

Proposed Consolidated Plan

2015
Annual Performance and Evaluation Report
Volume 1



Bill de Blasio
Mayor, City of New York

Carl Weisbrod
Director, Department of City Planning

NYCPLANNING
DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING CITY OF NEW YORK



Effective as of June 1, 2016

Proposed Consolidated Plan

2015
Annual Performance
and Evaluation Report
Volume 1

Bill de Blasio
Mayor, City of New York

Carl Weisbrod
Director, Department of City Planning



Department of City Planning
22 Reade Street, New York, NY 10007-1216

nyc.gov/planning

DCP# 15-01

**Proposed
2015 Consolidated Plan
Annual Performance and Evaluation Report
(CAPER)**

June 1, 2016

VOLUME 1

Table of Contents

Introduction

CR-05 Goals and Outcomes [91.520(a)]	1
CR-10 Racial and Ethnic composition of (person/households/families) Assisted	16
CR-15 Resources and Investments [91.520(a)]	17
CR-20 Affordable Housing [91.520(b)]	23
CR-25 Homeless and Other Special Needs [91.220(d, e); 91.520(c)]	25
CR-30 Public Housing [91.220(h)]	29
CR-35 Other Actions [91.220(j)-(k)]	33
CR-40 Monitoring [91.220(d, e); 91.520(c)]	53
CR-45 CDBG (specific) [91.520(c)]	59
CR-50 HOME (specific) [91.520(d)]	61
CR-55 HOPWA (specific) [91.520(e)]	63
ESG-specific	64
CR-60 Subrecipient Information	64
CR-70 Assistance Provided and Outcomes	70
CR-75 Expenditures	71

VOLUME 2

(This information is provided for reference)

Table of Contents

Appendices

- NYC Section 3 Reports
- 2015 NYC HOME Program Inspection Report
- ESG eCART (ESG-CAPER Annual Reporting Tool)
- 2015 NYC HOPWA Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report
(HOPWA CAPER) (form HUD-40110-D);
 - HOPWA Project Sponsor Directory

INTRODUCTION

As a condition of receiving U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) formula entitlement program funds (Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA), and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds, respectively), the City of New York is required to submit a Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). The Proposed 2015 CAPER reports on New York City's one-year progress (January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015) in using its annual entitlement grants award to address the priority needs and goals articulated in the City's Consolidated Plan Five-Year Strategic Plan for Consolidated Plan Years 2015-2019.

In May 2012, HUD's CPD office introduced the eCon-Planning Suite, a new electronic template for producing the (five-year) Consolidated Plan, One-Year Action Plans, and the associated Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) directly within HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS). HUD mandated that localities use the eCon-Planning Suite to formulate their next Consolidated Plan. In 2015, the City of New York used the eCon-Plan suite for the first time to formulate and submit its Proposed 2015 Consolidated Plan and One-Year Action Plan. Therefore, the Proposed 2015 CAPER represents New York City's first Performance Report formulated using HUD's template.

In addition, beginning 2015 localities receiving Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds were required to complete and submit the ESG eCART (ESG-CAPER Annual Reporting Tool) which supersedes the ESG-specific eCAPER module CR-65, ESG Persons Assisted. Therefore, the reader is requested to please refer to the appendix 2015 NYC eCART when reviewing ESG-related information in the respective eCAPER modules.

Similarly, as per HUD's guidance on March 4, 2016 [HOPWA Grantee Reporting in IDIS](#), the City's comprehensive HOPWA household output and accomplishment data is reported and available in the HOPWA CAPER (HUD-40110-D). Therefore, in order to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the City's HOPWA related programmatic expenditures and accomplishments the reader is also requested to refer to appendix HOPWA CAPER NYC 2015 when reviewing HOPWA-related data.

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

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

91.520(a)

This module provides information of the City of New York's 2015 performance with its entitlement funds. It defines the entitlement funds expended, and programmatic accomplishments for New York City's 2015 Consolidated Plan year, January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015. It includes: assessment of progress in fulfilling the vision of five-year strategy; adjustments in funding; and accomplishments; and nature and reasons for changes to program objectives, if any. (Changes to the CDBG program objectives, if any, are described in module CR-45, CDBG.) The City has reviewed, as it does every year, the progress made with the entitlement funds to address the priorities and objectives stated in the five-year strategy as described in the 2015 Consolidated Plan.

The City's review of its progress in carrying out its Strategic Plan (and Action Plan) is discussed in its Assessment narrative which follows Table 1 - Accomplishments.

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.

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

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Create Affordable Housing - New Construction	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$11,449,097	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	1055	715	67.77%	211	715	338.86%
Create New Homeownership Opportunities- Downpymnt	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$0	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	450	126	28.00%	90	126	140.00%
Emergency Shelter & Essential Services (ESG)	Homeless	ESG: \$6,279,987	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	74000	17717	23.94%	14800	17717	119.71%
Facilitate small business development and growth	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$542,270	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	29367	6053	20.61%	5729	6053	105.66%
Homeless Outreach (ESG)	Homeless	ESG: \$600,739	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	3000	163	5.43%	600	163	27.17%
Homeless Prevention (ESG)	Homeless	ESG: \$1,059,686	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	12500	7011	56.09%	2500	7496	299.84%
Improve literacy of low-skilled adults	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$1,498,084	Public service activities other than	Persons Assisted	8605	2082	24.20%	1730	2082	120.35%

			Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit							
Improve sanitary conditions throughout the City	Non-Housing Community Development Vacant Lots	CDBG: \$20,656,749	Other: Vacant Lots	Other: Vacant Lots	15466	2672	17.28%	2682	2672	99.63%
Increase accessible hsg for people w/disabilities	Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$15,757	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	23	1	4.35%	2	1	50.00%
Increase accessible hsg for people w/disabilities	Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$144,800	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	23	7	30.43%	0	7	
Increase capacity of local arts organizations	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$295,469	Other: Organizations	Other: Organizations	73	1	1.37%	12	1	8.33%
Increase housing stability among low-income PLWHA	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit	33624	34902	103.80%	33624	0	0.00%
Independent living for the elderly and disabled	Public Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$675,000	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	22770	4577	20.10%	4624	4577	98.98%
Maintain habitability for elderly homeowners	Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$362,091	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	11175	2135	19.11%	1850	2135	115.41%
Make the City more livable for	Non-Homeless	CDBG: \$148,669	Public service activities other than	Persons Assisted	910000	269026	29.56%	288554	269026	93.23%

ppl w/disabilities	Special Needs		Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit							
Preservation of historic buildings and areas	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$0	Facade treatment/business building rehabilitation	Business	5	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
Preservation of historic buildings and areas	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$60,235	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	15	5	33.33%	5	5	100.00%
Preserve and improve occupied private housing	Private Housing	CDBG: \$39,736,173	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	83845	26587	31.71%	60251	26587	44.13%
Preserve and improve occupied private housing	Private Housing	CDBG: \$36,936,564	Housing Code Enforcement/Foreclosed Property Care	Household Housing Unit	5645110	694533	12.30%	885000	694533	78.48%
Prevent Displacement and Reduce Cost Burdens-TBRA	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$0	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	6945	34	0.49%	1389	34	2.45%
Prevent long-term displacement and homelessness	Homeless	CDBG: \$15,041,270	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	6370	3094	48.57%	3390	3094	91.27%
Promote access to care among low-income PLWHA	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit	33624	34902	103.80%	33624	0	0.00%
Promote justice for victims of crime and abuse	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$3,231,179	Public service activities other than	Persons Assisted	599000	123304	20.58%	120000	123304	102.75%

			Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit							
Provide community green space through gardens	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$736,861	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	123694	96166	77.75%	76500	96166	125.71%
Provide day care services to low/mod households	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$2,965,966	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1885	205	10.88%	256	205	80.08%
Provide enrichment activities to low/mod areas	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$5,265,693	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	84000	20628	24.56%	17200	20628	119.93%
Provide recreational activities for low/mod people	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$1,541,143	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	86955438	16845459	19.37%	16834915	16845459	100.06%
Provide safe learning environment in City schools	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$4,648,192	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	779595	147295	18.89%	106950	147295	137.72%
Provide safe, accessible senior centers	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$1,087,647	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	15007	1699	11.32%	6584	1699	25.80%
Rapid Re-housing (ESG)	Homeless	ESG: \$87,339	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	1400	0	0.00%	280	0	0.00%
Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless	CDBG-DR: \$20,344,568	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	8200000	8200000	100.00%	8200000	8200000	100.00%

	Non-Housing Community Development									
Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG-DR: \$0	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	27850	0	0.00%	228	0	0.00%
Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG-DR: \$0	Brownfield acres remediated	Acre	69	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG-DR: \$364,309,503	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	32000	3548	11.09%	7532	3548	47.11%
Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG-DR: \$2,764,228	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	300	45	15.00%	169	45	26.63%

Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG-DR: \$10,163,694	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	430	45	10.47%	45	45	100.00%
Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG-DR: \$10,827,713	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	850	0	0.00%	10	0	0.00%
Recover and rebuild after Hurricane Sandy	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG-DR: \$0	Buildings Demolished	Buildings	400	0	0.00%	400	0	0.00%
Reduce discrimination and promote diversity	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$2,715,912	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	435000	52138	11.99%	43500	52138	119.86%
Reduce homelessness	Homeless	CDBG: \$3,500,527	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	46120	11708	25.39%	8821	11708	132.73%
Reduce homelessness among low-income PLWHA	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA: \$	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit	33624	34902	103.80%	33624	0	0.00%

Reduce hunger	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$0	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	318931	0	0.00%	43018	0	0.00%
Reduce hunger	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$315,912	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	192128		170400	192128	112.75%
Reduction of blighted properties	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$955,316	Buildings Demolished	Buildings	150	0	0.00%	0	0	
Return foreclosed housing to private ownership	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$14,784,729	Housing Code Enforcement/Foreclosed Property Care	Household Housing Unit	3077	2823	91.75%	2592	2823	108.91%
Revitalize commercial districts in low/mod areas	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$1,854,435	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	75	12	16.00%	11	12	109.09%
Revitalize the Bronx River and the adjacent area	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$208,954	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1440000	211395	14.68%	211000	211395	100.19%

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

The New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) transferred HOME Program funds to the New York City Human Resources Administration (HRA) to develop a Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) Program. 170 eligible families have been approved for assistance and are currently searching for suitable housing. In addition to the start of this program, HPD has transitioned those households previously receiving rental assistance through the HPD administered HOME TBRA program onto long-term rental subsidies.

New York City is creating new homeownership opportunities for existing renter households in the form of down payment assistance to first-time homebuyers. Eligible prospective homebuyers must qualify for a forgivable loan to use toward down payment and/or closing costs on a one- to four- family home, condominium or cooperative purchased in one of the five boroughs of New York City. In 2015, down payment assistance was provided to 126 households.

While the need in New York City for affordable housing continues to grow across most income groups, some feel the pressure more than others. In 2015, financing was provided to 22 developments in order to construct or rehabilitate affordable housing units that affect the most vulnerable populations. This financing aided in the addition of 715 affordable housing units to New York City housing stock.

CDBG Assessment of Program Performance

In 2015, the City's CD-funded programs generally met or exceeded their goals. However, five programs had actual accomplishments that were at least 25 percent lower than their 2015 projections. Below is an explanation for each activity.

- Alternative Enforcement Program (AEP): AEP did not meet its estimated goal of 425 housing units and, instead, achieved 256 housing units during Calendar Year 2015. However, the lower accomplishment number shows that less CD funds were needed to correct maintenance deficiencies in distressed buildings, which is an improvement from what was originally expected. Less units rehabilitated by the City during the program year reflects that more owners corrected the problems that the City required that they address. Further, the program received additional funds from the Mayor's Office to expand the program from 200 buildings to 250.
- Community Arts Development Program (CADP): CADP contracts with consulting firms to complete capacity building projects with small arts organizations. Accomplishments are reported following final payment to the vendors providing the services. This year, while CADP's CD-funded work was completed, the program had not yet paid all of its vendors. Final payments are expected to be made in early 2016.
- DFTA Senior Center Improvements: The program fell short of reaching its goal for a few reasons. First, DFTA used alternate funding sources for two projects that had originally been included in the proposed accomplishments. Another project was cancelled because the landlord would not provide the senior center with a long-term lease, which is a requirement for the renovation program. Finally, DFTA is in the process of rebidding a project after not receiving enough qualified bids.

- Emergency Repair Program (ERP): The Amended 2015 projection for this program was 59,800 housing units rehabilitated. The City's achieved accomplishment of 26,295 housing units was lower for two reasons. First, "Housing Units" was a new accomplishment indicator in Calendar Year 2015; ERP previously based its accomplishments on the number of violations corrected. Second, a greater proportion of owners completed repairs themselves in 2015. Emergency conditions referred to the program were only three percent lower than in 2014, but HPD needed to complete 15.8 percent fewer repairs in 2015.
- The Land Restoration Program (LRP): Due to the decline in CD-eligible vacant lots within the City, LRP is in the process of transitioning from treating vacant lots to focusing more on its Public Facilities and Public Service components, which benefit CD-eligible parks and gardens. A HUD ruling only allows the program to treat a lot for three years and then it is considered maintenance and ultimately not eligible for CD-funding.

Please see the CDBG Addenda for more detailed information on each CD-funded program's accomplishments.

CDBG Assessment of Addressing Specific Objectives

Program regulations state that every CD-funded activity must benefit either low- and moderate-income (low/mod) persons, prevent or eliminate slums or blight, or meet an urgent need. Further, at least 70 percent of CD program funds must benefit low/mod persons. New York City maintains discretion in using its funds for housing renovation, maintenance, and services; economic development; improvements and renovations to public facilities; and public services. The goals identified above and the programs that support them have been prioritized both for their ability to address the needs identified in the 2015-2019 Five-Year Strategic Plan and for their benefit to low/mod persons and communities.

For Calendar Year 2015, 83.9 percent of CD funds were used to benefit to low/mod persons. This was a significant drop from the 2014 figure of 92.1 percent. However, this reduction does not necessarily indicate that CD funds benefitted low/mod persons to a lesser extent. The primary reason for the reduction is a recategorization of the costs associated with lead-based paint work. In 2014, the City realized that its lead-related Housing Code enforcement efforts (through the Targeted Code Enforcement and Litigation programs) and lead remediation work (through the Emergency Repair Program) could not use the Low/Mod Area national objective; rather, the work must be categorized as either benefitting low/mod households or as preventing or eliminating slum or blighting conditions. The City thinks it is both infeasible and inappropriate to request the household incomes of the thousands of tenants that ask the City to inspect/remove lead-based paint hazards when their landlords fail to do so. Thus, the City recategorized all of the expenditures associated with lead-related code enforcement (\$6,860,646) and remediation (\$6,418,973) as meeting the Slum or Blight Spot national objective, resulting in the significant reduction in the overall low/mod benefit. However, as evident in the CDBG Appendices (primarily Appendix D), lead-based paint work overwhelmingly takes place in low/mod areas. In 2015, 82.2 percent of the Targeted Code Enforcement program's lead-based paint inspections and 91.7 percent of the Emergency Repair Program's work took place in low/mod census tracts.

The CD program is also limited in the programs that it can fund by the spending caps listed below. The City is close to both caps and cannot fund additional programs that would fall into these categories.

- A 15 percent cap on Public Services, which is calculated by dividing the sum of the Public Service expenditures and unliquidated obligations by the sum of the current year's grant and prior year's program income. In 2015, the City's Public Service percentage was 14.7 percent.
- A 20 percent cap on Planning and Administration activities, which is calculated by dividing the sum of the Planning and Administration expenditures and unliquidated obligations by the sum of the current year's grant and current year's program income. In 2015, the City's Planning and Administration percentage was 16.6 percent.

