with existing project based rent subsidy. This was done in order to maintain the affordability of the existing housing stock that serves Oregonians with extremely low incomes. In 2016, OHCS began additional efforts to track usage in the development of multifamily housing funded with federal 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and expanded outreach to potential MWESB contractors. Oregon provided a list of minority-owned and women-owned businesses registered in Oregon at the following webpage: https://oregon4biz.diversitysoftware.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPublic.asp?XID=6787&TN=oregon4biz
The Parks at Eastlake and Aspen Villas, Bend Oregon
Workforce Housing/40 units

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)(CR-55)**

Table below reports the 2016 goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households Served Through:</th>
<th>One-year Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units provided in transitional housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served*

The HOPWA program exceeded the goal for 2016 and assisted 75 households with tenant based rental assistance. Increasing client access to, and engagement in, HIV/AIDS care and support is one of the primary goals of the OHOP program. Clients served with HOPWA housing assistance under the 2016 OHOP Formula grant continued to achieve very high levels of housing stability and reduced risks of homelessness. All outcomes (including leveraged services) were assessed directly from client-level
service utilization data obtained through collaboration with the Ryan White Program (including the AIDS Drug Assistance Program), HIV/AIDS surveillance system, and LIHEAP program database.
# Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)(CR-60)

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

For Paperwork Reduction Act

## 1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

### Basic Grant Information

- **Recipient Name**: OREGON
- **Organizational DUNS Number**: 809579543
- **EIN/TIN Number**: 930952117
- **Identify the Field Office**: PORTLAND
- **Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance**: Eugene/Springfield/Lane County CoC

### ESG Contact Name

- **Prefix**: Ms.
- **First Name**: Vicki
- **Middle Name**: R
- **Last Name**: Massey
- **Suffix**: 0
- **Title**: ESG Program Manager

### ESG Contact Address

- **Street Address 1**: 725 Summer St NE Ste B
- **City**: Salem
- **State**: OR
- **ZIP Code**: 97301-
- **Phone Number**: 5039862146
- **Fax Number**: 0
- **Email Address**: Vicki.Massey@oregon.gov

## ESG Secondary Contact

### Prefix

### First Name

### Last Name

### Suffix

### Title

### Phone Number

### Extension

### Email Address
2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date: 01/01/2016
Program Year End Date: 12/31/2016

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

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY ACTION TEAM
City: St Helens
State: OR
Zip Code: 97051, 1708
DUNS Number: 039792635
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 108226

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: ACCESS
City: Medford
State: OR
Zip Code: 97501, 0188
DUNS Number: 082625914
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 143061

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: MID-COLUMBIA COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL
City: The Dalles
State: OR
Zip Code: 97058, 2208
DUNS Number: 930555518
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 31259
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM OF EAST CENTRAL OREGON
City: Pendleton
State: OR
Zip Code: 97801, 3060
DUNS Number: 943060985
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 39182

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY CONNECTION OF NE OREGON
City: La Grande
State: OR
Zip Code: 97850, 5267
DUNS Number: 930575647
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 31717

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY IN ACTION
City: Ontario
State: OR
Zip Code: 97914, 2468
DUNS Number: 829724447
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 25616

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: UCAN
City: Roseburg
State: OR
Zip Code: 97470, 1034
DUNS Number: 012168118
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 151172
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CSC
City: Albany
State: OR
Zip Code: 97321, 2299
DUNS Number: 182579008
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 154321

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: LCHHS
City: Eugene
State: OR
Zip Code: 97401, 1100
DUNS Number: 030786248
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 279481

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: MWVCAA
City: Salem
State: OR
Zip Code: 97301, 4520
DUNS Number: 076427962
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 221063

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NIMPACT
City: Redmond
State: OR
Zip Code: 97756, 7133
DUNS Number: 167358571
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 126495
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: ORCCA
City: Coos Bay
State: OR
Zip Code: 97420, 2976
DUNS Number: 039214416
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 67860

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: KLCAS
City: Klamath Falls
State: OR
Zip Code: 97601, 1136
DUNS Number: 623590754
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 46376

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CAO
City: Hillsboro
State: OR
Zip Code: 97123, 3822
DUNS Number: 071819999
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 78544

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: YCAP
City: McMinnville
State: OR
Zip Code: 97128, 8190
DUNS Number: 014109474
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 62128
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: MULTCO
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip Code: 97204, 1810
DUNS Number: 030784888
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 115780

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: OREGON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
City: Salem
State: OR
Zip Code: 97301, 1266
DUNS Number: 809580293
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 88653
Persons Assisted (ESG)(CR-65)

OHCS’ subgrantees track in a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database all client data and ESG services provided, as required by HUD. OHCS instructs subgrantees to report quarterly the demographic data and information about type of services provided to households participating in the subgrantees’ state and federal homeless programs. Additionally, at the end of the calendar year all subgrantees must submit data to OHCS about all Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) activity that has occurred during the year. These ESG activities are detailed in e-Cart, which replaces Section CR-65, and is included as Attachment E.
Assistance Provided and Outcomes (ESG) (CR-70)

8. Shelter Utilization

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Units - Rehabbed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Units - Conversion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of bed-nights available</td>
<td>197,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of bed-nights provided</td>
<td>235,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>119.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 – Shelter Capacity

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

Thirty percent of households exiting the ESG program resided in permanent housing at the time of exit. A number of subgrantees use some, or all, their ESG allocation for shelter operations and services; shelter activity is not represented in this performance measure and may skew the rate of exits to permanent housing.

Of households exiting to permanent housing for all OHCS funding sources, 79 percent remained in their housing at six months. Exit data for this performance measure is not reported by separate funding sources.
11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Rental Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation and</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation &amp; Stabilization</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services - Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Grants Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Homelessness Prevention</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Rental Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation and</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Housing Relocation &amp; Stabilization</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services - Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Grants Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Rehab</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter
### 11d. Other Grant Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Outreach</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 - Other Grant Expenditures

### 11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total ESG Funds Expended</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,534,657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,007,663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 - Total ESG Funds Expended

### 11f. Match Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-ESG HUD Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,002</td>
<td>4,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>188,405</td>
<td>136,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>455,780</td>
<td>180,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>893,952</td>
<td>80,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174,442</td>
<td>97,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Match Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,729,686</td>
<td>499,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

### 11g. Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,737,349</td>
<td>1,112,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities
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