

****DRAFT****

Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report

HUD FY 2015 - City FY 2016

Manchester, NH



Prepared for the
Department of Housing and Urban Development

September, 2016

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

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

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

During the Program Year, both the City and its Subrecipient's worked hard to meet the Goal Outcomes outlined in the 2014 Annual Action Plan. To Address Homelessness Issues, the City worked with 5 of its non-profit partners to provide: Tenant Based Rental Assistance and Rapid Rehousing services to 66 households; Overnight shelter to 1100 individuals and Homelessness Prevention Services to 133 individuals. In addition, HMIS data was collected on 4 Manchester organizations that serve the homeless population. The City is currently operating a Lead Hazard Control Demonstration Program and working with 4 of its partners to meet the objectives associated with Increasing the Number of Affordable Housing Units. Three projects have been completed which will result in the creation of 3 home ownership units and 18 rental units. Several projects are currently underway which will result in the elimination of lead hazards in 3 owner occupied units and 68 rental units. To Assimilate Refugees Into the Community, the City collaborated with the Holy Cross Family Learning Center resulting in services provided to 126 women. To Decrease the Number of Abused/Neglected Children in the community, the City worked with 2 agencies resulting in services provided to 178 families with children. To Increase the Manchester High School Graduation Rate services were provided to 2613 youth. To achieve this objective, the City worked with 9 of its partners. 4 of these organizations provided services under the CBDO umbrella. To Increase Access/Availability to Affordable Childcare, affordable child care was provided to 100 low/moderate income families. As a result of Agreements with 1 CBDO organization and 1 subrecipient, services were provided to 742 senior citizens. To Perpetuate the Independent Living of the Elderly. To Prepare Individuals for Gainful Employment, the City Collaborated with 1 non-profit organization to provide job training to 35 individuals. 11 of those individuals were placed in jobs. To Increase Recreation Programming for Low/Moderate Income, the City's Parks Department provided summer recreation programming to 337 youth. Year Round Access to Recreational Facilities was increased as a result of 2 City Park improvement projects. To achieve the outcomes associated with Community Supportive Living Environments housing code enforcement inspections were conducted in 4000 housing units and activities conducted in the center city positively impacted 31,440 individuals. 742 individuals benefited as a result of services provided to Support Health Care Activities for Underinsured (1 CBDO organization and 1 subrecipient). To Support the City's Infrastructure System, improvements to streets, sidewalks, drainage, lighting, etc. were completed in various income eligible Census Tracts resulting in a benefit to 58,158 residents. To Improve the Condition of Buildings Accessed By Public, the Boys and Girls Club gym floor was replaced resulting in a benefit to 1560 individuals. To Create a Universally Accessible City, pedestrian ramps were constructed in identified areas of the City in order to address accessibility issues on City sidewalks and walkways. Activities conducted by the City's Planning and Community Development Office in conjunction with the Facilitate Efficient Planning Public Management goal impacted Manchester's population (110,378) as a whole.

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

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee’s program year goals.

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Address Homelessness Issues	Homeless	HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	890	66	7.42%	178	66	37.08%
Address Homelessness Issues	Homeless	HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	5465	1100	20.13%	1093	1100	100.64%
Address Homelessness Issues	Homeless	HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	600	1330	221.67%	60	133	221.67%
Assimilate Refugees Into The Community	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	350	126	36.00%	70	126	180.00%
Decrease the number of Abused/Neglected Children	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	875	178	20.34%	175	178	101.71%
Equal Access to Affordable Housing Opportunities	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$0 / ESG: \$0	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	500	0	0.00%	100	0	0.00%
Facilitate Efficient Planning/Public Management	Planning and Administration	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Other	Other	551890	110378	20.00%	110378	110378	100.00%
Improve Condition of Buildings Accessed By Public	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	40883	1560	3.82%	8179	1560	19.07%
Increase Access/Availability to Afford. Childcare	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	500	100	20.00%	100	100	100.00%

Increase Community Supportive Living Environments	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	15025	0	0.00%	3005	0	0.00%
Increase Community Supportive Living Environments	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	38000	0	0.00%		0	
Increase Community Supportive Living Environments	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	16000	5290	33.06%	3200	5290	165.31%
Increase Community Supportive Living Environments	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Buildings Demolished	Buildings	5	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
Increase Community Supportive Living Environments	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Housing Code Enforcement/Foreclosed Property Care	Household Housing Unit	38000	4000	10.53%	7600	4000	52.63%
Increase Manchester Employment Opportunities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	25	0	0.00%	5	0	0.00%
Increase Manchester Highschool Graduation Rate	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	15435	2613	16.93%	3087	2613	84.65%
Increase Recreation Programming for Low/Mod youth	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1500	337	22.47%	300	337	112.33%
Increase the Number of Affordable Housing Units	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	5	10	200.00%	1	10	1,000.00%
Increase the Number of Affordable Housing Units	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	210	76	36.19%	67	76	113.43%

Increase the Number of Affordable Housing Units	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	30	6	20.00%	6	6	100.00%
Increase Year Round Access to Rec. Facilities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	22710	18550	81.68%	4542	18550	408.41%
Perpetuate the Independent Living of the Elderly	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1750	614	35.09%	350	614	175.43%
Prepare Individuals for Gainful Employment	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	125	24	19.20%	25	24	96.00%
Prepare Individuals for Gainful Employment	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	30	11	36.67%	6	11	183.33%
Support Health Care Activities for Underinsured	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	3425	742	21.66%	685	742	108.32%
Support the City's Infrastructure System	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	69420	58158	83.78%	13884	58158	418.89%
To Create a Universally Accessible City	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	15715	5581	35.51%	3143	5581	177.57%

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

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

In terms of the expenditure of CDBG funds, these funds are targeted to projects and activities that will benefit the City's poorest residents. The goals of these projects have been and continue to be consistent with the CDBG National Objectives in that the funds are used for activities that: 1) benefit low and moderate income persons.