In 2015, the City had a total of \$238,381,934 available from the Federal Fiscal Year 2015 Entitlement, program income, revenue credits, and accruals. Total expenditures were \$189,650,048, an 80 percent expenditure rate. The City believes this is an acceptable expenditure rate, which was achieved by the City primarily funding ongoing programs. Unlike new programs, in which expenditures are delayed because of start-up concerns (e.g., staffing, site selection, contract registration, etc.), ongoing programs do not generally experience this lag each year. One new program, the DOE School Kitchen Renovations program, did face such issues in 2015, but activity is expected to increase dramatically in 2016.

CDBG PR 26 Report



Office of Community Planning and Development
 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Integrated Disbursement and Information System
 PR26 - CDBG Financial Summary Report
 Program Year 2015
 NEW YORK CITY , NY

DATE: 05-06-16
 TIME: 11:11
 PAGE: 1

PART I: SUMMARY OF CDBG RESOURCES

01 UNEXPENDED CDBG FUNDS AT END OF PREVIOUS PROGRAM YEAR	155,698,687.00
02 ENTITLEMENT GRANT	152,405,592.00
03 SURPLUS URBAN RENEWAL	0.00
04 SECTION 108 GUARANTEED LOAN FUNDS	0.00
05 CURRENT YEAR PROGRAM INCOME	55,420,881.00
05a CURRENT YEAR SECTION 108 PROGRAM INCOME (FOR SI TYPE)	0.00
06 FUNDS RETURNED TO THE LINE-OF-CREDIT	0.00
06a FUNDS RETURNED TO THE LOCAL CDBG ACCOUNT	0.00
07 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL AVAILABLE	66,697.00
08 TOTAL AVAILABLE (SUM, LINES 01-07)	363,591,857.00

PART II: SUMMARY OF CDBG EXPENDITURES

09 DISBURSEMENTS OTHER THAN SECTION 108 REPAYMENTS AND PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION	160,133,819.00
10 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LOW/MOD BENEFIT	(1,034,460.00)
11 AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LOW/MOD BENEFIT (LINE 09 + LINE 10)	159,099,359.00
12 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION	29,507,744.00
13 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR SECTION 108 REPAYMENTS	0.00
14 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,042,945.00
15 TOTAL EXPENDITURES (SUM, LINES 11-14)	189,650,048.00
16 UNEXPENDED BALANCE (LINE 08 - LINE 15)	173,941,809.00

PART III: LOWMOD BENEFIT THIS REPORTING PERIOD

17 EXPENDED FOR LOW/MOD HOUSING IN SPECIAL AREAS	0.00
18 EXPENDED FOR LOW/MOD MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	67,396,465.00
19 DISBURSED FOR OTHER LOW/MOD ACTIVITIES	136,510,055.00
20 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL LOW/MOD CREDIT	(70,485,860.00)
21 TOTAL LOW/MOD CREDIT (SUM, LINES 17-20)	133,420,660.00
22 PERCENT LOW/MOD CREDIT (LINE 21/LINE 11)	83.86%

LOW/MOD BENEFIT FOR MULTI-YEAR CERTIFICATIONS

23 PROGRAM YEARS(PY) COVERED IN CERTIFICATION	PY: 2014 PY: 2015 PY:
24 CUMULATIVE NET EXPENDITURES SUBJECT TO LOW/MOD BENEFIT CALCULATION	326,268,514.00
25 CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES BENEFITTING LOW/MOD PERSONS	287,347,110.00
26 PERCENT BENEFIT TO LOW/MOD PERSONS (LINE 25/LINE 24)	88.07%

PART IV: PUBLIC SERVICE (PS) CAP CALCULATIONS

27 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR PUBLIC SERVICES	23,604,589.00
28 PS UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF CURRENT PROGRAM YEAR	5,217,845.00
29 PS UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF PREVIOUS PROGRAM YEAR	5,484,160.00
30 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL PS OBLIGATIONS	(392,591.00)
31 TOTAL PS OBLIGATIONS (LINE 27 + LINE 28 - LINE 29 + LINE 30)	22,945,683.00
32 ENTITLEMENT GRANT	152,405,592.00
33 PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM INCOME	38,649,814.00
34 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL SUBJECT TO PS CAP	(34,450,338.00)
35 TOTAL SUBJECT TO PS CAP (SUM, LINES 32-34)	156,605,068.00
36 PERCENT FUNDS OBLIGATED FOR PS ACTIVITIES (LINE 31/LINE 35)	14.65%

PART V: PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION (PA) CAP

37 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION	29,507,744.00
38 PA UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF CURRENT PROGRAM YEAR	668,750.00
39 PA UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF PREVIOUS PROGRAM YEAR	3,200,251.00
40 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL PA OBLIGATIONS	1,042,945.00
41 TOTAL PA OBLIGATIONS (LINE 37 + LINE 38 - LINE 39 +LINE 40)	28,019,188.00
42 ENTITLEMENT GRANT	152,405,592.00
43 CURRENT YEAR PROGRAM INCOME	55,420,881.00
44 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL SUBJECT TO PA CAP	(39,358,748.00)
45 TOTAL SUBJECT TO PA CAP (SUM, LINES 42-44)	168,467,725.00
46 PERCENT FUNDS OBLIGATED FOR PA ACTIVITIES (LINE 41/LINE 45)	16.63%

PR 26 - CDBG Financial Summary Report Adjustments

APR 41 - Calendar Year 2015

Community Development Block Grant

Explanation of Adjustments to IDIS PR 26 Report - CDBG Financial Summary Report

The following adjustments were necessary to properly reflect New York City's financial summary data in the Integrated Disbursement and Information system (IDIS).

Line 07 - Adjustment To Compute Total Available:

Adjustment of \$66,697.00 is the program income amount from the Neighborhood Housing Services revolving loan fund for Calendar Year 2015.

Line 10 - Adjustment To Compute Total Amount Subject To Low/Mod Benefit:

Line 09 amount of \$160,133,819.00 is incorrect. The correct amount is \$159,099,359.00 which is the total expenditures reported less the Planning & Administration expenditures.

Line 09 PR 26	(160,133,819.00)
Correct Amount	<u>159,099,359.00</u>
Line 10 Adjustment	(1,034,460.00)

Line 14 - Adjustment To Compute Total Expenditures:

Line 12 amount of \$ 29,507,744.00 is incorrect. The correct amount expended for Planning & Administration is \$30,550,689.00.

Line 12 PR 26	(29,507,744.00)
Correct Amount	<u>30,550,689.00</u>
Line 14 Adjustment	1,042,945.00

Line 20 - Adjustment To Compute Total Low/Mod Credit:

Line 19 amount of \$136,510,055.00 is incorrect. The correct amount disbursed for other Low/Mod Activities is \$66,024,195.00.

Line 19 PR 26	(136,510,055.00)
Correct Amount	<u>66,024,195.00</u>
Line 20 Adjustment	(70,485,860.00)

Line 30 - Adjustment To Compute Total PS Obligations:

Line 27 amount of \$23,604,589.00 is incorrect. The correct amount disbursed for Public Services is \$23,211,998.00.

Line 27 PR 26	(23,604,589.00)
Correct Amount	<u>23,211,998.00</u>
Line 30 Adjustment	(392,591.00)

Line 34 - Adjustment To Compute Total Subject To PS CAP:

Adjustment of (\$34,450,338.00) reduces the prior year's income by the value of the prior year's revenue credits, leaving just the prior year's true program income for the Public Service CAP calculation.

Line 40 - Adjustment To Compute Total PA Obligations:

Line 37 amount of \$29,507,744.00 is incorrect. The correct amount expended for planning and administration is \$30,550,689.00.

Line 37 PR 26	(29,507,744.00)
Correct Amount	<u>30,550,689.00</u>
Line 40 Adjustment	1,042,945.00

Line 44 - Adjustment To Compute Total Subject to PA Cap:

Adjustment of (\$39,358,748.00) reduces the current year's income by the value of the current year's revenue credits, leaving just the current year's true program income for the Planning and Administration CAP calculation. The adjustment also increases the current year's program income by the value of the program income from the Neighborhood Housing Services revolving loan fund.

2015 Revenue Credits	(39,425,445.00)
2015 NHS Program Income	<u>66,697.00</u>
Line 44 Adjustment	(39,358,748.00)

ESG Assessment of Program Performance

New York City has made substantial progress in addressing the priority areas laid out in its 2015 Action Plan, which included Veterans Homelessness; Homeless outreach; Homelessness Prevention; Emergency Shelter and Essential Services; Chronic Homelessness; and Rapid Re-housing.

Highlights of the City's overall progress include:

- New York City was certified by the federal government as ending chronic veteran homelessness in December 2015.
- In 2015 alone, the City successfully placed over 1,000 veterans into stable, permanent housing, reducing the number of homeless veterans in the City and the Veterans Administration's system from 4,677 in 2011 to 453 as of May 2, 2016.
- Since July 2014, 16,745 New Yorkers have received eviction prevention and anti-harassment legal assistance.
- In 2015, the Homebase program enrolled 15,560 clients. Homebase is an extensive network of neighborhood-based services located in high-need areas to help residents remain in their communities and avoid entering shelter.
- In City Fiscal Year 2015, the City provided emergency rent arrears grants to nearly 53,000 households, a 27 percent increase from the prior year.
- 11,038 households, comprised of 32,352 individuals, were placed into or retained subsidized permanent housing through the City's nine new homelessness rental assistance programs and three ongoing shelter exit strategies programs from July 2014 through March 2016.
- A new partnership with the Mayor's Clergy Advisory Council and faith leaders to use unused space at houses of worship for street homeless is working to open 500 faith-based "Safe Haven" beds and social services.
- The creation of HOME-STAT (Homeless Outreach & Mobile Engagement Street Action Team), a comprehensive street homelessness outreach effort that includes daily canvassing of streets in Manhattan and an online dashboard system that maps requests for homeless outreach assistance from the public in December 2015.
- The creation of a Shelter Repair Squad that brought together for the first time five City monitoring agencies (housing preservation, buildings, fire, health, social services and homeless services) to systematically inspect and make critical repairs on all homeless shelters in NYC.
- A plan to create 15,000 units of supportive housing over the next 15 years for New Yorkers in need, including homeless veterans, survivors of domestic violence, and street homeless individuals.

The following is a status update on the progress made by the Department of Social Services (DSS), Department of Homeless Services (DHS), and Human Resources Administration (HRA) and its first year accomplishments for the goals listed in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan Five-Year Strategic Plan and Continuum of Care. The accomplishments reflect January 1 – December 31, 2015 DHS/ESG and HRA activities.

Overall, New York City has made unprecedented progress towards its goals. While ESG program funds comprise a small percentage of total funding for homeless services in the City, they continue to be a critical and integral component of the effort to prevent and reduce homelessness:

- DHS exceeded its ESG goals for Emergency Shelter and Essential Services by 120 percent based on the data available in HUD reporting system (eCart) from 22 shelters. ESG supported 28 programs under essential services in Emergency Shelters.
- While 915 persons were provided services through ESG-funded homeless outreach programs, the placement goal of 600 through the ESG-funded programs was not achieved. However, a number of changes and enhancements were made during 2015 to better and more quickly respond to street homelessness. This included the creation of HOME-STAT – Homeless Outreach & Mobile Engagement Street Action Teams. The initiative partners existing homeless response and prevention programs with a series of new initiatives designed to better identify, engage, and transition homeless New Yorkers to appropriate services and, ultimately, permanent housing. Recognizing the challenges of moving street homeless persons to permanent housing, DHS created “Safe Haven” a non-traditional model of emergency shelter. Different from HUD’s Safe Haven project model, this low threshold housing is for traditionally difficult to serve unsheltered individuals who repeatedly refused to enter shelter. Since 2014, 214 Safe Haven and stabilization beds have been added to the shelter system and the City is working to open 500 more in partnership with faith leaders. Once housed, case management works to address individual needs and to remove barriers to permanent housing placement. DHS will work with the ESG programs to monitor and assist them in modifying their activities within the recently added outreach services to ensure better progress towards achieving their placement goal.
- DHS exceeded its ESG goals for prevention services for single adults by 299 percent. Targeting these funds towards adults without children enabled the City to increase services to this population and maximize funding available only for families.

No data are available for ESG-funded rapid re-housing services because client outcomes were not documented in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) in 2015. As this is the first time eCart is being used and that DHS is uploading data from its case management system (CARES) into HMIS, not all projects have been able to be transitioned to this new reporting process. DHS as the lead HMIS grantee will work with all ESG funded programs to report into the HMIS, including the rapid re-housing portfolio, so that outcomes are consistently reported.

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)

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

	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG
White	189,821	555	0	823
Black or African American	177,600	773	0	3,499
Asian	36,928	79	0	28
American Indian or American Native	1,982	21	0	26
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1,136	19	0	57
Total	407,467	1,447	0	4,433
Hispanic	180,867	517	0	1,904
Not Hispanic	392,801	930	0	3,056

Narrative

For details on the racial and ethnic composition of families assisted with ESG, and HOPWA funding in 2015, please refer to the Appendices: *ESG eCART*, and *HOPWA 2015 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (HOPWA CAPER)*, respectively.

Please note that the chart above does not contain all of the racial categories that are available to CDBG Entitlement grantees in the IDIS reporting screens. CDBG funds were used to serve an additional 166,201 people of multiple race. Please see the CDBG Total Race and Ethnicity Table below.

In addition, chart above does not contain all the households assisted with ESG funds. A total of 5,170 families with children were served by ESG funded shelter programs in Calendar Year 2015. Missing from the chart above are 737 families, five households which identified themselves a Multiple Race, and 732 ESG clients as Don't Know/Refused. Regarding Hispanic Ethnicity, 210 households indicated Don't Know/Refused. The majority served were Black or African American (68%). Most were also Not Hispanic (59%). The other ESG funded programs serve adults without children.

<i>CDBG Race and Ethnicity</i>	Total	Hispanic
White:	189,821	29,944
Black/African American:	177,600	3,963
Asian:	36,928	91
American Indian/Alaskan Native:	1,982	97
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander:	1,136	192
American Indian/Alaskan Native & White:	16	1
Asian & White:	1	0
Black/African American & White:	61	13
American Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American:	53	3
Other multi-racial:	166,070	146,563
Total:	573,668	180,867

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Table 3 – Resources Made Available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG		895,440,000	189,641,563
HOME		52,128,430	11,641,388
HOPWA		188,147,912	48,873,956
ESG		54,400,252	9,316,171
Other	CDBG-DR	4,213,876,000	408,409,766
Other	Neighborhood Housing Services Revolving Loan	114,461	8,485

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.

HPD Capital matching Federal Funds

HPD's total capital budget for calendar year 2015 from all funding sources (including HUD) was approximately \$483,153,571. Of that amount \$481,001,571 came from the City. Of the City funds, \$132,912,000 was scheduled for programs that used City funds in conjunction with Federal funds (CDBG, HOME, Section 8, etc.). The remaining \$348,089,000 of City funds was used in programs that did not receive Federal funds.

The City used a portion of this \$132,912,000 figure to meet its 12.5% requirement to match HOME funds, in addition to using the appraised value of tax exemptions.

HPD Expense matching Federal Funds

HPD's total expense budget for calendar year 2015 from all funding sources (including HUD) was approximately \$764,748,218. Of that amount approximately \$87,244,610 came from the City (tax levy, Inter-Fund Agreement (IFA), and Intra-City). Of the City funds, approximately \$46,289,114 was scheduled for programs that used City funds in conjunction with Federal funds (CDBG, HOME, Section 8, etc.). The remaining approximately \$40,955,496 of City funds was used in programs that did not receive Federal funds.

HPD Capital without Federal Funds

In Calendar Year 2015, HPD committed approximately \$348,089,000 in programs that received no Federal funds.

HPD Expense without Federal Funds

In Calendar Year 2015 HPD budgeted approximately \$40,955,496 in programs that received no Federal funds.

HOPWA Leveraged Funds:

In calendar year 2015, HOPWA dollars were combined with other federal resources, as well as State and City funding, to support HIV/AIDS housing and other services. HASA used City Tax Levy and matching State and federal dollars to fund case management; rental assistance; permanent and transitional congregate housing; and permanent scattered-site housing for low-income individuals and families living with AIDS or clinical symptomatic HIV illness. Eligible clients also received medical assistance, homecare, and homemaking services funded with City, State and federal dollars. HOPWA funds distributed to community-based organizations by DOHMH augmented City and State-funded services to persons with mental illness and HIV/AIDS. In the Lower Hudson Valley region of the NYC EMSA, State, City and County funds complement HOPWA-funded rental assistance and other supportive services. Individual-donor and private foundation dollars provided additional support to community-based organizations funded through HASA and DOHMH. In summary, the total funding leveraged across all HOPWA programs in 2015 totaled \$467,920,522.

In 2015, the majority of ESG funding was used for emergency shelter and essential services to create or staff new programs; provide enhancements for existing programs; and by other City agencies to support additional programs. Three organizations received funding to provide street outreach services. Seven organizations received ESG funds for prevention services, and DHS and two organizations used ESG to support rapid rehousing services. ESG funds were also used by DHS for administrative support and to manage the HMIS system.

The City of New York provides a dollar for dollar match to the ESG award through City Tax Levy funds. In 2015, approximately \$9 million in City Tax Levy funds were used to match ESG funds received from HUD. In addition to the required matching funds, the City of New York provides additional City Tax Levy expense and capital funds that are used for family and adult shelters; prevention services including legal services, emergency rent arrears and community based programs; rental assistance and permanent supportive housing; and program administration. The City also receives funding from the Federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant and Homeless Assistance Funds through the State of New York, as well as New York State general fund dollars which are used for programs and services for families and for adults without children.

ESG Leveraged/Matching Funds

DHS Expense with Federal Funds

DHS expended approximately \$1.171 billion in City Fiscal Year 2015 on homeless services related to the Coalition of the Continuum of Care. Not including CDBG and ESG funds used by DHS to provide homeless services, the total is approximately \$1.157 billion, which includes approximately \$9 million in City Tax Levy funds used to match ESG funds received from HUD. Of the \$1.157 billion, approximately \$109,418,879 was used in conjunction with U.S Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. The remaining shares of the \$109.419 million are approximately 45% City tax levy and 13% State of New York general funds.

DHS Capital without Federal Funds

The City expended approximately \$57,564,000 in City Capital funds for DHS programs .

DHS Expense without Federal Funds

In addition to the approximately \$9 million in City tax levy funds used for the ESG match, and the \$109.418 million used in conjunction with the TANF block grant, the City used approximately \$1.044 billion in CFY 2015 for the provision of homeless services without Federal block grant funds, such as CD, ESG or the TANF block grant. This represents the City's contribution to the Continuum of Care. The City tax levy funds in the \$638.21 million \$ leverage federal and New York State funds through the City's contributions to the TANF maintenance of effort and the New York State reimbursement for general assistance, adult shelter expenditures and permanent supportive SRO operating subsidies.

Table 4 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	740,827,268
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	71,740,856
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	812,568,124
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	0
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	812,568,124

Table 5 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

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
3569	12/01/2015	0	2,783,167	0	0	0	355,174	3,138,341
3728	08/01/2015	0	6,647,939	9,990,000	0	0	153,035	16,790,974
3741	12/01/2015	0	1,658,821	0	0	0	5,131,524	6,790,345
3755	08/01/2015	0	2,320,034	0	0	0	1,955,742	4,275,776
3942	12/01/2015	0	7,507,259	3,979,999	0	0	602,156	12,089,414
4398	08/01/2015	0	1,120,441	0	0	0	555,252	1,675,693
4403	08/01/2015	0	1,324,184	0	0	0	389,403	1,713,587
4430	12/01/2015	0	8,225,608	8,100,000	0	0	284,757	16,610,365
5357	12/01/2015	0	478,897	0	0	0	537,572	1,016,451
5480	12/01/2015	0	7,613,669	0	0	0	26,241	7,639,910

HOME MBE/WBE report

Table 6 – Program Income

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at begin-ning 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 \$
0	5,882,078	5,150,078	0	732,000

Table 7 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

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	347,790,819	0	0	0	0	347,790,819
Number	19	0	0	0	0	19
Sub-Contracts						
Number	383	0	18	13	45	307
Dollar Amount	192,317,274	0	5,227,450	3,740,084	13,786,860	169,562,880
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	347,790,819	0	347,790,819			
Number	19	0	19			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	383	36	347			
Dollar Amount	192,317,274	14,026,314	178,290,960			

Table 8 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

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

Table 9 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		0	0			
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

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.

Table 10 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	1,389	0
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	90	708
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	211	167
Total	1,690	875

Table 11 – Number of Households Supported

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	1,389	34
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	179	470
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	32	245
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	90	126
Total	1,690	875

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

In developing the 2015 Consolidated Plan the City anticipated using a substantial portion of the HOME grant for Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) to address the homelessness crisis the City is experiencing. At the time of submission we estimated that 1,389 households could be assisted with TBRA however lease-ups took longer than expected. As such, allocated funds intended for TBRA were used on other affordable housing developments including projects serving people who are homeless and who have special needs. Additionally, it is important to note that HUD's reporting system asks localities to separately report homeless and special needs households. However, the City uses HOME funds for supportive housing that is designed for people who are both homeless and who concurrently have special needs.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

In recent years the City has primarily allocated its HOME grant for either special needs/homeless housing or for downpayment assistance for first time homebuyers. This year's outcomes support the City's belief that HOME funds can be used successfully in this way and expects this usage of funds to continue in future annual action plans.

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.

Table 12 – Number of Persons Served

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	0	1,045
Low-income	0	296
Moderate-income	0	0
Total	0	1,341

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

As part of Mayor de Blasio's commitment to leveraging existing City resources to reduce the number of families in homeless shelters and to meet local housing needs, the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) re-instated the policy to give homeless families in Department of Homeless Services (DHS) shelters the highest priority level for NYCHA public housing in 2014. DHS-referred homeless families already have the highest priority for housing in NYCHA's Section 8 program.

To combat homelessness, NYCHA has provided homes to more than 3,350 formerly homeless households during calendar year 2015. Households assisted included 2,418 in public housing and 953 through Section 8. The Section 8 households comprised 426 families and 527 rentals to veterans.

ESG funds support outreach activities to street homeless persons to help them move into transitional and permanent housing. In 2015, it supported three outreach teams in coordinating services and making placements in drop-in centers, safe havens, stabilization beds, shelters and permanent housing settings. Many of these placements also provide homeless individuals with meals, counseling, medical/psychiatric services, showers, laundry facilities, recreation space, referrals for employment, assistance in applying for benefits and other social services. Through ESG funding, (915) unsheltered persons received services and (163) were placed into shelter or housing.

In addition, DHS deploys outreach teams 24 hours a day, seven days a week. DHS and DOHMH jointly fund four (4) street outreach programs and the MTA co-funds the transit program with DHS. The scope of this outreach includes homeless services in all five boroughs of NYC and 469 stations of the NYC subway system. In partnership with the MTA, DHS has tripled the number of outreach workers in the subways, from roughly 20 to 60 full time staff. Outreach workers made over 700 placements from the subway system during the first year.

At the end of 2015, the City launched HOME-STAT (Homeless Outreach & Mobile Engagement Street Action Team), a comprehensive street homelessness outreach effort that includes daily canvassing of streets in Manhattan and an online dashboard system that maps requests for homeless outreach assistance from the public. Fully implemented, it increases overall outreach staff from 175 to more than 300.

Evidence of the work done in 2015 was found in the annual federally-mandated Homeless Outreach Population Estimate (HOPE) street homeless survey, which found 2,794 homeless individuals were living on the streets of New York City in February 2016, 12 percent fewer than last year and 36 percent fewer than the first count in 2005.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Governed by a unique right to shelter mandate, New York City provides temporary emergency shelter to every man, woman, and child who does not have housing alternatives available to them, every night. At the end of 2015, 169 shelters for families with children, 83 shelters for single adults, and 24 shelters for adult families were in operation under the administration of DHS. ESG funding provided critical support to these shelters in the following ways:

- Twenty (20) Single Adult shelter programs, seven (7) Family emergency shelter programs, and one (1) Youth emergency shelter program received ESG funding in 2015. DHS placed 3,209 individuals from these ESG funded shelters into permanent housing during the year.
- DHS operates several shelters specifically for clients who have substance use issues. ESG funding supported substance use counselors at one shelter and substance-use services at two other shelters. Through these initiatives, 393 persons were placed into permanent housing in 2015.
- ESG funding supported mental health services at five shelters. These programs placed 342 clients into permanent housing in 2015.
 - New York City created a non-traditional model of emergency shelter for unsheltered individuals who repeatedly refused to enter shelter called a “Safe Haven” (not to be confused with HUD-funded Safe Havens). These shelters offer low-threshold rules and provide private/semi-private sleeping areas. A flexible model, it allows providers to best meet the needs of the chronically unsheltered Homeless population and are used for placement by outreach teams only. NYC Safe Havens, which are partially funded with ESG funding, placed 93 clients into permanent housing in 2015.
 - ESG funding supported two Drop-In Centers in 2015. Drop-in Centers provide clients with food, shower/bathroom facilities and chairs to rest. Case managers and housing specialists work clients to obtain any needed services, medical care, mental health treatment, benefits and permanent housing. In 2015, these two Drop-In Centers placed 278 clients into permanent and transitional housing.

In 2015, NYC also committed to adding 300 emergency beds and 400 Tier II shelter units for survivors of domestic violence. Once fully in place, a total of about 13,300 children and adults can be served a year, a 50 percent increase over the current 8,800 individuals served yearly.

The City is also working to improve conditions in existing shelters. It has created a coordinated Shelter Repair Squad that aggressively inspects homeless shelters to identify and address building violations and shelters in need of repairs, and will expand a hotline for shelter residents so that it can respond quickly to their concerns. By December 2018, the City will phase out the use of “cluster site” shelter units, returning them to the market so that the apartments can be restored as low-rent 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

The Homebase program remains at the center of New York City's prevention efforts. Comprised of community-based organizations in areas of high-need, Homebase assists families and individuals overcome immediate housing issues that could result in them becoming homeless and helps them stay in the community in permanent housing. With locations throughout the five boroughs, assistance is individualized to meet the needs of each household. Services include family or tenant/landlord mediation; household budgeting; emergency rental assistance; job training and placement; and benefits advocacy (child care, food stamps, tax credits, public health insurance).

Eleven out of the City's 23 Homebase programs received ESG funds in 2015, helping 7,496 single adults and adult families. ESG rapid rehousing funds were also used to provide relocation and stabilization services / financial assistance through two Homebase programs.

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

The City continues to help homeless individuals move to permanent housing, especially chronically homeless individuals, veterans and youth. In 2015, 3,209 individuals in ESG funded shelters were placed into permanent housing.

Employment is a cornerstone of DHS' effort to help its clients return to housing independence. ESG funds support several employment initiatives, including a program offering a substance-free environment for men that stresses the importance of saving money and self-sufficiency. This program offers career counseling, job search and placement services. A total of 503 men were served by this program in 2015.

Additionally:

- Through a collaborative citywide effort, NYC achieved and the federal government certified the end of chronic veteran homelessness;
- The City's nine new homelessness rental assistance programs - Living in Communities (LINC) 1-6, the City Family Eviction Prevention Supplement Program (CITYFEPS), the Special Exit and Prevention Supplement Program (SEPS), and HOME-Tenant Based Rental Assistance (HOME TBRA) - and three ongoing shelter exit strategies for persons into supportive and affordable housing - NYCHA, Section 8 - 11,038 households, comprised of 32,352 individuals, have been placed into or retained permanent housing between July of 2014 and March of 2016; and
- A comprehensive plan to monitor and close down encampments of homeless persons began in September 2015 with the closing of 21 encampments. Fifty-five percent of the individuals' encountered were placed into permanent housing.

New York City is continuing to implement and refine new strategies to increase permanent housing placements. These efforts include expanding HomeBase staffing and services; streamlining access to DYCD shelter for homeless youth; continuing to utilize NYCHA placements to address homelessness;

consolidating and streamlining rental assistance programs; adding additional Aftercare services, and increasing enforcement of source of income discrimination law.

Some of these programs started in 2015 and are helping working families/individuals, vulnerable families, survivors of domestic violence, and elderly individuals/families move into permanent housing. The City will also continue its efforts to achieve and maintain veteran functional zero by offering specialized rehousing services.

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

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

The Public Housing Reform Act of 1998 allows for the development of public housing units, either replacement or incremental, through mixed-finance transactions. Developments recently completed or currently under construction include:

East 173rd Street and Vyse Avenue

The Rev. Crawford housing development is being developed in three phases and will result in 224 new units in the Bronx. After subdividing the property into three parcels, NYCHA will convey each site separately as the developer obtains financing. Phase I of the project with 84 units affordable to households earning up to 60% Area Median Income (AMI) was completed and tenanted in 2012. Phase II of the project with 84 units was completed and tenanted in 2015. The third phase will contain 56 units. Twenty-five (25) percent of the units will be set-aside for income eligible NYCHA residents or Section 8 Voucher holders from NYCHA's waiting list.

Highbridge Gardens

The development at Highbridge Gardens consists of two buildings, yielding 220 units affordable to households making 60% Area Median Income (AMI) in the Bronx. In addition, the development will provide approximately 65 surface parking spaces, a community room and other tenant facilities. Also, a site adjacent to the new housing site has been conveyed to the School Construction Authority for a 390-seat school. The first phase, Highbridge Terrace, was completed in 2012; and the second phase, Highbridge Overlook, in 2014. The new middle-school opened for the 2013 -14 school year. Highbridge is 100% complete and occupied; and the new middle-school is in full operation.

Washington Houses

The development at Washington Houses in East Harlem consists of one building containing 89 units of affordable housing above a 450-seat K-8 charter school. Current NYCHA residents will receive a preference for the newly created units. The school opened for the 2014-15 school year; and the housing was completed and tenanted in 2015.

Linden & Boulevard Houses

The Linden and Boulevard Houses parking lot located in Brooklyn was first proposed for the construction of fifty-three for-sale townhouses (fifteen two-family and thirty-eight three-family townhomes) containing a total of 144 units. Due to financing difficulty occasioned by the 2008-09 economic slowdown, the designated developer has recast the homeownership housing proposal with rental housing for up to 240 low-income families, along with a community facility. The project is currently under construction.

An 80-unit building for seniors was developed on the southeast corner of the central parking lot with Section 202 funding. The building was completed and tenanted in 2015.

Soundview Houses

The development at Soundview Houses in the Bronx will consist of two 8-story rental buildings: one for families (120 units); one for seniors (86 units) and 16 two-family townhouses for homeownership. The senior units will be affordable to households making up to 50% Area Median Income (AMI), while the other rental units will be affordable for households making up to 60% AMI. The affordability of the

townhouses is under review. The developer will also construct the extension of the mapped Bronx River Avenue as part of the development agreement. A developer for the project was selected in October of 2008. Closing and ground breaking took place in 2013. The family building is complete, and tenancing has begun. The senior building is under construction, and will be completed in 2016.

Section 8 Recapitalization Transaction

In December 2014 the Authority closed a mixed finance transaction that will rehabilitate 875 Project-Based Section 8 dwelling units locate in six multifamily housing developments. These developments are in Kings, New York and Bronx Counties and NYCHA has owned them since the late 1970s. Utilizing NYC Housing Development Corp. tax-exempt bonds and the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program, Triborough Preservation LLC undertook rehabilitation of the six sites, including energy and security upgrades, common and landscaped and retail spaces. No current residents will be displaced as a result and this financing will assure the properties remain affordable and in a state of "good repair" for at least the next thirty years.