The City has continued to support key public service activities that have demonstrated their effectiveness in assisting low and moderate income

residents improve their quality of life and facilitate their assimilation into the mainstream of the Manchester Community. Such services include the provision of Day Care, healthcare, after school recreational and educational programs and job training. Economic development continues to be one of the City's priorities. Over the past Fiscal Year, the Manchester Economic Development Office introduced a Small Business Assistance Program. To date, there have been no participants in the program.

The ongoing revitalization of City neighborhoods is another of the City's key strategies identified in the Consolidated Plan and also identified as a major concern by the Manchester citizenry. In particular, a major focus has been on housing, infrastructure, safety, business assistance, greening and neighborhood identity and other major influences that affect the ability of these neighborhoods to stabilize and become more desirable places to live. The City has sought to respond to these problems through continued concentrated Police presence along with involving the neighborhood watch groups and focusing on programs of physical improvements both public and private. These efforts were demonstrated in the past year through projects involving the following: the provision of health and human services, youth recreation programs, tree plantings, infrastructure improvements to parks, streets and sidewalks, concentrated code enforcement, rental assistance programs and CBDO activities. All of these activities have been requested on a consistent basis by the City residents at the annually held CIP Budget hearings, the Aldermanic Neighborhood Meetings and through individual contact with the Planning and Community Development Department.

The City has also continued to support projects and programs developed by NeighborWorks Southern New Hampshire (NWSNH), Families in Transition (FIT), The Way Home and Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority (MHRA). These community-based organization's efforts in Manchester are in concert with those of the City and have resulted in neighborhood revitalization and the development of quality affordable housing. Numerous properties have also been rehabilitated and de-leaded providing additional quality affordable rental units and 20 new 1 bedroom assisted living rental units have been constructed on a formerly blighted commercial site. Initiatives that are currently underway are being funded with HOME funds. Without the participation of NWSNH, the Way Home, FIT and MHRA, the production of affordable housing for Manchester's working families as well as the revitalization of inner city neighborhoods would be difficult to achieve.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

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

91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	ESG
White	8,958	93	896
Black or African American	1,197	13	115
Asian	242	0	11
American Indian or American Native	48	0	10
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	7	0	12
Total	10,452	106	1,044
Hispanic	1,721	25	170
Not Hispanic	9,439	87	1,047

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

HUD FY 2015- Racial and Ethnic Breakdown for CDBG, HOME, and ESG Funding Sources			
	CDBG	HOME	ESG
White	8,958 (80.27%)	93 (83.03%)	896 (73.62%)
Black or African American	1,197 (10.73%)	13 (11.61%)	115 (9.45%)
Asian	242 (2.17%)	0	11 (.90%)
American Indian/Alaskan Native	48 (.43%)	0	10 (.82%)
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	7 (.06%)	0	12 (.99%)
American Indian/Alaskan Native & White	10 (.09%)	0	43 (3.53%)
Asian & White	18 (.16%)	0	3 (.25%)
Black/African American & White	76 (.68%)	0	15 (1.23%)
American Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American	13 (.12%)	0	10 (.82%)
Other Multi-Racial	591 (5.30%)	6 (5.36%)	64 (5.26%)
Other/Unknown (all that do not match)	0	0	38 (3.12%)
Total	11,160	112	1,217
Hispanic	1,721 (15.42%)	25 (22.32%)	170 (13.97%)
Not Hispanic	9,439 (84.58%)	87 (77.68%)	1,047 (86.03%)
CR-10 Table 2 - Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds			
(Data Tabulated from monthly and cumulative beneficiary reports and Entry/Exit HMIS reports)			

Narrative

Please note the attached JPEG (CR-10 Table 2) represents the racial categories included in CR-10 Table 1 as well as the following categories: American Indian/Alaskan Native and White, Asian and White, Black/African American and White, American Indian/Alaskan Native and Black/African American, Other Multi-Racial and Other/Unknown.

According to Table 1, only 10,452 persons of various racial backgrounds benefitted from CDBG programs. CR-10 Table 2, accounts for the additional racial categories used to track beneficiaries and represents the total number of beneficiaries as 11,160 individuals; an increase of 708 persons who benefitted from CDBG funded programs.

The prepopulated number in Table 1 for HOME beneficiaries has been adjusted to match the Community Improvement Program's recorded total number for HUD FY 2015 as 106 individuals, however, CR-10 Table 2 accounts for the total number of HOME beneficiaries at 112, an additional 6 persons. These beneficiaries received Tenant Based Rental Assistance Services.

In Table 1, the ESG column was not prepopulated and the data entered was gathered from the monthly and cumulative Entry/Exit HMIS reports from ESG Sub-recipients. Important to note that based on Table 1, it would appear that only 1,044 persons benefitted from ESG funded programs. A total of 1,217 individuals actually benefitted from Emergency Shelter, Homeless Prevention, Rapid Rehousing and Street Outreach programming and the full racial and ethnic breakdown can be found on the CR-10 Table 2 attachment.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 5-Year American Community Survey, the City of Manchester, NH Race Profile is comprised of approximately 85.8% White, 4.6% Black or African American, 4.9% Asian, 2% Some Other Race, 2.6% Other Multi-Racial and .2% American Indian and Alaska Native individuals. Citywide 8.1% of the population identifies as Hispanic or Latino. Of the 11,160 individuals who benefitted from various CDBG projects in HUD FY2015, the racial breakdown was approximately 80.27% White, 10.73% Black or African American, 2.17% Asian, and 5.30% Other Multi-Racial which represent 98.47% of the total CDBG beneficiaries. 1,721 individuals or 15.42% identified as Hispanic.

The racial and ethnic status of the 112 individuals who benefitted from HOME Tenant Based Rental Assistance subsidies were comprised of 83.03% White, 11.61% Black or African American and 5.36% Other Multi-Racial with 22.32% also identifying as Hispanic.

The major racial categories reported for ESG funds were 73.62% White, 9.45% Black or African American, 5.26% Other Multi-Racial, and 3.53% American Indian/Alaskan Native and White which account for 91.86% of the ESG beneficiaries. 13.97% of assisted individuals identified as Hispanic. Comparing the CDBG, HOME, and ESG beneficiaries based on their reported racial and ethnic background to the Citywide racial breakdown, the City of Manchester is providing equal opportunity and is complying with nondiscrimination requirements.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG		6,128,248	963,953
HOME		1,520,829	
ESG		443,832	

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

Narrative not included in DRAFT.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Citywide/CDBG-eligible CT-BG	22		Citywide/CDBG-eligible CT-BG
Citywide/CDBG-eligible CT-BG	75		Citywide/CDBG-eligible CT-BG
Manchester Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area	25		
Manchester Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area	78		

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

Section intentionally left blank for DRAFT.

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.

Funding to initiate projects and programs designed to impact on the priority elements of each of the key strategies identified in the Consolidated Plan and each subsequent Annual Action Plan is provided through the City's Community Improvement Program, (CIP). The CIP has the responsibility for the administration and coordination of the expenditure of CDBG, ESG, HOME and Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant funds as well as other Federal and State resources. The Community Improvement Program allocates all of its financial resources, including the HUD entitlement funds, with the aim of providing effective services and programs in the most efficient and economical manner possible. One method of gauging its success in this regard therefore, is the amount of "other funds" leveraged beyond the entitlement funds that assist in the carrying out of the elements of the key strategies.

For some of the programs listed as receiving funds from the City, these funds may represent the sole source of support. Generally however, in the competition for limited resources, the City more favorably receives worthwhile programs that are able to demonstrate additional funding since they effectively extend the impact of the City's allocation.

Accordingly, the following projects reported on in the activity summary as receiving federal funding also leveraged other public and private funding to assist in their completion. Included in these tables are projects that received CDBG, HOME and ESG funds that are statutorily obligated to provide additional funds to satisfy match requirements. The source of their match is further elaborated upon in the corresponding CDBG, HOME and ESG sections of this report.

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	37,511,615
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	213,173
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	37,724,788
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	15,044
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	37,709,744

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
IDIS #1254 CIP #610016	06/30/2016	65,217	0	0	0	0	0	65,217
IDIS #1302 CIP #611416	06/30/2016	136,501	0	0	0	0	0	136,501
IDIS #1303 CIP #611316	06/30/2016	11,455	0	0	0	0	0	11,455

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
199,032	368,097	567,129	88,787	0

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	5,680,408	0	0	0	0	5,680,408
Number	32	0	0	0	0	32
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	5,680,408	0	5,680,408			
Number	32	0	32			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0			
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			

Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	2	0	0	0	0	2
Dollar Amount	1,582,808	0	0	0	0	1,582,808

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition

Parcels Acquired		1	349,900			
Businesses Displaced		0	0			
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0	0			
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0	0			
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

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

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	79	38
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	22	62
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	0	0
Total	101	100

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	79	100
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	6	20
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	67	82
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	10	0
Total	162	202

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

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

The City exceeded the one year goal to support 79 households through rental assistance. The primary reason was because of the blending of ESG and HOME funds to deliver Rapid Rehousing and Homeless Prevention assistance coupled with rental subsidies. The City partnered with The Way Home to continue offering this program from the previous Fiscal Year and it has grown in popularity and efficiency to yield 82 households provided with affordable housing. In addition, other strong performing projects providing affordable housing to local families included: New Horizons – Housing First (4) and Families in Transition – Tenant Based Rental Assistance (14). New Horizons for NH has been following a 'housing first' model by providing homeless individuals with rental subsidies and wrap around services to assist them in establishing income, programming to assist with mental, physical and emotional issues and a supportive case manager to work individually with the clients. This approach does not yield large number of beneficiaries, but it instead provides more individual attention to establishing long term income streams and securing affordable housing for the future and hopefully prevents a chronically homeless client from being homeless again. Families in Transition fell short of their proposed goal, 31 families, because of two factors: extremely low income (15% AMI or less) and family size dictates larger units requiring a larger subsidy for each family assisted. These challenges are common for Families in Transition as their target population is service the families.

The City had four large HOME funded projects that were completed in the previous program year. Manchester Housing Redevelopment Authority (MHRA) developed 20 units for clients with mental health issues, Habitat for Humanity rehabbed 3 homeownership units for first time, low income homebuyers, Housing Benefits, Inc. rehabbed 4 units of affordable rental housing, and Neighborworks Southern NH rehabbed 98 units of affordable rental housing. Each project was either fully or in part funded with HOME funds which allowed for leveraging opportunities through other public partners and private partnerships. The completion of these affordable housing projects greatly exceeded the established one year goals.