Prospect Plaza

NYCHA and HPD have selected Blue Sea and Partners to redevelop Prospect Plaza in Brooklyn as a new mixed finance, mid-rise development to be constructed in three consecutive phases. Prospect Plaza will have 364 new housing units, including 80 public housing units and 284 affordable units. The project also includes a 22,000 square-foot supermarket, a 12,000 square-foot community center, and a 30,000 square-foot recreation area on a city-owned property adjacent to Prospect Plaza. The second housing phase closed in December 2014 and construction will be completed by August 2016. The third phase of development, which includes housing along with mixed-use ground floor retail space and community facility, will close in March 2016 with construction to be completed by March 2018. Completion of the final phase will also represent 100% completion of NYCHA's 1999 Prospect Plaza HOPE VI Revitalization Plan.

Randolph Houses

Randolph Houses in Central Harlem will be extensively rehabilitated, and will result in 302 units of housing; 147 public housing units and 155 affordable housing units. The existing individual tenement buildings will be modified internally so that they are grouped into several larger buildings with a common circulation core with elevators. Construction closing took place in December 2013. The first phase of the development is complete, and tenancing is underway. The second phase of the development is expected to close in 2016.

La Preciosa

This 7-story building, 49-unit low-income building in the Morrisania section of the Bronx was completed in 2015 by the Bronx Pro Group on its property at 1070 Washington Avenue. The building contains 21 public housing units for families on NYCHA's waiting list, making La Preciosa the first such collaboration between NYCHA and private partners. The building meets LEED for Homes Gold Certification and Enterprise Green Communities criteria with energy efficient features such as solar thermal panels, green roof and fiberglass windows. Amenities for the residents include laundry rooms, a meeting room, a landscaped backyard with a playground as well as a bike room and off-street parking on an adjacent site at 1085 Washington Avenue.

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

Public Safety Advisory Committee

As part of NextGeneration NYCHA, the New York City Housing Authority will soon launch a Public Housing Advisory Committee. It will build on the strengths of NYCHA communities to improve resident safety and quality of life. Of the resident PSAC members, the Advisory Committee is recruiting two young NYCHA residents (age 18 to 24) to serve on the committee.

Resident Associations

Most NYCHA developments have resident associations, also known as tenant associations, resident councils, or tenant councils. These democratic organizations are dedicated to improving the quality of life in NYCHA developments and the surrounding neighborhoods. They work with NYCHA management at every level, giving residents a real voice in the operation of their developments. Each resident association's executive board is elected by association members and typically consists of a president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and sergeant-at-arms. NYCHA helps residents create a resident association if their development does not already have one. To find out how they can join or create a resident association, residents can contact their development's Management Office.

The Citywide Council of Presidents

Every president of a recognized resident association is a member of one of nine Citywide Council of Presidents (CCOP) districts in the city. Resident association presidents elect a Chair to represent their district. Members of the CCOP automatically become members on the Resident Advisory Board, described below.

CCOP works with senior NYCHA staff on the issues affecting life in NYCHA developments, engaging with government at all levels (local, state, and federal). CCOP Executive Board officers were elected to serve an approximate three-year term. This current Board will serve from July 21, 2014, through December 2016, or until succeeding officers are elected.

The Resident Advisory Board

The Resident Advisory Board (RAB) consists of public housing and Section 8 residents. It primarily addresses various aspects of NYCHA's annual and five-year agency plans, which set forth NYCHA's priorities and policies in 18 core areas and chart the course for NYCHA's short-term and long-term future. RAB members express concerns, make recommendations, and advise NYCHA management as the plans are drafted. RAB's recommendations for the final plan are incorporated when the plan is submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

RAB members are responsible for informing residents in each development/district about the plans' development at both the draft and final stages. There are more than 80 RAB members, consisting of 45 elected resident association presidents, 5 Section 8 representatives, and 31 alternates.

Resident Watch Program

For over 40 years, thousands of residents have volunteered their time to enhance the safety and security of their communities through the Resident Watch program (formerly Tenant Patrol). By patrolling their development, resident volunteers help make their homes safer and more secure while building communities and fostering pride in their development. NYCHA strongly encourages resident

volunteers to implement lobby, roving or youth watch groups as part of the Resident Watch Initiative, as well as to work with their Property manager to create a safe and supportive environment for themselves, families and neighbors.

Homebuyer Education

In 2015, NYCHA's Resident Economic Empowerment and Sustainability (REES) piloted homebuyer education as a new service offering under the financial literacy and asset building portfolio. For this work, they partnered with Bridge Street Development Corporation (BSDC), a local organization serving the Bedford-Stuyvesant and Brownsville areas of Brooklyn; Neighborhood Housing Services of Staten Island (NHS of SI) and Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America (NACA), which is a national organization that offers a low-interest rate mortgage. BSDC and NHS of SI facilitated workshops that led to residents having the opportunity to earn a First-Time Homebuyer Certificate which is required to apply for certain down-payment assistance grants. Homeownership education has received positive responses from NYCHA residents and NYCHA Section 8 voucher holders with more than 300 interested residents attending REES-coordinated and partner led workshops to learn about the home-buying process. In 2015 REES continued to collaborate with the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Financial Empowerment and other community based partners to make 555 financial counseling referrals to NYCHA residents and NYCHA Section 8 voucher holders. Many of these referrals came from residents who attended a homebuyer education workshop and were encouraged to accept a financial counseling referral to begin assessing their financial readiness to become homeowners. Also in 2015, REES launched a new way for residents to request a financial counseling referral online through Opportunity Connect.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

The New York City Housing Authority is not designated as troubled.

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)

One of the objectives of Mayor de Blasio's ten-year housing plan was the establishment of a new Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Program (MIH) to ensure that the housing marketplace serves New Yorkers at a broader range of income levels. The program would apply to all medium- and high-density districts where rezonings provide an opportunity for significantly more housing. The City would require a portion of the housing developed to be affordable.

In addition, the City proposed several amendments to the Zoning Resolution in 2015 to encourage development. These amendments reduce requirements for parking and relax minimum unit sizes where they prevent the creation of appropriately sized senior housing units. The amendments are commonly referred to as Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA).

With new housing comes increased demand for a wide range of services necessary to promote vibrant, mixed-use neighborhoods. Stringent zoning parking requirements for commercial uses discourage new buildings from also including housing.

The height of ground-floor retail spaces in mixed-use buildings is often constrained by current zoning limits for building height and setback thereby inhibiting the creation modern, high-quality retail space.

The elderly represent the fastest growing segment of New York City's population which increases the demand for the production of senior housing in addition to enhanced housing supports and services.

In September 2015 City Planning referred the proposed MIH and ZQA zoning text amendments for the City's full public land use review process. At the end of the 2015 Consolidated Plan program year, the MIH and ZQA zoning text amendments were undergoing the City's public review process.

Editor's Note: Both the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing and Zoning for Quality and Affordability were adopted by the Planning Commission in early February 2016 and sent to the City Council for their review. On March 22, 2016, the City Council approved the MIH and ZQA text amendments, with modifications. More information on these zoning text amendments is found on DCP's website: www.nyc.gov/planning.

NYCHA's Accessibility and Visitability Activities

The New York City Housing Authority's (NYCHA) conventional Public Housing Program has 177,657 (as of January 1, 2016) apartments in 328 developments throughout the City in 2,547 residential buildings. As of January 2016, NYCHA has a total of 7,628 fully converted accessible apartments for people with mobility impairments, of which approximately 7,500 are occupied. Furthermore, ninety-eight percent of NYCHA's developments, serving approximately 175,818 families and 403,275 authorized residents, meet visitability standards, allowing mobility impaired persons to visit families and friends. Visitability means that: 1) at least one entrance is at grade (no step), approached by an accessible route, such as a

sidewalk; and (2) the entrance door and all interior doors on the first floor are at least 34 inches wide, offering 32 inches of clear passage space. A visitable home also serves persons without disabilities (for example, a person pushing a stroller or delivering large appliances).

NYCHA's Tenant Selection and Assignment Plan

NYCHA's Tenant Selection and Assignment Plan (TSAP) ensures families are selected for housing in a non-discriminatory manner, in compliance with Title VI, the Fair Housing Act, and HUD regulations. TSAP requires computer-based selections of public housing applicants and transferees.

NYCHA's Section 18 Demolition/Disposition Compliance

NYCHA applies to HUD to seek approval for all demolition/disposition activities affecting NYCHA Public Housing property. If applicable, a plan for the relocation of tenants who would be displaced by the action, including descriptions of reasonable accommodations and timetable for relocation, is included. NYCHA also certifies that the proposed action does not violate any remedial civil rights order or agreement, voluntary compliance agreement or other court order or agreement.

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

As indicated in the City's Consolidated Plan, the City recognizes the need for more Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). In order to meet the need for PSH, the City has taken steps to expand available supportive housing resources. In November of 2015, Mayor de Blasio announced a new plan to create 15,000 units of supportive housing over the next 15 years. The 15,000-unit plan is comprised of roughly 7,500 newly-developed, congregate units and 7,500 scattered site units. The plan will target New Yorkers in need, including homeless veterans, survivors of domestic violence, and street homeless individuals. Supportive housing is a proven, cost-effective approach to deliver stability and permanently house New Yorkers struggling with mental illness, homelessness, and substance use. At the same time, it reduces reliance on homeless shelters, hospitals, mental health institutions, and incarceration.

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

The City operates several programs to investigate, treat and reduce lead-based paint hazards. The City investigates, abates, and removes LBP hazards in City-owned properties and in privately owned dwellings where owners are unwilling or unable to do so after receiving violations from a City agency related to lead-based paint. Where a lead-poisoned child is identified, the DOHMH orders the owner to abate lead paint hazards. If the owner fails to do so, HPD's Emergency Repair Program (ERP) will do the work and place a lien against the property for the cost. For calendar year 2015, HPD maintained four (4) requirements-type contracts for lead hazard reduction at a cumulative total contract maximum of \$6,400,000. In addition, HPD had five (5) contracts for dust wipe analysis at a total contract maximum of \$25,000 each.

In 2015, ERP completed 34,286 initial inspections, uncovering a total of 11,269 violations. 1,944 re-inspections were performed and certified as corrected. An additional 13,388 violations were removed due to corrections by either the owner or HPD.

NYCHA complies with Federal, State, and City laws and regulations concerning lead and executes HUD directives regarding lead-based paint (LBP). NYCHA identifies hazards posed by paint, dust and soil, and implements programs designed to control or mitigate such hazards safely and efficiently. Among other things, NYCHA evaluates and eliminates lead hazards on apartment turnover; inspects apartments with children under 6 for the presence of lead paint hazards; and provides information to new tenants on lead paint hazards.

The Department of Homeless Services oversees and manages several initiatives to investigate, treat and eliminate lead-based paint (LBP) hazards in homeless shelters that are operated by the agency, or are operated under contract with the agency. ESG funding allocated through DHS is not used for any maintenance or operation of shelters for Families with Children.

All construction, renovation, and repair work at DHS' facilities is preceded by certain lead-based paint related activity whenever disruption of any lead-based paint may be involved. Such activity may consist of inspecting, sampling, air monitoring, laboratory analysis, encapsulation or abatement. These tasks are conducted by DHS-contracted vendors. These vendors are also available on-call to respond on an as-needed basis to emergency situations. In-house staff at DHS ensures that all contracted services are conducted in conformance with HUD/EPA established guidelines through management of vendor contracts.

The Agency's Maintenance, Repair, Capital and Construction unit's (MRCC) inspectors conduct lead paint hazard investigations as a part of bi-annual shelter inspections. If lead paint presence is known or detected during such inspection, remedial steps are taken to eliminate the risk of exposure. Finally, DHS responds to any reports of lead-based paint hazards identified for the Agency by any other City, State or Federal agency. Overall, for the past 12 years, New York City has addressed lead paint hazards in accordance with Local Law 1 of 2004.

MRCC maintains work orders and records of all actions assigned to contracted vendors for lead-based paint remediation activities at shelter facilities. In calendar year 2015, DHS directed construction, renovation and/or repair work at nine (9) adult and family facilities on thirty (30) occasions that required the use of contracted vendors to engage in lead-based paint related activities because such work would disturb lead-based paint in those facilities.

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

The de Blasio administration has begun a major initiative in workforce development to better train New Yorkers for good-paying jobs and help secure job placements in fast-growing fields. Based on a report, Career Pathways, released by the Jobs for New Yorkers Task Force, the administration will invest in middle-skill job training, prioritize good-paying full-time job placements at workforce agencies, and require companies doing business with the City to move New Yorkers to the front of the hiring line.

The report features 10 recommendations in three key policy areas:

Policy Area 1., Building Skills Employers Seek - The workforce system will significantly expand its capacity to provide job-relevant skills and education.

- Launch or expand Industry Partnerships with real-time feedback loops in six sectors: healthcare, technology, industrial/ manufacturing, and construction, which will focus on training more New Yorkers for jobs with career potential, and retail and food service, which will focus on improving the quality of low-wage occupations.

The New York Alliance for Careers in Healthcare (NYACH) has worked with its Partners Council, including trade associations representing more than 40 employers and more than 100,000 workers, a labor-management partnership, and CUNY, to develop a common agenda and set of activities. Through industry feedback loops driven by these partners, NYACH has re-aligned eight curricula and launched 12 new industry-informed trainings. These trainings have already connected more than 1,000 New Yorkers to new jobs or promotions.

The NYC Tech Talent Pipeline (TTP) mobilized 150 industry partners around its mission and launched an advisory board representing the City's top CEOs and CTOs and a workforce of more than 40,000. Together, they have defined employer needs, developed 10 new and expanded training programs, realigned curricula for 15 academic and training programs, and connected more than 250 New Yorkers to jobs and internships in the sector.

- Establish Career Pathways as the framework for the City's workforce system.

Since Mayor de Blasio took office, the three biggest City agencies in workforce each have made significant changes to align with the administration's vision: The Human Resources Administration (HRA) is dramatically changing its approach from a single rapid-attachment model to a population-specific menu of services emphasizing education and employment skills (see example below). The Department of Small Business Services (SBS) set a job quality standard for employers receiving recruiting services from the Workforce1 Career Center: (full-time employment or \$11.50 per hour). The Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) is piloting bridge programming and making substantial investments in advanced training.

- Invest annually in bridge programs that prepare low-skill jobseekers for entry-level work and middle-skill job training.

In FY2016, which began on July 1, 2015 the City has invested \$6.4M towards its goal of \$60M invested annually by 2020.

- Triple the City's training investment to \$100 million annually by 2020 in career-track, middle-skill occupations, including greater support for incumbent workers who are not getting ahead.

In FY2016, which began on July 1, 2015 the City has invested \$54.3M towards its goal of \$100M invested annually by 2020.

- Improve and expand career and technical education (CTE) and college preparedness programs, adjust CUNY's alternative credit policy, and invest in career counseling to increase educational persistence and better support students' long-term employment prospects.

With support from the de Blasio administration, CUNY is expanding its heralded Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) initiative to 25,000 students over the next four years. ASAP has more than doubled associate degree completion rates for participating students.

- Increase work-based learning opportunities for youth and high-need jobseekers.

The Center for Youth Employment (CYE), a project of the Mayor's Fund to Advance NYC, was established in May 2015 to coordinate and expand programming to youth and young adults in New York City to opportunities for employment, career exploration and guidance, and quality skills-building programs. Its overall goal is to support 100,000 jobs, internships, mentorships, and related experiences per year across all city agencies and programs by 2020.

Policy Area 2., Improving Job Quality - In addition to enabling income mobility by investing in skill development, the City will take measures to support the economic stability of New Yorkers in lowerwage jobs.