The City was successful in securing a LEAD Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant in the previous Fiscal Year and used CDBG funds to provide an additional 10% match to each property for the construction costs. This leveraging has resulted in 79 units being made lead safe and carry the rental requirements of: low to moderate income family occupancy and pricing of the unit at or below Fair Market Rents for at least 3 years.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

The City had a strong year of development with several multi-year projects reaching completion in the past program year. Future action plans will discuss the City’s continued commitment and need for affordable housing, but most likely will continue this trend of falling short one year and exceeding the following year. Construction projects are complex and lengthy and typically completion exceeds one year.

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

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	3,734	21
Low-income	6,271	3
Moderate-income	339	4
Total	10,344	28

Table 13 – Number of Persons Served

Narrative Information

Numbers in table above were edited to reflect the accomplishments as reported in the PR23 for CDBG and HOME activities.

- HOME fund recipients are primarily extremely low-income families being benefitted through a TBRA subsidy
- Subsidy is coupled with ESG Rapid Rehousing/Homeless Prevention activities which aligns with HOME’s priority of gearing subsidies to the extremely low income population
- Table does not account for the ESG beneficiaries – data is reported in HMIS, but households are all extremely low income
- CDBG beneficiaries are predominantly extremely low/low as most the majority resides in the City’s designated Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area comprised of the Census Tracts and Block Groups with the lowest income populations within the City.
- The biggest contributor to the CDBG amounts are the individual beneficiaries of Public Service programs including: abused and neglected children, health services, child care services, senior services, youth services, etc.
- PS activities primarily being carried out with the City’s CBDO partnering agency

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

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

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

The Manchester Continuum of Care (MCoC) has an outreach team that routinely checks in on people, work to engage them in services and advise them of shelter options. Manchester Police have been a part of outreach and seek to connect unsheltered homeless to MCoC services. The Manchester VA also has an outreach team that works to assess and address homeless Veteran's needs. Child and Family Services has two dedicated Outreach workers to engage homeless youth.

The MCoC counted one unsheltered family, a mother and child, in the 2016 Point in Time count, which is the same number as the 2015 count. The MCoC's Permanent Housing and Rapid Rehousing are major assets for families. Homeless Prevention includes education, positive landlord relationships, City initiatives around lead poisoning, bedbugs or other infestations, and individualized diversion strategies. Outreach is ongoing with the Manchester School District, Child & Family Services and Office of Youth Services.

2-1-1 NH continues to divert or coordinate services for homeless families and individuals, and provides referrals to the City's homeless services/providers.

The City and MCoC will continue with these activities and work together to enhance capabilities in engaging homeless people and motivating them to connect with area resources.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Manchester has the largest adult shelter, available to men and women, in the state of New Hampshire-New Horizons. It is also the state's only wet shelter. The shelter has 76 beds and routinely has over that many clients in the winter months as authorized by the Manchester Fire Department. There is also a separate shelter for women-Angie's with 16 beds. Emergency overflow space is accommodated during extreme weather. Shelter executives plan with other MCoC agencies, the City's Mayor and City department heads from police, health, fire and public works. Families in Transition moved the Manchester Emergency Family Shelter to a new facility with 28 beds that will host a Head Start daycare, health clinic, a food pantry with commercial kitchen, and an intake center. This facility will assist homeless families in a targeted manner by assisting them in (re)gaining stable housing. Families in Transition also has a specialty shelter for single women and families with 22 beds.

There is a domestic violence shelter in Manchester with 11 beds. This shelter is also part of a system of care where women and their children may be moved to another part of the state or out of state if they are in great danger.

Child and Family Services has access to 3 safe house shelter beds for children under the age of 18 and a strong collaboration with a professional facility, Webster House, for children under 19 and in crisis. Transitional housing is available for homeless youth 18-22, veterans, families and individuals throughout

the city with strong programming.

All shelters have case management and strive to connect clients to mainstream resources with end goal of (re)gaining permanent housing.

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

State discharge plans specifically do not allow discharge from healthcare, mental health, foster care or corrections into homelessness. The City is in close communication with shelters and the MCoC Homeless Liaison committee to ensure this does not happen. If such an occasion does occur, the City is willing and able to get involved at an executive level to correct such discharges. The Healthcare for the Homeless program works very closely with City hospitals to ensure homeless individuals are released to a proper care setting. The MCoC also works to educate corrections on the importance of helping prisoners apply for entitlements for which they are eligible prior to release. In fact, the percentage of homeless people entering the shelter directly from jail and/or prison decreased from 2014 to 2015.

The City recognizes the importance of prevention efforts as does the MCoC. Programs divert people through other supports if possible. City funded partner and MCoC member agency, The Way Home, is a solid resource for prevention assistance and utilizes budget and life skills training as part of this. If it is determined that a client should move to a lower priced unit to maintain housing, The Way Home does have access to a security deposit assistance program to help make this possible. Clients are also educated on the many resources available within the community to help them keep their housing, grocery and other costs down. The Section 8 waiting lists in New Hampshire are approximately eight years long, so this resource is difficult to acquire for very low income households. Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority is a strong partner in providing low cost housing but availability continues to be low.

The City will continue to fund homeless prevention activities, which may include financial assistance for rent and/or security deposits. The MCoC is incorporating prevention and diversion strategies into the coordinated entry system, and the City is assisting with this planning.

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

Within the MCoC, all programs strive to exit 100% of people to some form of permanent housing. In addition to ensuring that people exit to stable housing destinations, all CoC- and ESG funded programs make certain that individuals and families currently in the homeless services system are connected to all appropriate resources that will help them to sustain stable housing upon exit, (mental health, substance use, employment training, etc). Currently, the CoC utilizes HMIS to monitor and measure recidivism through the use of a report that lists all clients who exit to nonpermanent housing destinations. When agencies appear to have persistent difficulties in people returning to homelessness or exiting to unstable housing destinations, they are flagged and processes are analyzed to determine how outcomes can be improved. All of this, combined with budgeting, life skills classes and landlord relationships help to increase opportunities for affordable housing.

Families in Transition, which operates many of the CoC's Transitional Housing (TH) programs, incorporated a Case Management Needs Identifier into programming in Jan, 2014 that informs an action plan for participants entering TH. Immediate goals are set to progress through a 3-phase housing readiness model. Each participant is re-evaluated every 3 months on progress toward achieving goals. Child & Family Services TH is a 12-18 month program that provides supportive housing, life skills, and support services to youth (18-21) who are homeless or transitioning out of foster care. The program promotes self-sufficiency and reduces the risk of future homelessness. The adult emergency shelter, New Horizons, utilizes a Tier System to monitor/encourage success and offers enhanced living accommodations. They also partner with MCoC outreach and the homeless services center in getting clients connected to services to enhance capabilities to secure solid housing.

The family shelter is now being managed by Families in Transition which opens doors to professional service opportunities for clients. Access to services in addition to connections to housing remain the two main goals in reducing lengths of shelter stays.

Manchester has seen a decline in permanent supportive housing beds dedicated for Chronically Homeless (CH) from 71 in 2014 to 56 in 2015. The MCoC has decided to focus on prioritization over dedication of permanent supportive housing beds. Therefore, all MCoC organizations funded through HUD's Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability ("NOFA") have agreed to prioritize 100% of turnover beds for chronically homeless, up from 90% in 2015. In addition, Harbor Homes Inc. has reallocated a transitional housing project to add an additional 3 dedicated Chronically Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing beds as a new project in the 2015 CoC NOFA.

All programs serving the homeless in Manchester include connections to mainstream resources, job skill development referrals/assistance and information on educational resources within the case management spectrum. The City continues to work with and support these programs.

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

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

MHRA will continue to provide housing and housing assistance through its 1,270 public housing units, 132 Low Income Housing Tax Credit Units, and 2,074 units of rental assistance.

MHRA gets funding from HUD under the Public Housing Capital Fund Program for two areas of activity, (1) management improvements and (2) physical improvements. For FY 2016, management improvements include software improvements, professional training, items to improve public housing management and funding for other improvements. Planned physical improvements include interior rehabilitation of several scattered sites, heat pipe replacement at Elmwood Gardens, window repairs and exterior trim and siding replacement at Elmwood Gardens, roofing replacement and window repairs at Kelley Falls, roofing replacement at scattered sites, remodeling of efficiency apartments at Pariseau Apartments, and electrical panel replacement at Burns Apartments.

MHRA continues to look for innovative ways to provide housing and housing assistance and is presently working on a project with the Mental Health Center of Greater Manchester wherein 20 units of service-assisted housing are being developed for people with disabilities that lead to homelessness.

Resident initiatives designed to enrich the lives of MHRA's residents, to enhance opportunities for employment, and to enable elderly/disabled residents or to continue to live independently will be continued. These initiatives include the following: 1.) Family Self-Sufficiency Program for Housing Choice Voucher residents (with 25 participants currently enrolled). In addition, the Family Self-Sufficiency program will soon be offered to residents of Public Housing. 2.) Supportive Service Program for elderly residents and residents with disabilities residing in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit properties. 3.) Employment and MHRA resident employment: MHRA hires, trains and employs residents on government-financed projects and employs several assisted housing residents in permanent, full-time positions. 4.) MHRA will continue to work with local non-profits and to participate in coalitions such as GMASA (Greater Manchester Association of Service Agencies) and the Continuum of Care to increase housing opportunities for Manchester's homeless and low income residents. MHRA will continue to coordinate with partner agencies to assist low income residents to become economically self-sufficient.

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

MHRA encourages its residents to provide input in management decisions. One public housing resident sits on MHRA's Board of Commissioners. In addition, MHRA has a Resident Advisory Board comprising public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) residents which reviews and comments on the Annual and the Five Year Plans. MHRA also provides direct employment opportunities to public housing and HCV residents. Currently, MHRA employs two public housing residents and two participants of the HCV program. In addition, a number of MHRA's employees are former residents/participants.

MHRA's Homeownership Program allows eligible HCV residents to use their assistance toward the purchase of a home in MHRA's jurisdiction. Families who participate in this program must be first-time homebuyers and must attend and complete a homeownership and housing counseling program. Successful residents may use their voucher toward payment of the mortgage for up to 15 years, depending on the term of the original mortgage. Since the beginning of the program, 36 families have participated and there are 22 currently enrolled.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

N/A

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

Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)

The Community Improvement Program is ideally located in the Planning and Community Development Department enabling us to work together collaboratively to identify barriers and work towards solutions. Unfortunately, the regulatory requirements are not flexible and require creative work around solutions to be discussed between several members of the Staff in order to implement the needed solutions.