- Create a standard that recognizes high-road employers who have good business practices, with the goal of assessing at least 500 local businesses by the end of 2015.

The primary goal in the first phase of this project is to have 500 businesses take the assessment. As of November 2015, 350 businesses have started the assessment, and the initiative is on pace to achieving the 500-businesses goal by early 2016.

- Improve the conditions of low-wage work by expanding access to financial empowerment resources in partnership with at least 100 employers and pursuing legislative changes such as increasing the minimum wage.

In late October 2015, Mayor de Blasio signed the Fair Chance Act into law, making it illegal to deny qualified candidates employment solely based on their criminal records. The new law bans job ads written to weed out candidates with criminal records and bans job application and interview questions about criminal history. This legislation - a result of the "Ban the Box" campaign - will enable millions of New Yorkers who have a criminal record the chance to compete for a broader range of jobs, broaden the range of candidates employers can consider, and ensure that public and private employers are considering applicants based on their skills, experience, and qualifications, before weighing whether their conviction history is relevant.

In addition, the de Blasio administration continued to pursue legislation to increase the minimum wage for New Yorkers in 2015.

Editor's Note: In April 2016 New York State Governor Cuomo signed into law legislation which will incrementally increase the minimum wage to \$15 per hour for all workers within New York City by the end of 2019.

Policy Area 3., Increasing System and Policy Coordination - New York City's economic development investments and contracts must work in tandem with training and employment services to deliver value not only for the entities that benefit from public subsidies, but for jobseekers and incumbent workers as well. Accordingly, the multiple agencies that administer workforce programs must also function cohesively, with shared metrics, definitions, requirements, processes, and data systems.

- Maximize local job opportunities through the City's contracts and economic development investments by establishing a "First Look" hiring process and enforcing targeted hiring provisions in social service contracts.

HireNYC was launched in October 2015 to help New Yorkers access jobs resulting from the City's purchases and investments. The program expands current targeted hiring programs and creates new guidelines to require employers receiving City contracts, working on development projects receiving City subsidies, or meeting job projection targets to work with the City's public workforce system. Large contracts make up over 90 percent of the City's non-emergency spending, and HireNYC will leverage that spending to help provide New Yorkers access to thousands of jobs, ranging from positions like security guards and administrative assistants to design coordinators and project managers.

- Reimburse workforce agencies on the basis of job quality instead of the quantity of job placements by aligning service providers under a system-wide data infrastructure that measures job outcomes such as full-time work, wage growth, and job continuity.

As a first step to changing reimbursement standards, the Mayor's Office of Workforce Development (WKDEV) has led efforts to establish common definitions and metrics across all City workforce programs. WKDEV has engaged staff from each agency administering workforce programs, worked to understand the program model and types of services offered, and requested aggregate client data. In partnership with the Mayor's Office of Operations and CEO, WKDEV established a set of 13 common metrics for the workforce system. With cooperation from agency Commissioners, these metrics will be included in future concept papers, RFPs, and contracts, eventually facilitating easier aggregation of activity and outcome data across workforce programs.

For additional information regarding the progress made in meeting the objectives described above, please refer to the report *Career Pathways - Progress Update*, released December 2015 at: <http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/careerpathways/downloads/pdf/Career-Pathways-Progress-Update.pdf>.

The NYCHA Office of Resident Economic Empowerment & Sustainability (REES) implements programs, policies and collaborations to measurably support residents' increased income and assets with a focus on employment and advancement, financial literacy and asset building, adult education and training, and business development.

By using housing as a platform REES:

1. Connects residents to high quality and relevant economic opportunity services;
2. Supports economic opportunity providers to better serve NYCHA residents;
3. Attracts new resources and proven models to public housing communities; and Generates economic opportunities for NYCHA residents.

REES uses a partnership and place-based service coordination model, or "Zone Model", to identify and partner with high-quality economic opportunity service providers in each key service area. This approach broadens NYCHA's scope from resident job training and employment to a more comprehensive suite of high-quality economic opportunity service providers.

Through the Zone Model, REES manages public/private partnerships with high-quality economic opportunity service providers. Through a formal application process, REES has established partnerships with best-in-class workforce, financial literacy, business development, adult education and training providers. Partners work collaborative with REES to develop strategic, outcome-focused projects that connect NYCHA residents to their services. These projects include receiving direct referrals through a web-based referral system; targeted recruitment campaigns for cohort-based services; reverse referrals of NYCHA residents to NYCHA job orders and employment-linked training programs; support and training from NYCHA in leveraging and integrating NYCHA policies into service delivery. At the close of the inaugural program year, REES saw a 22% increase in the volume of residents served through this new model, over 13,000 residents total. Building on this initial success, in late 2013 through 2014, REES expanded the Zone Model to additional neighborhoods including: Western Queens, Brownsville/East New York, East Harlem, Highbridge, Northwest Bronx, Rockaways, and Staten Island. By the end of 2015 over fifty providers have since entered into formal partnership with REES, expanding past traditional workforce, training and financial counseling services, to include new adult education partnerships through the SUNY's Educational Opportunity Center's and CUNY community college programs, as well as new business development, homebuyer education service providers and job training programs such as Y Roads and YouthBuild.

i. Connecting to Services: Resident Outreach, Recruitment and Referrals

Through the Zone Model, REES has created multiple platforms for performing outreach and connecting residents to services. In 2013, REES launched OpportunityNYCHA.org, a web-based platform designed to connect residents to services and provide timely information on REES and partner programs. Since launching, OpportunityNYCHA.org has seen over 160,000 unique visitors and in 2014, REES launched a bi-weekly e-newsletter that reaches nearly 38,000 subscribers. Residents utilize the microsite to register for information sessions and connect to programs.

In 2015, the NYCHA Office of Resident Economic Empowerment & Sustainability (REES) served over 5,717 residents through event-based recruitment and resident information sessions. Events include twice-weekly information sessions hosted at REES' central office in downtown Brooklyn, in addition to similar sessions hosted offsite at NYCHA developments for a variety of vocational and other training programs, including to educate residents on section 3 hiring. REES also hosted employment pre-screening events with partners including the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Columbia University, and the New York City Police Department.

In 2015 there were 619 resident class/training enrollments for services in each service area through REES recruitment efforts. Below is an overview of the enrollment outcomes for cohort-based services.

In addition to event-based recruitment, REES connected residents to services through its web-based referral system which is designed to connect residents to services in 10 minutes or less. Referrals are initiated by NYCHA frontline staff and REES through routine interactions, such as rent collections, with residents. Building on the scalability that REES achieved in 2014 with utilization of the Referral System throughout NYCHA, REES continued to provide training support in 2015 to 73 frontline NYCHA staff to make referrals. 2,639 resident referrals were made through the referral system alone in 2015.

In November 2015, REES launched a new way for residents to receive referrals through "Opportunity Connect." Opportunity Connect is a new feature of the NYCHA Self-Service Portal that allows residents to refer themselves for services by answering a few simple questions on a web page. Opportunity Connect

is a part of Doorways to Opportunity – a \$1.4 million investment in New York City public housing residents by Citi Community Development. Financial counseling, which is offered for free through the New York City Office of Financial Empowerment’s Financial Empowerment Centers, is the first service to be made available on Opportunity Connect. Additional services in the areas of job training, adult education and business development will be added in the coming year. By the end of 2015 16 e-referrals had been made using Opportunity Connect.

A. Program Highlights: Employment and Advancement

i. Section 3/Resident Employment Program

In 2015, REES facilitated 1075 direct job placements. These job placements included 808 resident job placements leveraged through outside contractors for various projects at NYCHA developments, in accordance with the employment-related provisions of the Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) Section 3 mandate. Of the 808 residents hired, a total of 443 were made through NYCHA’s Resident Employment Program (“REP”). The Resident Employment Program (REP) is a NYCHA-sponsored program that requires that 15% of the labor costs on a contract be expended on resident hiring. With few exceptions, REP applies to construction contracts valued in excess of \$500,000.

ii. Jobs-Plus

Jobs-Plus is a proven place-based employment program that provides customized employment services, financial counseling, rent-based incentives and peer to peer support to working age residents in twenty-three (23) NYCHA Developments. A collaboration between NYCHA, Human Resources Administration (HRA), the Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO), and the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), there are currently nine (8) Jobs-Plus sites operating city-wide under the Jobs-Plus expansion, a signature component of the Young Men’s Initiative. There is a ninth site operating in the Bronx and supported by the Social Innovation Fund. In total the 9 Jobs-Plus sites serve nearly 25,000 working age NYCHA residents. The Jobs-Plus expansion marks a key milestone in NYCHA’s new approach to better support its residents to increase their income and assets by working with public and private partners to identify gaps in service offerings and to develop strategies that attract high quality resources and proven economic opportunity models, like Jobs-Plus, into public housing neighborhoods.

Below are resident job placement outcomes through the Jobs-Plus program:

Jobs-Plus Site Location	2015 Placements
East Harlem (<i>Hostos Community College</i>)	168
South Bronx Site 1 (<i>Bronxworks</i>)	124
South Bronx Site 2 (<i>East Side Settlement House</i>)	170
Western Queens (<i>Urban Upbound</i>)	212
Lower East Side (<i>Henry Street Settlement House</i>)	138
Central Brooklyn (<i>Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation</i>)	215
Northwest Bronx (<i>Goodwill Industries</i>)	211
Staten Island (<i>Arbor ResCare</i>)	167
Brownsville Brooklyn (<i>DB Grant Associates</i>)	182
Total Placements	1587

Section 3 Requirements:

Community Development Block Grant Program

In 2015, a total of \$6,623,555 in Community Development Block Grant (CD) -funded contracts was subject to the Section 3 requirements. No businesses qualified as a Section 3 business. There was a total of 23 new hires, of which 12 persons were Section 3 residents.

CDBG Section 3 New Hires in 2015

CDBG Section 3 New Hires in 2015		
<u>Category</u>	<u>New Hires</u>	<u>Number of Section 3 Residents</u>
Officials and Managers	2	1
Professional	7	5
Technicians	8	2
Laborers (Unskilled)	2	0
Clerical	4	4
Totals	23	12

HPD HOME Program

The City of New York, to the greatest extent feasible, is committed to directing job training and employment opportunities to low- and very low-income New Yorkers. The Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) has undertaken various affirmative efforts to realize the benefits of Section 3 for local residents and local businesses:

- HPD includes information on Sec. 3 requirements in the equal opportunity packages provided to HPD loan recipients, contractors and their sub-contractors at weekly Pre-Award Conferences.
- HPD includes the Section 3 clause in its HUD-funded contracts, alerting each entity of the program and its obligations. The clause also requires its placement in every subcontract subject to Section 3 regulations.
- HPD has created and posted a HUD Section 3 webpage at the HPD website. The webpage contains an explanation of the regulations, reporting forms, a Section 3 Business Concern application, a Business Concerns directory and a listing of employment/training referral sources. The webpage provides firms working with the Agency easy access the information they need to comply. It is available here: http://www.nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/developers/hud_sec3.shtml
- HPD has procured and is implementing a new web based payroll management system. The LMAC (Labor Management And Compliance) service collects, stores, and manipulates business profile and certified payroll information as required by labor laws and socioeconomic mandates, including Section 3.

- HPD, in line with the policy of the City of New York, posts job notices on its website. Job notices are also available at the NYC Dept. for Citywide Administrative Services website and at public bulletin boards throughout the City.
- HPD has partnered with the NYC Department of Small Business Services (DSBS) to provide the employment and training services of DSBS's Workforce1 Centers. HireNYC is a free program designed to help New Yorkers access training and jobs through the City's purchases and investments. Under HireNYC, the NYC Department of Small Business Services' Workforce1 provides high-quality recruitment services to employers and high-quality employment services to jobseekers. HPD is now partnering with HireNYC to better connect low-income workers to construction job opportunities generated by our affordable housing development projects.

HPD is committed to implementing the goals of the Section 3 program.

Emergency Solutions Grant

The US Congress directed HUD to take the lead in requiring all Continuum of Care jurisdictions nationwide to have unduplicated client-level data: the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). In addition to this HUD funding requirement, the NYC Department of Homeless Services (DHS) and the NYC Coalition on the Continuum of Care (NYC-CCoC) used HMIS data to describe of the current state of homelessness in NYC. This analysis provided a greater understanding of service usage, effectiveness and potential gaps in service for CCoC planning purposes. HMIS data is also used to understand how to realign housing resources and service delivery within the NYC-CCoC, and how to create links to mainstream programs that are essential to the prevention of homelessness and to sustaining formerly homeless people in permanent housing. All of the CoC-funded projects actively participating in the NYC HMIS. The 2013 CAPER reports were generated from the NYC HMIS. Due to the transition to the 2014 data standards the 2014 CAPER was not generated from HMIS, instead the data was generated from the DHS CARES system and imported to HMIS. The 2015 CAPER reports were generated from the NYC HMIS and subsequent reporting will be from the NYC HMIS data system. The City of New York does not use its ESG funds for construction or rehabilitation of emergency or transitional homeless shelters. Thus there were no training, employment, and contracting opportunities generated by ESG funding (Section 3-related beneficiaries).

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

The City of New York has a sophisticated and comprehensive infrastructure in place to meet the various needs of persons who are homeless or at-risk of becoming homeless. While the service delivery system within New York City is robust, the City recognizes the need for more permanent supportive housing and is already taking action to address this need through a plan to create 15,000 more supportive units over the next 15 years.

As noted previously, New York City has made significant investments and plans to enhance the provision of homeless prevention, shelter and rehousing services. As part of this work, the structure and delivery of services related to homelessness is changing. Instead of operating separately, there will be an integrated management structure with both HRA and DHS reporting to the Commissioner of Social Services. This will ensure homeless services are delivered as efficiently and effectively as possible with a focus on both preventing vulnerable New Yorkers from becoming homeless and rehousing individuals and families in shelter into permanent housing.

There are four key elements to the City’s new plan – prevention, rehousing, street homelessness outreach and improving shelter conditions – and a total of 46 individual systemic reforms. More information on these changes can be found in report on the [Review of Homeless Service Agencies and Programs](#).

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

Naturally Occurring Retirement Community (NORC) Program

The NORC Program was developed to address the needs of concentrations of seniors who have aged in place, in non-elderly housing. The program was designed to provide comprehensive support and health care services for well and frail elderly residents, 60 years of age and older, who continue to live independently in their apartments and communities. Approximately 20.5% of the NYCHA population is over 60, and not all live in senior-designated buildings.

The NORC program concept is to provide services to the elderly who do not live in units built for the elderly through building community infrastructure support services, which include the following: on-site assessment, information and referral services, case management, counseling, education/prevention /wellness programs, recreational/socialization programs, and volunteerism. One of the key components is the assistance to access needed health care services, which includes nursing, health screenings, in-home assessments, medication management, and home visits by doctors, when needed. Additionally, the program provides ancillary services such as transportation, shopping, financial management, housekeeping, personal care, support groups, and intergenerational activities, among many others.

Based on DFTA’s reports, from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, the NYCHA NORC program provided the following services:

Case Management & Assistance-	22,971;
Health Care Management & Assistance-	3,927;
Number of residents receiving at least 1 core service -	9,957;
New this Calendar Year (CY) -	952.

Elderly Safe at Home-

The program provides comprehensive crime prevention education, crisis intervention, and general crime victim’s assistance to elderly residents in the South Bronx. The program also offers workshops on entitlements, health and nutrition, conducts monthly meetings to disseminate information on crime prevention and arranges monthly shopping trips to area supermarkets. During 2015, the program provided 15,680 units of support services to approximately 620 residents monthly, and conducted 4,483 home visits.

Service Coordinator Program

The Service Coordinator Program is operated in clusters of developments in upper Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island. Service Coordinators assists elderly/disabled residents to access government benefits, assistance in daily living, monitoring health care needs, "Meals on Wheels", and other types of assistance as needed.

During 2015, the program provided 12,206 units of supportive services to an average of 615 residents monthly in 18 developments, and conducted 3,450 home visits.

Senior Resident Advisor Program

The Senior Resident Advisor Program consists of trained paraprofessionals who provide crisis intervention services and case management coordination. Services provided include assistance in obtaining entitlements, health services, mental health services, assistance in maintaining independent daily living, home care services, senior legal services, outreach, meals for the homebound, and recreational activities (through NYCHA Senior Centers). Each program includes a substantial resident volunteer component (Floor Captains) to ensure daily contact with each elderly resident. NYCHA operates this program at 16 senior-only developments.

During 2015, the program provided 30,550 units of support services to an average of 961 residents monthly, and conducted 7,747 home visits.

Senior Companion Programs

This program is funded by the Corporation of National Service with seven Senior Companions assigned through the Henry Street Settlement to specific developments in Queens, Staten Island and Brooklyn. The Senior Companions provide friendly home visits to a specific number of residents, most of whom are frail and socially isolated. They also provide escort and light shopping services. During 2015, this program conducted 1,044 home visits, and provided 107 escort services to approximately 8 elderly residents monthly.

DHS, as the ESG recipient, coordinates extensively with NYC's Coalition on the Continuum of Care (CoC) and the Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) jurisdiction. Coordination takes place monthly meetings between Collaborative Applicant and representatives of Con Plan. Efforts are made around shared goals, listed in NYC's five year Con Plan which are consistent with the CoC's strategic plan: investing in proven strategies to reduce the number of homeless individuals on the streets; preventing those families and individuals at-risk of homelessness from entering shelter; and ensuring that shelter is a short-term solution to a housing crisis by rapidly re-housing families and individuals. It aims to end homelessness, with an emphasis on chronic and veteran's homelessness. The alignment of the Con Plan goals and the CoC's strategic plan has led to coordinated efforts within the jurisdiction to comprehensively address the needs of homeless individuals and families as well as those at risk of homelessness.

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

Impediments to Affordable Housing and Actions to Remove Impediments

In addition to New York City's actions to remove regulatory barriers that act as an impediments to affordable housing described above, the City continued to make progress on removing regulatory barriers that act as an impediments to fair housing choice.

Mayor de Blasio's Housing New York, A Five-Borough Ten-Year Plan, identified possible impediments that, if removed, would facilitate the achievement of the Mayor's ambitious affordable housing goal.

The Plan indicated that such impediments to new housing take a variety of forms:

- Certain existing regulations unduly burden or restrict the development of affordable housing. Amending regulations to remove these impediments would encourage the construction of new housing.
- In “Inner Ring” neighborhoods that are located outside the Manhattan core but are accessible to transit, employment centers, and services, per-unit parking requirements for affordable housing exceed car ownership rates among low-income households. Where parking is built for affordable housing, spaces often go unused. The construction of unnecessary parking spaces increases construction costs and may deter development or reduce the number of affordable units that can be produced. The City will propose appropriate reductions in parking requirements for affordable housing developments near public transit.

In 2015, the Department of City Planning initiated revisions to the Zoning Resolution to remediate existing regulations that are unduly burdensome or restrict affordable housing development. In the fall of 2015, the Department’s revisions to the Zoning Resolution, commonly referred to as Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA) were submitted for public review.

ZQA creates a “Transit Zone” which consists of multifamily districts that have low car ownership rates, are accessible to transit, retail and other services. The purpose of the modification in parking requirements is to facilitate affordable housing development for seniors and income-restricted housing. ZQA provides for reduction or waiver of parking requirements for accessory group parking facilities, and reduction of existing parking spaces for income-restricted housing units and for affordable independent residences for seniors.

- Because of higher standards for housing, the rise of green technologies, and new methods including modular construction, today’s residential buildings typically have higher floor-to-floor heights than the buildings of 30 years ago, when many of the height and setback regulations of zoning were established. Standards for retail space have also increased to provide an improved shopping environment and to allow space for modern ventilation and other mechanical systems. Especially when combined with the floor area bonus allowed through the Inclusionary Housing Program, these factors can make it difficult to accommodate the full amount of housing allowed within the permitted height and setback limits. The City will propose zoning changes that would provide some additional flexibility to these regulations to facilitate housing creation, further encourage use of the existing Inclusionary Housing zoning bonus, and improve the quality of both housing and street-level commercial activity.

The ZQA provides greater flexibility in building design and floor height requirements for Inclusionary Housing buildings, affordable independent residences for seniors (AIRS), and long-term care facilities (LTCF). ZQA also allows more flexibility in the minimum required setback from a street line above the base height in a contextual building; and modifies the “transition rule”, which limits the height of buildings in higher-density districts when they adjoin certain lower-density districts.

- Developing housing that meets our changing demographics and the evolving ways New Yorkers live is critical. The City’s housing stock currently does not adequately reflect the needs of the growing number of one- and two-person households. Moreover, many larger families face significant rent burdens because of lack of affordable two and three bedroom units.
 - The City has many regulations that restrict the development of smaller housing units. Zoning regulations establish a minimum unit size of 400 square feet for multifamily housing in many areas, limit the density of units based on lot area, and prevent the construction of a building consisting solely of units built at the minimum square footage. However, projects in other cities and pilots in New York City are demonstrating that developers can build compact units that are livable, safe, and healthy and contribute a new set of housing options for small households. A compact unit includes a kitchen and bathroom and is often smaller than allowed under current regulations. This housing type is likely most appropriate in highly transit-accessible neighborhoods that contain a large proportion of small households. The City will review the results of the pilot now underway once it is completed, and consider zoning changes to allow the construction of both compact units and a greater number of small units per building.

ZQA eliminates minimum unit sizes for high density districts, with an exception for affordable independent residences for seniors where minimum unit size is reduced to 325 square feet in all districts. Also in the fall of 2015, leasing began at the City’s first multifamily micro-unit residence. The micro-unit development contains 55 residential units that range from 260-360 square feet with kitchens and bathrooms. This micro-unit development is a pilot program for the City that requires further assessment and evaluation.

Editor’s Note: The Zoning for Quality and Affordability zoning text amendments were adopted by the Planning Commission in early February 2016 and sent to the City Council for their review. On March 22, 2016, the City Council approved the MIH and ZQA text amendments, with modifications. More information on these zoning text amendments is found on DCP’s website: www.nyc.gov/planning.

- The ability to secure affordable housing in inclusive mixed-income neighborhoods is based on the provision of units and the household’s ability to pay affordable rents. In addition to promoting the development of new affordable housing, the City can improve fair and affordable housing opportunities by working to increase income and employment for New Yorkers. To this end, the City is working on several initiatives to expand workforce opportunities.
- The City has a variety of workforce development and placement programs. The programs have succeeded in placing New Yorkers into jobs, but have had moderate success helping them develop the skills that employers require today. As a result, most were placed in low-wage jobs that offered no clear path to higher earnings and greater security.

The City will develop new programs coordinated through the Office of Workforce Development to ensure that our housing investments are incorporated into the City’s broader workforce development efforts.

On May 20, 2014 Mayor Bill de Blasio announced the creation of the ‘Jobs for New Yorkers’ Task Force that will develop real-time strategies to strengthen the city’s workforce and help

workers develop the skills needed to secure good paying jobs in fast-growing careers. The task force will help shift the City's approach to focus on employment for New Yorkers in skill building, higher-wage jobs that offer opportunities for advancement. In addition, the task force will be responsible for combining economic development strategies with workforce development initiatives to allow more New Yorkers access to quality employment in industries where the City makes investments, such as affordable housing development.

Please refer to New York City's narrative response within this eCAPER module to the question regarding the City's actions to reduce the number of poverty-level families in 2015.

Evaluation of the Current Fair Housing Complaints

All New York City residents in public and private housing may file housing discrimination complaints with either the HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO); or the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ); or with the City of New York's Commission on Human Rights. Residents of buildings owned by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development or the Housing Authority may file internal complaints at their agencies. At the end of this chapter, a Fair Housing Complaint Chart is provided which outlines the complaint process. All of the agencies listed above can and will investigate complaints, or if necessary refer them to the appropriate governmental entities.

Complaints made by NYCHA residents or applicants are investigated internally to determine if the individual's human rights have been violated and to take corrective or conciliatory action, if necessary. Preliminary investigations of complaints filed by residents and applicants with the State Division of Human Rights, the City Commission on Human Rights, and/or HUD are investigated in consultation with the NYC Law Department.

Once a housing discrimination complaint has been filed, an investigation is commenced to ascertain if the complaint has merit. This section describes current status of fair housing discrimination complaints filed between January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015 where a "probable cause" for the discrimination has been found.

A. Probable Cause Determinations Issued by the Secretary of HUD

In 1999, the New York State Division of Human Rights (NYSDHR) was accepted into the federal Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP) because its new fair housing law was deemed to be substantially equivalent to the Federal Fair Housing Act. As a result, all cases received by HUD that are in the State of New York are referred to NYSDHR for investigation.

During the period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015, in the New York City area there were 23 Probable Cause determinations issued by the NYSDHR under the following bases: seventeen (17) probable cause determinations involved claims of disability discrimination; five (5) probable cause determinations involved claims of discrimination based on the complainant's race/color; three (3) involved national origin discrimination; ten (10) involved claims of discrimination based on the sex of the complainant; three (3) probable cause determinations involved claims of discrimination based on familial status; one (1) probable cause determination involved claims of discrimination based on marital status; four (4) involved claims of discrimination based on the complainant's creed; seven (7) probable cause determinations involved a claim of retaliation for exercising the complainant's legal rights; one (1) probable cause determination involved a claim of age discrimination; and two (2) involved claims of discrimination based on the perceived sexual orientation of the complainant.

Ten (10) cases involved denial of reasonable accommodation for a disability; sixteen (16) cases involved denial of equal terms, conditions, and privileges of tenancy; two (2) cases involved refusal to rent; four (4) cases involved evictions/threatened eviction; two (2) cases involved denial of reasonable modification; three (3) cases involved sexual harassment of the existing or prospective tenant; two (2) cases involved refusal to sell housing; one case of discriminatory advertising; and seventeen (17) cases involving other housing discriminatory practices.

During this time there were four (4) complaints formally settled before the Division; two (2) complaints were voluntarily discontinued by the Complainants because of private settlements with Respondents; two (2) complaints are in settlement negotiations; four (4) complaints are pending a hearing; and eleven complaints have been transferred to the Supreme Court for adjudication at either the complainant's or respondent's request.

B. Fair Housing Discrimination Lawsuits Filed by the U.S. Department of Justice or private plaintiffs
New York City is divided between two federal judicial districts: the Eastern District of New York, which includes Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island; and the Southern District of New York, which includes the Bronx and Manhattan. In addition, private plaintiffs may file their own housing discrimination lawsuit directly with the Department of Justice's main office in Washington, D.C.

Eastern District

During the time period of January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development referred one case to the Eastern District Office for prosecution concerning alleged instances of housing discrimination within the City of New York.

In the case of *United States v. Trump Village Section IV, Inc. et ano*, 1:15-cv-07306, the United States alleges that the cooperative apartment complex known as Trump Village engaged in a pattern or practice of denying individuals with disabilities the right to live with emotional support animals. That case is currently pending.

Southern District

During the time period of January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development referred 2 cases to the Southern District Office for prosecution concerning alleged instances of housing discrimination within the City of New York.

The United States filed two (2) Complaints and entered into two (2) Consent Decrees related to properties within New York City. The Southern District Office filed one Complaint and simultaneous Consent Decree against a Manhattan co-operative for failing to offer reasonable accommodations to tenant shareholders with disabilities who need service animals (*U.S. v. RiverBay*, 15 Civ. 4180). Under the Consent Decree, entered June 3, 2015, the co-operative agreed to change its policies and procedures to accommodate tenants with service animals. The District Office obtained similar relief in a Consent Decree in *United States v. East River Housing Corp* (13 Civ. 8650, Consent Decree entered May 28, 2015).

The Southern District Office also settled a Fair Housing Act suit against a major real estate developer for failing to design and construct an apartment building that was not fully accessible to persons with disabilities (*U.S. v. Durst Org. et al.*, 14 Civ. 2698). Under the Consent Decree entered November 17,

2015, the defendants must make certain retrofits so that the buildings are accessible for people with disabilities. The settlement also provides for a fund for victims, a civil penalty, and a fund for accessibility improvements. The Office also settled claims against the architects who designed and constructed a major set of apartment buildings in *U.S. v. Related Companies et al.*, 14 Civ. 1826 (Consent Decree against developers entered December 11, 2014; Consent Decree against architects entered February 4, 2015).

Finally, three private plaintiffs sued the City of New York regarding the City's long-standing policy of providing a community preference when allocating new units in a City-subsidized affordable housing development. The action is titled *Winfield et al v. City of New York*, 1:15-cv-05236. Pursuant to this policy, the Department of Housing Preservation and Development reserves 50% of the affordable units in a new, City-subsidized affordable housing development for current residents of the community district in which such development is located. Three plaintiffs, who identify themselves as African-American women, applied to three affordable housing developments in Midtown Manhattan and the Upper West Side that received financial incentives pursuant to section 421-a of the State Real Property Tax Law and the City's Voluntary Inclusionary Housing Program. The plaintiffs are not eligible to receive a community preference in these neighborhoods, and plaintiffs claim that the policy violates the Fair Housing Act and the City's Human Rights Law. The City fully submitted its motion to dismiss the complaint on December 4, 2015, and is awaiting a decision from the Court.

Washington, D.C. Department of Justice Office

The U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division's Housing and Civil Enforcement section provided the information described above. The cases were filed in the respective District Courts.

C. Fair Housing Complaints made to Local Agencies

NYCHA's Department of Equal Opportunity (DEO) investigates residents' or applicants' housing discrimination complaints internally and recommends corrective or conciliatory action where necessary. NYCHA DEO also investigates applicants' claims of denial of eligibility based on disability. In 2015, NYCHA opened 22 Fair Housing investigations and reviewed 3 housing eligibility disability matters as referenced below. In 2015, NYCHA DEO reduced its backlog of Fair Housing investigations by 78% (77.77). NYCHA's Law Department investigates complaints filed by residents and applicants with the State Division of Human Rights, the City Commissioner of Human Rights, and/or HUD.

Total number of housing discrimination complaints filed with DEO in 2015: 22

Sexual Harassment:	9
Race:	7
Sexual Orientation:	1
Disability:	1
Complaints with Multiple Bases	2
National Origin	2

Total number of probable cause determinations: 1

Three (3) applicants who were determined ineligible for public housing and who asserted the denial based on disability were reviewed by NYCHA DEO between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015. The number of applications where ineligibility determination was revoked: 0.

Fair Housing Programs within the New York City Housing Authority

NYCHA is committed to providing equal housing opportunities for all qualified residents and applicants and prohibits unlawful discrimination.

NYCHA's Non-discrimination Training

NYCHA's Department of Equal Opportunity (DEO) also conducts mandatory training for all NYCHA employees on non-discrimination policies, including equal employment opportunity; sexual harassment; fair housing non-discrimination; and reasonable accommodation. NYCHA posts its Fair Housing Non-Discrimination Policy conspicuously at development management offices, community centers, hearing rooms and public places where NYCHA serves residents and applicants.

NYCHA's Services for People with Disabilities

Through the DEO Services for People with Disabilities Unit (SPD), NYCHA will continue to strengthen its relationships with advocates and organizations that assist people with disabilities. SPD provides assistance and information to applicants and residents with disabilities to assist them in obtaining decent, affordable and accessible housing, and assists in processing reasonable accommodation requests of NYCHA residents with disabilities. In 2015, SPD responded to or assisted with 283 reasonable accommodation matters from residents, applicants, Section 8 voucher holders and/or their respective advocates. The SPD also handled approximately 1,219 housing related matters from clients who either telephoned or were walk-ins. Housing applicants, residents, Section 8 voucher holders and others in need of assistance with disability issues may call the "Hotline" at (212) 306-4652 or TTY at (212) 306-4845.