One of the major barriers that was discovered is the City's conflicting Building and Fire Codes. These two documents are designed to ensure the safety of housing throughout the City, so their ability to work together towards this end is crucial in creating and maintaining safe, decent and sanitary housing. Currently, the City Planning Department has begun working with the Fire Department to review Architectural Building Plans together to ensure a seamless blend of requirements and avoiding last minute construction delays and preventing future code violations. Unfortunately, this initiative is only employed for new construction, but in the future efforts can be made to utilize this relationship when existing housing violations are discovered.

In an effort to address the issue of a sub-par inspection cycle, the City increased the Concentrated Code Enforcement Division by adding a second Code Enforcement Officer as of December 2015. This additional employee help to inspect more units than what was done the previous year and will hopefully allow for the City to reduce the inspection cycle to once every two years. The shorter inspection cycle of residential, multi-family buildings will identify violations earlier and help to maintain the quality of housing before it gets too deteriorated.

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

The City realizes the demand for essential social services from the comments made at Citizen Participation meetings, written comments and the volume of applications received annually to assist programs with HUD funding. In an effort to provide an adequate level of public services to a large, diverse City, the partnership formed with Manchester Community Resource Center (MCRC) as a Community Based Development Organization (CBDO) has been crucial. MCRC is directly located in the lowest income census tracts within the City and works with clients from the same area. Their expertise in understanding client needs and meeting them with particular programming is invaluable in channeling resources directly to the most needed services and to ensure other funding goals are able to be achieved. From those efficiencies, some specific non-public service projects completed in the previous funding year included: substantial infrastructure improvements to roads, sidewalks and ADA accessibility. All of these activities expended funding in the previous Fiscal Year and worked to achieve positive results in neighborhoods in need of extra care.

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

The following provides a description of the strategies in place for the remediation and management of lead based paint and related health problems in the City.

Effectiveness of Lead Hazard Control Program (Manchester Housing Initiatives)

- Awarded \$2,905,091 by HUD to assess 205 housing units and repair 185 units over three years;
- Have trained 30 new contractors and lead abatement workers;
- Have inspected 95 units and repaired 66 units this project year.

Other Program Elements

In 2015, the City applied for and was granted a \$2.9 million-dollar Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant. The City of Manchester works closely with Alchemy Lead Management to assess housing units for lead hazards, to oversee construction management, and to ensure that there is training available to bring workers and contractors into the lead abatement labor pool. Program management and application intake are both managed in-house.

We have had the opportunity to partner with local non-profits and with health departments to disseminate educational information as well as program enrollment information. Our outreach effort, which paired our program flyer with water bills in targeted wards, was very successful, leading to an uptick in web searches, program inquiries, and received applications. We also had an informational table at a citywide event which attracted close to 5,000 under-resourced citizens, where we were able to reach tenants who would benefit from our services, and contractors who would like to enter the lead abatement field.

We have a robust connection with State lead inspectors, who let us know when a property with lead hazards will be put under order due to a finding of a child with elevated blood lead levels. We have found that property owners are willing to work with our program once they receive an Order of Lead Hazard Reduction from the State.

We also coordinate directly with city inspectors to ensure that city-required certificates of compliance are obtained for each rental housing unit. The rental housing codes, which must be met by Manchester property owners who come through our lead abatement program, track closely with Healthy Homes requirements. The information and data we are able to obtain from coordinating these efforts will inform future grant applications.

This year, the City has awarded contracts to at least 10 different construction firms through our competitive, sealed bid process. We have had excellent turnout at the required bid walk-throughs, which has kept pricing competitive. The LHRD project is currently on budget, and is ahead of schedule for unit assessment and completion benchmarks.

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

While no single agency or office in the City of Manchester has overall charge of an “anti-poverty strategy”, many programs operate under the premise of mitigating the cause of poverty, and making significant, permanent improvements in the lives of low and very low-income residents. It is also clear that the effort to increase the supply of affordable housing, services and jobs is an important part of an anti-poverty strategy. The lack of sufficient affordable housing in any community contributes to the economic difficulties of individuals or families who can barely afford – or who cannot afford – shelter. Conversely, when low or very low-income individuals are expending no more than thirty percent of their income on housing, they presumably have the ability to pay for other essential needs, such as food, utilities and healthcare. Thus, the City’s and agencies’ programs and policies address the spectrum of issues often facing the poor or near poor in our society. Other efforts to reduce poverty, administered by Manchester Community Resource Center and various local human service agencies include:

Emergency and Crisis Oriented Services:

- Health Services
- Nutrition
- Energy Assistance
- Domestic Violence Prevention
- Drug and Substance Abuse Treatment
- Crime Prevention
- Immigrant & Refugee Services

Comprehensive Program Services:

- Employment and Skills Training
- Vocational and Remedial Education
- Budgeting and Personal Finance
- New Citizen Assimilation Initiatives
- Counseling
- Affordable Housing
- Child Development Programs/Day Care Services
- Elderly Services
- Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services
- Veterans Services
- Rehabilitation Services
- Recreation Programs
- Youth Service

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

The institutional structure for housing in Manchester, other than those of the CIP staff and both local non profit and for profit housing providers, primarily involves Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority (MHRA).

MHRA was established by state statute as the local housing authority and the redevelopment agency for the City. Five commissioners who are appointed for staggered five-year terms by the Mayor govern the Authority. MHRA owns and manages 1,270 units of family and elderly housing in various sites throughout the City. It also administers 1,813 units of rental assistance under its Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program, 138 VASH vouchers, 100 Vouchers for Non-Elderly Persons with Disabilities and assists 23 additional households through the MOD/SRO Program.

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

The coordination of efforts between MHRA, which administers local housing resources, local non-profits such as Neighborworks Southern New Hampshire, The Way Home, Families In Transition, the YWCA, the Mental Health Center of Greater Manchester, Harbor Homes and New Horizons along with other service providers in the community, is emphasized. A strong relationship also exists between the City and Manchester's Community Based Development Organization, Manchester Community Resource Center. Representatives of the organizations mentioned above are also active in the Greater

Manchester Association of Social Service Agencies, the Continuum of Care and other coalitions.

MHRA is active in coordinating with a number of partner agencies to provide programs to assist low-income families to become economically self-sufficient. Programs mobilize a wide array of area resources to remove barriers to economic self-sufficiency for public housing residents. In concert with its partner agencies, MHRA promotes school to work and welfare to work training and transition.

The Manchester Continuum of Care (MCoC) exists to promote coordination between Manchester's homeless service providers and other community leaders in the ongoing development of a comprehensive system of care. MCoC will help in the coordination and use of community resources to prevent homelessness by helping families and individuals move from homelessness to successful placement in permanent housing.

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

In accordance with the requirements of Section 570.601(b) and as part of the City's Consolidated Plan, the City recently completed an analysis to identify any impediments to fair housing that may exist and in particular, within its own Housing Program. The June 2013 analysis included a review of applicable City policies, practices, and procedures resulting in the development of a plan of action to eliminate or improve identified conditions that limit fair housing choice. Information for this analysis is obtained through contact with various State, Federal, and Local Housing and Human Rights organizations that the City regularly interacts with and, in some instances, also funds. Such organizations include the New Hampshire Commission for Human Rights, NH Legal Assistance, Legal Advice and Referral Center (LARC), Child and Family Services, The HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority, New Hampshire Governor's Commission on Disability, New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority, New Hampshire pro bono Program through the State Bar, Neighborworks Southern New Hampshire and The Way Home a review of pertinent City policies, practices, and procedures resulting in the development of a plan of action to eliminate or ameliorate identified conditions that limit fair housing choice.

Based upon the findings of the 2013 Manchester, NH Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI), the City is confident that it has obtained a realistic and up to date awareness of the fair housing issues presently existing in Manchester.

As a part of the 2013 AI, the following impediments to fair housing choice were identified. These impediments are considered when making funding recommendations for the Program Year and most areas are address by program(s) within the Community Improvement Program for the reporting year:

1. Insufficient, Quality Affordable Housing
2. Crime and Safety
3. Housing Options for the Homeless/At-Risk of Homeless
4. Language and Cultural Barriers
5. Insufficient Fair Housing Information, Training, Education and Outreach
6. Insufficient Public Transportation and Services Outside the Center City.
7. Discrimination and Patterns of Segregation

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

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

In order to ensure compliance by operating agencies, the City Planning Department Community Improvement Program Staff uses its comprehensive project monitoring system to physically monitor entitlement funded activities. Through site visits and project progress reports, the CIP staff strives to ensure that all applicable regulations and procedures are complied with by the administering operating agency/city department. A systematic monitoring of the projects further serves to assist the departments and administering agencies through identification of problems and potential delays, and in the realization of the expected impact of their project within the schedules established at project inception. A Risk Assessment was performed to determine the organizations that presented the most risk. The risk assessments were scored, and the organizations that ranked in the top quartile were considered to be "high risk" and received "on-site" monitoring. Any organization that scored above a predetermined level received a "desk audit". CIP staff utilize both "desk audits" and "on-site" monitoring to assess the quality of program performance over the duration of the agreement or contract.

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

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

Following the protocol identified in the City of Manchester Citizen Participation Plan, the City will announce the release of performance reports (Comprehensive Annual Performance Evaluation Report) through a notice in the Union Leader. Copies will be available at the main branch of the Library, the West Side Library, Manchester Community Resource Center at 434 Lake Avenue and the Department of Planning and Community Development at City Hall. The City will provide a 15-day period for the public to submit comments on such reports prior to submitting them to the HUD.

The City will consider all comments it receives for use in preparing the performance reports. A summary of these comments and the City's response will be attached to the performance reports.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

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

During the past reporting year the activities and level of funds identified in the City’s 2015 Annual Action Plan submission were with minor exceptions, the exact activities and funds expended. A few new projects were added due the receipt of a large amount of CDBG program income. The deviations from the submissions in the Plan involved increases as well as some decreases in the budgets of identified projects.

CDBG project changes included:

- 710315 Highway Department – Intersection Improvement Project – Project cancelled due to inactivity.
- 710515 Highway Department – Municipal Infrastructure – budget increased by \$60,000 due to the reallocation of program funds.
- 211816 Community Security Enhancement Project - The Mental Health Center of Greater Manchester was cancelled due to the fact that Davis Bacon requirements were not complied with.
- 212016 Boys & Girls Club Gym Floor Replacement Project - \$50,000 project added to CIP due to the reallocation of program funds.
- 510516 Planning & Community Development – MPAL Rehabilitation – budget increased by \$100,000 due to the reallocation of program income.
- 610416 – New Horizons – Capital Improvements Loan – New Horizons did not accept the funding.
- 610516 Planning & Community Development - Dilapidated Building was cancelled due to inactivity.
- 610916 – Planning & Community Development – Concentrated Code Enforcement – budget increased by \$20,000 due to the reallocation of program funds.
- 611616 - Planning & Community Development – 2015 Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Program - budget increased by \$203,500 due to the reallocation of program income.
- 611916 - Planning & Community Development – 267 Wilson Street Project - \$300,000 project added to CIP due to the reallocation of program income.
- 810816 - Planning & Community Development – Impact Fee Study - \$40,000 project added to CIP due to the reallocation of program income.