NYCHA's Services for Homeless Families

NYCHA reinstated the highest housing priority for homeless families in NYC Department of Homeless Services (DHS) shelters by upgrading their need-based priority from N-4 to N-0 (the highest Need-Based priority). This will enable NYCHA to prioritize a number of units for assignment to homeless families from approximately 5,000 public housing apartments that become available each year. With HUD's permission, NYCHA amended its priority system to afford the highest public housing priority to city-referred homeless families. Utilizing the City's public housing resources to address the homeless population is an important step in receiving New York State support for a homeless rental subsidy. NYCHA's plan not only addresses local housing needs, but is also in line with the national objectives of using mainstream housing assistance programs as an essential part of achieving President Obama's goals of the 2010 Federal Strategic Plan to End Homelessness. In further support of the Mayor's Housing Plan, NYCHA also connected homeless families holding top priority on the Section 8 waiting list with available Section 8 project-based units in the Authority's 21 LLC developments. NYCHA will continue to prioritize homeless individuals for Section 8 resources.

Assisting LEP Persons

In addition to its ongoing language access activities, including translating vital documents and providing interpreters at the Annual Plan public hearing and otherwise as needed, NYCHA also overhauled and updated its Language Assistance Services Implementation Plan in 2015 as part of its ongoing efforts to promote meaningful access of persons with limited English proficiency to its programs and activities

HPD Fair Housing Services Program

HPD's Fair Housing Services Program is the result of an interagency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development and the New York City Commission on Human Rights (CCHR). This agreement enables HPD to utilize CCHR's dedicated and knowledgeable staff. CCHR is mandated to enforce the most comprehensive local human rights law in the country. The City's Human Rights Law, like the Federal Fair Housing Act, prohibits housing discrimination based on a person's race, color, religion, sex, disability, national origin, familial status, sexual orientation, age, alienage and citizenship status, marital status, partnership status, lawful occupation, gender, or lawful source of income. The City's law also prohibits bias-related harassment. Because the City's Human Rights Law is inclusive of the Federal Fair Housing Act, the MOU is compliant with HPD's Federally-mandated obligation to promote fair housing.

The MOU has created a Fair Housing Services Program focused on raising the awareness of building owners and project sponsors of their duty to comply with the Federal Fair Housing Act, the NYS Human Rights Law, and the NYC Human Rights Law. CCHR staff present a review of fair housing obligations during HPD's weekly Pre-Award Conferences, wherein recipients of HPD funding are also informed of equal opportunity, business utilization, and workforce participation provisions found in HPD contracts.

CCHR participates in community forums ("Owners Night" and "Tenant Nights") sponsored by HPD, in partnership with local political and community leaders, to inform the public of housing opportunities and regulations, and to answer questions related to fair housing.

HPD and CCHR conduct quarterly "Fair Housing in Practice" workshops for representatives of building owners and sponsors. The workshops promote understanding of how to avoid discriminatory practices and policies; provide an overview of tenant/buyer rights; and included a presentation on HPD affirmative marketing guidelines.

HPD and CCHR also collaborate to sponsor an annual Fair Housing Symposium. This event features panel discussions by representatives of government agencies before an audience of social service agencies and real estate management firm representatives. The Symposium explores current housing trends, rights, and opportunities and encourages sound and prompt referrals of instances involving possible discrimination.

HPD and CCHR have created a website that promotes awareness of fair housing practices and enforcement. Fair Housing NYC is a visually appealing website that provides the public with a broad range of fair housing-related content and referral services. The site includes summaries of relevant laws, examples of discriminatory practices and policies, and links to CCHR and HPD resources. The summaries can be downloaded and printed in the most widely used languages in New York City: English, Spanish, Korean, Haitian Creole, Russian, and Mandarin. The site can be accessed at: <http://www.nyc.gov/html/fhnyc/html/home/home.shtml>.

The Fair Housing Services Program reaffirms HPD's and CCHR's commitment to implement the goals and objectives of Federal, State, and City mandates to promote housing choices free of discriminatory barriers.

Super Storm Sandy Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) Program
On January 29, 2013, Congress passed the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013, which requires grant recipients to certify that they will each affirmatively further fair housing when using grant money.

Affirmatively furthering fair housing includes conducting an analysis of impediments to fair housing choice and taking actions to overcome the identified impediments.

As a Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery program, the Build it Back program (the “Program”) seeks to meet the national objectives of benefitting low- and moderate-income (“LMI”) persons, preventing and eliminating blight, and meeting particularly urgent needs of homeowners who sustained damage to their properties as a result of Hurricane Sandy. Various factors including the location of a property and the nature of damage sustained by the property result in different prospective assistance pathways for applicants including reimbursement, moderate rehabilitation, rebuild, elevation, and acquisition.

All residential buildings which served as a primary residence on October 29, 2012, and were damaged by the storm, whether they were owner-occupied or renter-occupied (year-round) may be eligible for Build It Back assistance. As part of the intake process, the Program verifies the income of the household living in each unit contained within an application. The Program does not repair second homes, only homes which are used as a primary residence including rental properties which provide housing to New Yorkers. This ensures that properties which will be used as primary residences for LMI New Yorkers are repaired to safe and sanitary conditions, restoring housing.

Knowing how crucial every dwelling unit is, the Program has a goal not to lose any legal housing units in the repair and rehabilitation program. All efforts are made to ensure that existing units will be rebuilt as part of the elevation or reconstruction process. The Department of Buildings has instituted a series of ongoing inspections, certifications and notifications to ensure that all work being done to homes being elevated or reconstructed complies with Appendix G of the New York City Building Code and FEMA regulations.

In neighborhoods affected by the storm and shifts in coastal flood hazards, which necessitate changes to the form of buildings, local planning studies and community outreach is required to identify and implement land use and zoning changes to facilitate rebuilding and increased resilience. Neighborhood studies take into account current and projected future flood hazards, land use, housing, access to shopping, services, jobs, and transportation, built form and quality of the public realm, economic challenges of rebuilding and flood insurance costs, and other factors.

As stated in the City of New York’s 2012 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Statement for its conventional federal formula entitlement grant programs, the City’s zoning regulations, as a whole, do not represent a regulatory barrier to fair housing choice. However, each of the City’s residential zoning districts have their own respective bulk, density, height, setback, and open space requirements, which in certain instances may limit or entirely prohibit the reconstruction or new construction of affordable housing in FEMA’s new Base Flood Elevation (“BFEs”) zones due to the fact the BFEs require the buildings to be built elevated to specific heights. There are occasional construction challenges and where necessary, the Mayor’s Office of Housing Recovery Operations (“HRO”) is working to get General City Law (“GCL”) waivers for sections 35 and 36 to expedite construction. Section 35 generally prohibits building in the bed of any street identified on an official map. Section 36 generally prohibits the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for buildings that do not front on a mapped street. HRO applied for bulk waivers of GCL 35 and 36 for over 1,000 storm damaged homes that are located on an unmapped streets and have sought repair or reconstruction. Applying in bulk is a way to speed up the process and commence repair work so that safe housing is restored.

The City adopted a new rule to increase the required minimum flood proofing elevation so that substantially damaged buildings and other new construction are built to withstand greater flood risk. Changes to the zoning will help the Program build and preserve affordable housing stock in Sandy affected neighborhoods. Additional local planning is necessary to address other complex and neighborhood-specific issues in areas severely affected by Hurricane Sandy, such as attached homes.

Homes participating in the Program which were substantially damaged, meaning that Hurricane Sandy destroyed more than half of the value of the pre-storm structure, may be eligible for elevation assistance. Properties located in high-risk areas often need an Elevation Certificate to determine flood insurance premiums under the National Flood Insurance Program, with elevated homes in high-risk areas having lower flood insurance premiums. A building's elevation compared to the estimated height floodwaters will reach in a major flood helps determine the flood risk and the cost of flood insurance and homes which require and receive elevation assistance become safer and more sustainable in the event of another disaster. Lower premiums make maintaining flood insurance more affordable and therefore sustainable for homeowners; this is a major benefit to homeowners and the tenants renting properties which are repaired by the Program.

Almost 300 NYCHA buildings across 33 developments sustained physical damage as a result of Hurricane Sandy in October 2012. NYCHA is utilizing its Sandy Recovery Program to rebuild better and smarter, significantly improving structural resiliency to protect residents from the effects of future disasters and climate change. The program includes a 16-member Community Outreach Team, with 10 NYCHA resident members, to communicate with residents regarding resiliency efforts and to involve them in the recovery process.

In 2015, NYCHA finalized an agreement under which it will receive a total of \$3 billion in FEMA disaster recovery funding to repair and protect its developments. NYCHA's Sandy Recovery Team completed design on a majority of its disaster recovery projects, with large construction projects anticipated to begin in 2016. During 2015, NYCHA began preliminary construction activities at 17 developments, including boiler demolition, replacement of electrical conduit, asbestos abatement, and apartment renovations. NYCHA also began a smaller-scale Sandy recovery project at Lower East Side Rehab V, Manhattan, during 2015; when completed, this will be NYCHA's first fully-repaired, more resilient development.

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

HOPWQ 2015 Monitoring Activities

The DOHMH's Division of Disease Control staff monitors HOPWA contract performance and spending among the project sponsors on a monthly basis. Furthermore, the Division conducts on-site program and fiscal monitoring visits and annual fiscal desk audit reviews to assess program compliance as well as habitability visits to ensure all HOPWA-funded housing units meet the Housing Quality Standards defined by HUD.

Technical assistance is routinely delivered to address programmatic and/or fiscal challenges. On a quarterly basis, the Division convenes a review of all HOPWA contracts to determine if there are new or emerging trends or common barriers/challenges experienced among project sponsors that should prompt additional training and technical assistance.

CDBG 2015 Monitoring Activities

In 2015, the NYC Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Community Development (CD) Unit conducted the following monitoring activities.

The CD Unit attended a Business Basics class offered through the Department of Small Business Services' (SBS) NYC Business Solutions program. The CD Unit found that the class was well-run and offered valuable information to its clients. The class instructor ensured that all participants filled out the Course Intake Form, which requested the clients' household income to justify the program's eligibility. The only concern was that the Intake Form did not reflect the current Section 8 Income Limits or a recently-added certification clause. The income limits on the form were lower than the limits actually in effect so this did not negatively impact the program's eligibility; more clients, not less, could have been considered CD-eligible. The CD Unit instructed SBS to update the form and of its intent to visit another class in 2016 to ensure the new form was in use.

Also in 2015, the CD Unit performed an equipment use and tracking monitoring at Project Hospitality's drop-in center for homeless persons, located at 25 Central Avenue in Staten Island. The drop-in center receives both City tax levy funds from the Dept. of Homeless Services (DHS) and CD funds. The CD Unit also visited Project Hospitality's headquarters at 100 Park Avenue, Staten Island. The CD Unit had the following concerns:

- Several computers were listed in the wrong room.
- There were numerous broken or obsolete items that hadn't been used for years.
- Although each item had a sticker that noted the item's serial number, it did not name the item's funding source. Thus, it was not clear whether City or Federal disposition requirements applied.
- Several items that appeared on the Property Register could not be found. All but one of these items were at least 10 years old, so they were likely obsolete and worthy of disposition. However, all dispositions should have been noted on the equipment registry.

The CD Unit advised that Project Hospitality should only use its tax levy allocation to purchase equipment and follow DHS's disposition procedures. However, if future purchases must be made with CD funds, the Property Register must be prepared and reviewed by at least two people, both of whom must sign the equipment registry prior to submission. Additionally, each item must be tagged as CD-funded.

The CD Unit also reviews agencies' requests to hire CD-funded staff. The CD Unit is electronically notified every time an agency requests to fill a CD-funded position. If the CD Unit determines that a position is not CD-eligible, it will not approve the hire. The requesting agency must then either use another funding source for the position or make necessary adjustments to the position's duties. Agencies are also instructed to correct positions that are CD-eligible but are not being charged to the appropriate eligibility category or national objective. In 2015, the CD Unit required that at least one position be charged to City tax levy rather than CD; recategorized several others into other eligibility categories or national objectives; and required that at least four positions' duties were changed to be fully CD-eligible.

Finally, in 2015 HUD monitored the Dept. of Housing Preservation and Development's Housing Code enforcement efforts, which are primarily provided through the Targeted Code Enforcement Program and the Neighborhood Preservation Consultants Program. HUD had no findings or concerns and determined that the City "has developed an impressive system of data gathering that also delivers on code enforcement services while providing effective financial and programmatic management."

HOME 2015 Monitoring Activities

File review and site visits to assure records properly collected and reserved:

The agency reviews all files of tenants selected for HOME units to assure records are properly collected and tenants meet HOME funding requirements, or when new information is discovered that demands our investigation. Staff completed a tax credit certification course in January of 2014 to ensure that they are qualified to review these files. Finally, the agency conducts site visits the year after a projects is Placed-in-Service.

The agency will continue to conduct these site visits to assure records are properly collected and reserved by developers.

Suspicion of Fraud: The agency works closely with New York City Department of Investigation (DOI) to address fraud involving HOME Program funds. If the agency is suspicious of fraud, then a further review is conducted by an agency staff member, and possible referral is made to DOI.

The Marketing Guidelines require that the Developers use certain forms during all tenant selection processes. These forms include IRS Form 4506 Request for Copy of Tax Return; IRS Form 4506-T Request for Copy of Tax Return Transcript; NYS DTF-505 Form Request for Copy of State Tax Return; as well as an Authorization to Release Information form. If an applicant file contains inconsistent information, these forms are used by agency staff and DOI in order to clarify the information or to determine if any fraud exists. On occasions, DOI has referred matters to appropriate prosecutors' offices. Furthermore, Developers are made aware that they may forward any suspicious information directly to the agency and/or DOI. Lastly, if any inconsistent or suspicious information is brought to the agency's attention regarding a Developer and or its agent, the matter is referred to DOI for further investigation.

During the year 2015, no applicant or developer referrals were made for projects involving HOME funds to DOI.

ESG 2015 Monitoring Activities

The NYC Department of Homeless Services (DHS) receives Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG) grant money to engage unsheltered individuals living on the street, increase the number and quality of emergency shelters for homeless individuals and families, to operate these facilities and provide essential services to residents, to rapidly re-house homeless individuals and families, and to help prevent homelessness.

The DHS Budget and Finance division is responsible for the fiscal administration of the ESG grant. These units allocate the ESG funding and ensure that payments and claims are made in accordance with the approved uses of the grant for eligible activities.

As part of ESG monitoring plan, DHS revised its standards according to the requirements set forth in 24 CFR 576.400(e) (1) and (e) (3). The purpose of the ESG monitoring plan is to determine if the ESG-funded programs have administered and implemented ESG-funded activities in accordance with applicable Federal requirements.

If any findings or concerns are identified after a program monitoring review, DHS works with the program staff in implementing corrective actions and making improvements.

DHS utilizes HUD's standard performance measures to evaluate ESG funded provider performance. DHS shared this framework with the Continuum of Care Steering Committee and reviews periodically with the NYC CCoC Data Management Committee.

DHS plans to utilize HMIS as a data source to monitor performance through the following indicators:

- Number of homeless individuals/households served
- Number of successful placements of individuals/households into permanent housing
- Length of time person remains homeless

DHS works with program staff in implementing and improving ESG-funded activities in accordance with applicable Federal requirements.

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.

In order to notify the public of the release of the Proposed CAPER for public review New York City utilized the same notification methods as it did to announce the public comment period for the formulation of its 2016 Proposed One-Year Action Plan. Over 1,900 notification letters were sent to New York City residents, organizations and public officials inviting their review and comment on the report. In addition, notices of the previously mentioned activity were published in three local newspapers, one English-language, a Spanish-language, and a Chinese-language daily, each with citywide circulation.

To provide public access to the document, copies of the Proposed 2015 Consolidated Plan Annual Performance and Evaluation Report could be obtained at the City Planning Bookstore, 120 Broadway, 31st Floor, New York, New York 10271, Phone: 212-720-3667, (Monday: 10 am until 12 noon with walk-ins from 10 am until 11 am, and Wednesday: 1 pm until 3 pm with walk-ins from 2 pm until 3 pm) or any of the New York City Department of City Planning borough offices.

In addition, copies of the Proposed CAPER were made available for reference in the City's Municipal Reference & Research Center (the City Hall Library), and the main public library in each of the five boroughs.

Furthermore, the Department of City Planning posted the Proposed 2015 Plan on the Department's website in Adobe Acrobat format for review by the public. The Internet-based version may be accessed at: <http://www.nyc.gov/planning>.

The public comment period began May 13, 2016 and ended until May 27, 2016. The public was instructed to submit their written comments on the Proposed 2015 Consolidated Plan Annual Performance and Evaluation Report by close of business, May 27, 2016 to: Charles V. Sorrentino, New York City Consolidated Plan Coordinator, Department of City Planning, 120 Broadway 31st Floor, New York, New York 10271, email: Con-PlanNYC@planning.nyc.gov.

Comments received were to be summarized and agencies' responses incorporated into the version submitted to HUD. However, no comments were received.

Lastly, at the end of the public hearing on the formulation of the Proposed Consolidated Plan One-Year Action Plan for the upcoming (2017) Consolidated Plan Program Year City agency representatives in attendance made themselves available for a question and answer session regarding the City's performance of Consolidated Plan activities in 2015. However, no questions were asked.

Summary of Citizens' Comments

1. Comments Received During the Public Comment Period on the Proposed 2015 Consolidated Plan Annual Performance and Evaluation Report, May 13, 2016 through May 27, 2016

No comments regarding the Proposed CAPER were received during the public comment period.

ESG - Citizen Participation

Please refer to the 2014 Consolidated Plan Volume 2, Part II, Section A., and Citizen Participation Plan. This section of the Plan is the most recent description of the community and citizen participation outreach activities conducted by the Consolidated Plan Committee member agencies relating to their own agency's area of expertise.

The Department of Homeless Services (DHS) as the lead agency for the New York City Coalition on the Continuum of Care (NYC CCoC), a large group of homeless service providers, consumers, advocates, representatives of the public, and government agencies, works closely with stakeholders and informs them about the EGS funding process in its scheduled meetings and solicits participation and feedback on

the process. As part of the CoC, there is consumer representation by means of a consumer committee. Consumers are also voting members of the CoC and this directly associated with CoC planning and activities.

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.

In 2015, the City closed four CD-funded programs: the CCHR Law Enforcement Program, the CCHR Neighborhood Human Rights Program, the HPD Neighborhood Preservation Offices, and the HPD Program Planning program. Each of the programs fell into either or both of the Public Service or Planning and Administration eligibility categories. The programs were closed because the cumulative impact of recent collective bargaining salary increases for City staff over several years would cause the City to exceed the 15 percent cap on Public Service expenditures and the 20 percent cap on Planning and Administrative expenditures. In order to remain under these caps, all of the programs were switched to City tax levy funding.

In addition, due to rising incomes and improving housing conditions, portions of the City were no longer CD-eligible under HPD's Targeted Code Enforcement program. A portion of the program's budget was switched to City tax levy funding. The total reduction for all of these actions was \$14.677 million.

The freed-up CD funds were re-allocated to pay for the expansion of the Department of Education's (DOE) Breakfast in the Classroom (BIC) program. This program is known as DOE School Kitchen Renovations Program in the CD budget. The BIC expansion aims to increase free breakfast participation in public elementary schools, which is relatively low compared with the need: about 24 percent of students eat breakfast in school every morning while approximately 75 percent of students qualify for "free" or "reduced-price" meals, meaning that they are from low-income homes. These students often live in neighborhoods labeled "food deserts," with little access to healthy food. The program's goal is to prevent the short- and long-term effects of skipping breakfast, which can contribute to tardiness, poor attendance, and overall lower grade performance. Students are ensured a nutritious and healthy breakfast needed to think clearly, concentrate on learning, and perform better in class.

At the request of the City Council, the City also allocated \$375,000 for the Metropolitan Council on Jewish Poverty's food pantry. The organization used this allocation to purchase food, operate the pantry's warehouse, and for meal delivery. Due to issues registering the organization's contract with the Department of Youth and Community Development, the program did not have expenditures in 2015. Expenditures are expected to be reflected in early 2016.

Through foreclosure for tax delinquency (in rem), the City assumed ownership and management responsibility of formerly privately-owned residential buildings. For many years, CD funds have been used to support the operation and maintenance of the in rem inventory. This effort was previously comprised of the following CD-funded programs: In Rem Superintendent Contract, In Rem Material Management and Procurement, In Rem Property Management, In Rem Building Maintenance and Repair Program, In Rem Building Maintenance and Repair Project Support, and Property Disposition and Finance. As of 7/1/15 these programs were collapsed into the Maintenance and Operation of Tax-Foreclosed Housing Program due to the significant reduction in the inventory of City-owned tax-foreclosed housing.

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

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.

During 2015 there were 500 HOME projects under compliance monitoring. The projects included 1,739 buildings containing 15,230 HOME units.

Of the 500 projects, 159 required physical (HQS) inspection in calendar year 2015. A sample of 1,992 apartments were inspected: 1,902 passed or were corrected; 90 failed. Notices of non-compliance have been sent to owners of units that failed, and HPD will continue to seek a satisfactory response.

Please see the Appendix to this document for a detailed list of the inspected units.

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

The NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), in conjunction with their sister agency, the NYC Housing Development Corporation (HDC) conducts regular oversight of the Developer's tenanting process. Developers receiving HOME funds must establish and maintain satisfactory records in accordance to the agency's Marketing Guidelines. The Marketing Guidelines describe policies, procedures, and certain requirements for the marketing and selection of residents for developments subsidized by the agency. Developers must follow these guidelines in preparing marketing plans for their projects and comply with its specific requirements, including certain forms required during the tenant selection process to ensure eligibility, fairness, consistency and prevent fraud in the agency's programs. The Marketing Guidelines require the developer maintain individual tenant files for all families in HOME assisted units. The tenant files must contain all income certifications and verifications along with leases, lease riders, unit inspections, and all correspondence, which are subject for review by the agency. Developers forward the agency a tenant file which is reviewed by the staff to ensure income eligibility prior to the lease-up of a unit.

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

The City utilized program income on 4 supportive housing projects. Tenants are a blend of formerly homeless and other low income households.

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)

Since the launch the *Housing New York* plan, the City has made incredible progress towards the goal of creating and preserving 200,000 affordable units in ten years and fostering strong, economically diverse neighborhoods across the five boroughs. *Housing New York* is a comprehensive plan, requiring the collaboration of multiple city agencies.

In 2015, the City financed 21,041 affordable apartments, of which over a third were new construction and two-thirds were preservation of existing affordable housing. The City invested \$600 million in City capital in these homes, and leveraged more than \$1.3 billion in bonds issued by the Housing Development Corporation during 2015, including its new Sustainable Neighborhoods Bonds - the first social investment bonds used for affordable housing in the United States.

Progress in 2015 included:

More apartments for the formerly homeless: Through new programs such as “HomeStretch” that create a pathway from shelter to permanently affordable housing, HPD, HDC and the Department of Homeless Services partnered to help stem the homelessness crisis and return families to stable housing. 1,618 apartments for the formerly homeless were financed in 2015.

More housing for seniors on fixed incomes: New programs, including the Senior Affordable Rental Apartments (SARA) program increased the new construction and renovation of affordable housing for very low-income senior citizens. 1,087 such apartments were financed in 2015

More apartments for the very lowest-income families: HPD and HDC’s new Extremely Low and Low Income Affordability (ELLA) program kicked into high gear, creating more housing opportunities for families with the lowest incomes – those making less than \$23,300 for a family of three. 1,081 such units were financed in 2015.

The First-Ever M/WBE Affordable Housing Pipeline: To ensure an increased role for Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise (M/WBE) firms building affordable housing, the City launched its first ever M/WBE request for proposals, soliciting bids on six new projects across the city.

CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)

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

Table 13 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	10	17
Tenant-based rental assistance	557	528
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	2,887	2,878
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	0	0

Narrative

As the designated grantee for the New York City Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA), the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene's (DOHMH) Division of Disease Control administers, coordinates and executes the HUD HOPWA formula grant. The EMSA is comprised of the five boroughs of the City of New York together with Westchester, Orange and Rockland Counties in the Lower Hudson Valley and Middlesex, Monmouth and Ocean Counties in New Jersey. The Division of Disease Control works with these six counties and eligible localities therein to plan and evaluate their use of HOPWA funds and to ensure the consistency of their efforts with those in the rest of the EMSA.

In calendar year 2015, the Division of Disease Control administered the HOPWA grant to serve low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS across the NYC EMSA with permanent supportive housing, permanent housing placement assistance, TBRA, STRMU and supportive services.

In the permanent housing facilities category, HOPWA funds assisted 2,878 households. HOPWA funds were also used to provide housing information services—which surpassed expectations by serving 937 households, compared to its goal of 350 households. Additional funds were used to assist 173 households secure permanent housing placement in 2015 (data not reflected in the table above).

HOPWA STRMU funds increased housing stability among 17 households compared to the projected goal of 10 STRMU supported households. Finally, 528 households benefitted from TBRA services in 2015.

In tandem with housing, many households received supportive services which are essential to ensuring housing stability and durability for low-income persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. In 2015, 34,028 clients received supportive services and an additional 874 clients received supportive services along with housing subsidy assistance, both exceeding proposed projections.

For additional details on HOPWA's 2015 accomplishments, please refer to the Appendix: *HOPWA 2015 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report*.

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	NEW YORK CITY
Organizational DUNS Number	140135505
EIN/TIN Number	136400434
Identify the Field Office	NEW YORK
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	New York City CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Mr
First Name	Kevin
Middle Name	0
Last Name	Rente
Suffix	0
Title	Director of Federal Policy

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	NYC Dept of Homeless Services
Street Address 2	33 Beaver Street
City	New York
State	NY
ZIP Code	10004-
Phone Number	2123615595
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	KRente@dhs.nyc.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	Ms
First Name	MERIH
Last Name	ANIL
Suffix	0
Title	Senior Policy Analyst
Phone Number	2122320830
Extension	0
Email Address	manil@dhs.nyc.gov

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date 01/01/2015
Program Year End Date 12/31/2015

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

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: BLACK VET. FOR SOCIAL JUST.

City: Brooklyn

State: NY

Zip Code: 11217, 1609

DUNS Number:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 269791

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA

City: VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA

State: NY

Zip Code: 99999,

DUNS Number:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 664849

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: RIDGEWOOD BUSHWICK SENIOR CITIZEN COUNCIL, INC

City: Brooklyn

State: NY

Zip Code: 11237, 5001

DUNS Number: 046254991

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 56549

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: COMMON GROUND COMMUNITY II HDFC

City: New York

State: NY

Zip Code: 10018, 6505

DUNS Number: 806767419

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 259744

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10004, 2736
DUNS Number: 035493646
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 4299270

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: BRONXWORKS INC
City: Bronx
State: NY
Zip Code: 10453, 5842
DUNS Number: 133254484
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 196699

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: GODDARD RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY CENTER
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10024, 1904
DUNS Number: 131893908
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 250997

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: BOWERY RESIDENTS' COMMITTEE, INC
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10001, 7207
DUNS Number: 132736659
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 331540

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CAMBA INC
City: Brooklyn
State: NY
Zip Code: 11226, 2630
DUNS Number: 112480339
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 446362

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: THE DOE FUND, INC
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10028, 2902
DUNS Number: 609643598
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 191714

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: GRAND CENTRAL NEIGHBORHOOD SOCIAL SERVICES CORPORATION
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10017, 4707
DUNS Number: 133534255
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 37904

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: LENOX HILL NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE INC.
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10021, 8601
DUNS Number: 131628180
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 245822

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: PALLADIA, INC
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10035, 1217
DUNS Number: 237089380
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 322007

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: PROJECT RENEWAL INC
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10014, 4810
DUNS Number: 057841710
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 359623

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: SAMARITAN VILLAGE INC
City: Briarwood
State: NY
Zip Code: 11435, 2642
DUNS Number: 072730179
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 151933

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: URBAN PATHWAYS INC
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10018, 3011
DUNS Number: 057808784
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 207581

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: WEST SIDE FEDERATION FOR SR & SUPPORTIVE HOUSING INC
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10025, 2942
DUNS Number: 132926433
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 76376

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NYC DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE
City: Long Island City
State: NY
Zip Code: 11101, 4130
DUNS Number: 083489737
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 141866

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CDYCD
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10038, 2609
DUNS Number: 002545379
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 98216

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATOR
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10007, 1602
DUNS Number: 136400434
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 62500

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CATHOLIC CHARITIES NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES, INC
City: Brooklyn
State: NY
Zip Code: 11201, 4306
DUNS Number: 056926215
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 233072

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CATHOLIC CHARITIES COMMUNITY SERVICES, ARCHDIOCESE NEW YORK
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10022, 4112
DUNS Number: 173647699
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 71901

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: HELP SOCIAL SERVICE CORPORATION
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10004, 2682
DUNS Number: 827233982
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 286534

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE, INC.
City: New York
State: NY
Zip Code: 10279, 1299
DUNS Number: 073299836
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 53323

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

10. Shelter Utilization

Table 14 – Shelter Capacity

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	1,323,855
Total Number of bed-nights provided	1,259,539
Capacity Utilization	95.14%

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

DHS is also the CoC's Collaborative Applicant and Steering Committee member and therefore DHS, the ESG recipient, coordinates extensively with NYC's CoC and the Consolidated Plan jurisdiction. Coordination takes place through monthly meetings between Collaborative Applicant and representatives of Con Plan. Efforts are made around shared goals, listed in NYC's five year Con Plan, which are consistent with the CoC's strategic plan: investing in proven strategies to reduce the number of homeless individuals on the streets; preventing those families and individuals at-risk of homelessness from entering shelter; and ensuring that shelter is a short-term solution to a housing crisis by rapidly re-housing families and individuals. It aims to end homelessness, with an emphasis on chronic and veteran's homelessness. The alignment of the Con Plan goals and the CoC's strategic plan has led to coordinated efforts within the jurisdiction to address the needs of homeless individuals and families and those at risk of homelessness.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

Table 15 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	163,194	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	1,929,800	1,257,720	1,059,686
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	2,092,994	1,257,720	1,059,686

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

Table 16 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	2,438	33,015	37,984
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	1,761,210	893,814	49,355
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	1,763,648	926,829	87,339

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

Table 17 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Essential Services	6,970,874	5,689,556	5,869,987
Operations	393,755	409,560	410,000
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	7,364,629	6,099,116	6,279,987

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

Table 18 - Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
HMIS	568,323	81,775	1,161,587
Administration	220,167	112,650	126,833
Street Outreach	722,364	543,967	600,739

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Table 19 - Total ESG Funds Expended

Total ESG Funds Expended	2013	2014	2015
8,715,432	12,732,126	9,022,057	8,715,432

11f. Match Source

Table 20 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

	2013	2014	2015
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	0	0
State Government	0	0	0
Local Government	12,732,126	9,022,057	9,316,171
Private Funds	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	12,732,126	9,022,057	9,316,171

11g. Total

Table 21 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2013	2014	2015
18,031,603	25,464,252	18,044,114	18,031,603