HOME project changes included:

- 610814 - Planning & Community Development – HOME Housing Initiatives – budget increased by \$300,000 due to the reallocation of program income.
- 610915 - Planning & Community Development – HOME Housing Initiatives – budget increased by \$82,808 due to the reallocation of program income.
- 610916 - Planning & Community Development – HOME Housing Initiatives – budget increased by \$355,596 due to the reallocation of program income.

ESG project changes included:

- 611516 YWCA Crisis Service – Emily’s Place Operations – budget increased by \$5,200 due to the reallocation of program funds.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?	No
--	----

[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.

CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

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

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

Section intentionally left blank for DRAFT.

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

The City includes section 92.351 Affirmative Marketing in all of its Developer's Agreements to ensure understanding of procedures that must be in place to carry out affirmatively marketing units (if applicable) to eligible persons without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, religion, familial status or disability. Upon project completion, the subrecipient is provided with HUD form 935-2a (Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan) worksheet to assist with the development/evaluation of the marketing efforts. On an annual basis, the City conducts an audit requiring the subrecipient to submit an updated affirmative marketing plan, audited financials and project compliance report checklist. CIP Staff will review the submission and ensure outreach efforts are consistent with HUD regulations and the City's policies.

Of the City's HOME funded development projects still in their affordability period, 10 properties comprising 109 units are bound to the affirmative marketing requirements. These development projects are monitored annually and provided with HUD form 935-2a which they are required to return to the City. If not returned, a follow-up letter will be sent to obtain the information required for annual compliance as explained above. To date, the City has not had any issue obtaining and evaluating the marketing plans.

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

Section intentionally left blank for DRAFT.

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

Section intentionally left blank for DRAFT.

CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

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

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	MANCHESTER
Organizational DUNS Number	045009073
EIN/TIN Number	026000517
Identify the Field Office	BOSTON
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Manchester CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Mr
First Name	Todd
Middle Name	
Last Name	Fleming
Suffix	
Title	CIP Coordinator

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	One City Hall Plaza
Street Address 2	
City	Manchester
State	NH
ZIP Code	03101-
Phone Number	6036246450
Extension	
Fax Number	
Email Address	t Fleming@manchesternh.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	Mrs
First Name	Kerrie L
Last Name	Poplin
Suffix	
Title	CIP Planner
Phone Number	6036246450
Extension	
Email Address	kpoplin@manchesternh.gov

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date	07/01/2015
Program Year End Date	06/30/2016

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

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

City: Manchester

State: NH

Zip Code: 03105, 0448

DUNS Number: 095505905

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 14000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: FAMILIES IN TRANSITION

City: Manchester

State: NH

Zip Code: 03101, 1952

DUNS Number: 852360399

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 25000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: THE WAY HOME

City: Manchester

State: NH

Zip Code: 03103, 4813

DUNS Number: 146234211

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 48535

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NEW HORIZONS SHELTER

City: Manchester

State: NH

Zip Code: 03101,

DUNS Number: 014115225

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 35814

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: YWCA

City: Manchester

State: NH

Zip Code: 03101, 1806

DUNS Number: 111111111

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 15200

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	18
Children	15
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	33

Table 14 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	10
Children	6
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	16

Table 15 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	932
Children	133
Don't Know/Refused/Other	4
Missing Information	0
Total	1,069

Table 16 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	84
Children	15
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	99

Table 17 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	1,044
Children	169
Don't Know/Refused/Other	4
Missing Information	0
Total	1,217

Table 18 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	771
Female	436
Transgender	4
Don't Know/Refused/Other	6
Missing Information	0
Total	1,217

Table 19 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	169
18-24	392
25 and over	652
Don't Know/Refused/Other	4
Missing Information	0
Total	1,217

Table 20 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans	64	0	0	64
Victims of Domestic Violence	276	1	0	275
Elderly	40	2	0	38
HIV/AIDS	1	1	0	0
Chronically Homeless	337	0	0	337
Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill	299	2	3	294
Chronic Substance Abuse	38	0	0	38
Other Disability	439	6	3	430
Total (Unduplicated if possible)	776	8	6	762

Table 21 – Special Population Served

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

10. Shelter Utilization (Intentional Left Blank for Draft)

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	0
Total Number of bed-nights provided	0
Capacity Utilization	0.00%

Table 22 – Shelter Capacity

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

This information will be provided in the Final CAPER submission.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	12,000
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	5,000
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	0	0	17,000

Table 23 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	17,359	870
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	514	10,911
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	0	17,873	11,781

Table 24 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Essential Services	0	5,200	61,862
Operations	0	0	0
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	0	5,200	61,862

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
HMIS	0	0	0
Administration	0	0	10,929
Street Outreach	0	0	14,000

Table 26 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2013	2014	2015
124,645	0	23,073	115,572

Table 27 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2013	2014	2015
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	0	0
State Government	0	17,873	29,115
Local Government	0	0	26,467
Private Funds	0	5,200	47,902
Other	0	0	1,496
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	0	23,073	104,980

Table 28 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2013	2014	2015
252,698	0	46,146	220,552

Table 29 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities