



Governor Steve Bullock

State of Montana

Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation & Report

April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017



301 S. Park Avenue – PO Box 200523
Helena, MT 59620-0523
406-841-2770

<http://commerce.mt.gov/conplan>

Montana Department of Commerce

Pam Haxby-Cote, Director

Department of Public Health & Human Services

Sheila Hogan, Director

Final

Submitted to HUD: June 29, 2017



The Montana Department of Commerce will provide alternative accessible formats of this document upon request. If you need this document in an alternative format such as large print, Braille, audiotape, or computer diskette, please contact the Department.

DOCConPlan@mt.gov

Phone: (406) 841-2700

Fax: (406) 841-2701

TDD: (800)-841-2702

Montana Relay Services number: 711

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
CR-05 – Goals and Outcomes.....	4
CR – 10 – Racial and Ethnic Composition of Families Assisted.....	12
CR – 15 – Resources and Investments	13
CR-20 – Affordable Housing.....	23
CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs.....	26
CR-30 – Public Housing	30
CR-35 – Other Actions.....	32
CR-40 – Monitoring.....	37
CR-45 – CDBG.....	40
CR-50 – HOME	41
CR-55 – HOPWA.....	43
CR-60 – ESG.....	46
CR-65 – Persons Assisted	50
CR-70 – ESG – Assistance Provided and Outcomes.....	52
CR-75 – Expenditures.....	53

Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report

Introduction

Montana Departments of Commerce (Commerce) and Public Health and Human Services (DPHHS) receive annual U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) programs. Activities have been completed with limited administrative budgets while adhering to increased regulatory requirements. The decrease in program funding, as seen over the past several years, makes it increasingly difficult to address the needs across the state as programs are oversubscribed for funding. Funding through these programs is a key component to organizations struggling to obtain scarce funding to serve households at or below 80% of area median income. As demonstrated in this 2016-2017 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER), these programs have been a critical funding source for constructing senior and health facilities in rural areas, housing facilities to assist disadvantaged populations, or providing clean water and sanitary sewer to support the growth of vital, resilient communities across Montana.

The State of Montana's CAPER serves as the report to HUD regarding the outcome of the goals and objectives with the resources made available through the CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs during the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan and the 2015-2020 Montana Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development (Consolidated Plan). The 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan and the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan comprehensively fulfill three basic goals in Montana: provide decent housing, provide a suitable living environment, and expand economic opportunities. The 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan summarizes the actions Montana will take to support the strategic goals identified in the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan during the plan's second year, which is April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017. The CAPER identifies the accomplishments of the CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs through detailed reports or spreadsheets and narrative.

Commerce and DPHHS have evaluated its first-year performance in a previous CAPER for the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan, where information is reported in the HUD Integrated Data Information System (IDIS), which interfaces with the eCon Planning Suite. IDIS and eCon Planning Suite establishes the format and manner in which information is collected and reported in all Consolidated Plan documents. The 2016-2017 CAPER is the second year the CAPER has been presented for the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan and is in the eCon Plan Suite format prescribed

by HUD. This new format heavily relies on reports and spreadsheets specifically established in the electronic format and which derives its results from the objectives and outcomes specifically established in the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan. This format allows this, and each future, CAPER to report on specific information for each year's Annual Action Plan, and include an evaluation of past performance through measurable goals and objectives compared to actual performance. The 2015-2016 CAPER did not accurately reflect the data goals and objectives met, due to the new and unique data reporting requirements, established in the eCon Planning Suite, which were not reflected in the data collection reports for many of the programs. However, during the 2016-2017 Plan Year, the State was better able to report its accomplishments within the eCon Planning Suite and therefore the reports accurately reflect the data goals and objectives for the programs. Commerce specific data was used to augment the prepopulated tables from IDIS in the 2015-2016 CAPER and is combined with the eCon Planning Suite prepopulated data in the cumulative tables, and additional tables have been added to the 2016-2017 CAPER to continue to report additional program accomplishments tracked by the state.

CR-05 – Goals and Outcomes

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a) This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

The 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan established five goals using the available resources from CDBG, HOME, HTF, and ESG funds that would address needs across the state. CDBG and HOME expended a combined \$13,276,980.93 towards the five goals established in the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan. Commerce planned to devote funds to each of the following goals:

- 17.27% of CDBG funds and 73.46% of HOME funds to Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing;
- 8.63% of CDBG funds to Plan for Communities;
- 35.61% to Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure;
- 25.99 to Revitalize Local Economies; and
- 7.77% of CDBG funds, 16.54% of HOME funds to Reduce Homelessness.

Actual expenditures for Plan Year Two for both CDBG and HOME totaled \$7,392,609. These expenditures primarily include funding from past years. Once CDBG and HOME funds are awarded, construction activities and expenditures typically begin 12 to 15 months after award. Projects take two to four years to complete before the accomplishments associated with those expenditures are reported. Therefore, the annual CAPER reporting includes project expenditures and accomplishments from previous fiscal years and goals and objectives from previous Annual Action Plans.

In addition, the State's HTF Allocation Plan was approved in December 2016 and the achievements of HTF will be reported in future CAPERs. The state will receive applications from eight communities, who have been invited to submit a detailed application, compliant with HTF regulations, on June 8, 2017. Funding will be awarded in Summer 2017.

Commerce, through the CDBG and HOME programs, has made progress towards the goals and objectives identified in the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan and 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan. Commerce awarded CDBG and HOME funds during the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan year to activities that addressed all five goals.

The first goal, Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing, identified the use of \$5,121,060 in CDBG and HOME resources combined, which provided assistance to 185 eligible households across the state with rental developments or homebuyer financial assistance. The second goal, Plan for Communities, identified the use of \$500,000 in CDBG resources, which provided assistance to twenty-one (21) local governments with planning activities to address various land use planning and project specific planning needs across the state to assist with long term development. The third goal, Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure, identified the use of \$2,062,350 in CDBG resources and assisted 8,333 income-eligible persons with new or improved access to vital public infrastructure. The fourth goal, Revitalize Local Economies, identified the use of \$1,505,292 in CDBG resources and assisted four (4) businesses to create or retain 100 jobs that will benefit income eligible businesses or individuals. Lastly, with the fifth goal, Reduce Homelessness, the state assisted homeless individuals with \$833,277.33 of ESG funds for housing and services across the state. During the report period, neither CDBG nor HOME received an application from any eligible applicant to complete work related to reducing homelessness.

Montana communities most often use CDBG and HOME funds in combination with other federal, state, or local funds to serve the needs of income eligible households through projects that address all the goals listed above. Eligible applicants prepare planning documents that better identify the communities' highest priority needs and the types of development that need to occur in the community to meet these needs. As determined at the local level, applicants frequently apply with partner organizations, for CDBG and/or HOME funding for projects with a high priority need and are supported within the community. Commerce does not prescribe or dictate which applicants or project types will be submitted to request funding, therefore the project types vary from year to year and the sum of submissions may not result in meeting exactly the planned goals or objectives.

ESG assisted a total of 938 individuals, spending \$277,353.51 to serve 469 individuals through Homeless Prevention activities and \$366,386.09 to serve 469 individuals through Rapid Rehousing activities which included Case Management, Rental Assistance, Rental Arrears, Security Deposit payments, and other expenditures for housing relocation and stabilization services. Two subrecipients spent \$15,686.81 to assist their area women's domestic violence shelters serve 306 individuals through essential services and operations support. This was the first year a subrecipient used \$1,384.66 for direct Street Outreach activities. One subrecipient has very effectively and consistently used a portion of ESG to fund their area's coordinated assessment and assistance system.

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)

As stated earlier, the CDBG and HOME programs do not prescribe or dictate the location or type of activities that are submitted by local communities across the state, therefore, some goals were not met due to the lack of applications received to address a specific goal. Commerce based the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan goals on the historical awards and activities completed with program funding.

Helping an individual secure stable housing to prevent homelessness or rehouse someone who is homeless or at risk of homelessness requires more than one time support. Therefore, ESG subrecipients are finding it necessary to spend more funds per client assisted than anticipated and are not able to help as many individuals as they had planned. In addition, while the intent is to focus funds on Rapid Rehousing, there was more demand for Homeless Prevention assistance than anticipated during this program year.

Table 1 – Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date, shows both Plan Year Two specific data as well as cumulative data for the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan. The first three data columns (Expected – Strategic Plan, Actual – Strategic Place, and % Complete) are reflective of the first two Program Years of the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan. This table includes Commerce-specific data and data pulled from IDIS report PR23 Home Disbursements and Unit Completions and IDIS report PR23 Count of CDBG Activities with Disbursements by Activity Group & Matrix Code.

The last three data columns (Expected – Program Year, Actual – Program Year, and % Complete) reflect the Plan Year Two CAPER Report Year. Data is drawn from only IDIS report PR23 Home Disbursements and Unit Completions and IDIS report PR23 Count of CDBG Activities with Disbursements by Activity Group & Matrix Code.

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
Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$3,486,816.06	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	5000	10,814*	216.28%	1000	8,333	833.3%
Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDGB: \$0 HOME: \$7,826,809.31 National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF): \$0	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	125	132*	105.6%	25	128	512%
Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$5,800 HOME: \$0 National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF): \$0	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	125	14*	11.2%	25	14	56%
Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$0 HOME: \$0 National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF): \$0	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	25	0	0%	5	0	0%
Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ HOME: \$0 National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF): \$0	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	20	1*	5%	4	0	0%
Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$0 HOME: \$1,323,165.31 National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF): \$0	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	250	88*	35.2%	50	43	86%
Reduce Homelessness	Homeless	CDBG: \$0 HOME: \$0	Tenant-based rental	Households Assisted	3000	854*	28.47%	600	469	78.17%

		ESG: \$366,386.09	assistance / Rapid Rehousing							
Reduce Homelessness	Homeless	CDBG: \$0 HOME: \$0 ESG: \$15,686.81	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	600	1670*	278.33%	120	306	255%
Reduce Homelessness	Homeless	CDBG: \$0 HOME: \$0 ESG: \$0	Overnight / Emergency Shelter / Transitional Housing Beds added	Beds	23	18*	78.26%	5	0	0%
Reduce Homelessness	Homeless	CDBG: \$0 HOME: \$0 ESG: \$277,353.51	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	3000	1932*	64.4%	600	469	78.17%
Reduce Homelessness	Homeless	CDBG: \$0 HOME: \$0 ESG: \$0	Housing for Homeless added	Household Housing Unit	50	42*	84%	10	0	0%
Revitalize Local Economies	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$0	Façade Treatment / Business Building Rehabilitation	Business	5	0	0%	1	0	0%
Revitalize Local Economies	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$0	Brownfield Acre Remediated	Acre	3	0	0%	1	0	0%
Revitalize Local Economies	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$764,677.29	Jobs Created / Retained	Jobs	100	434*	434%	20	100	500%
Revitalize Local Economies	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$0	Businesses Assisted	Businesses Assisted	20	0	0%	4	0	0%

*A combination of Commerce specific data and data reported in the eCon Planning Suite to produce a cumulative total.

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.

As stated above, the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan identified the following five goals:

- Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing
- Plan for Communities
- Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure
- Revitalize Local Economies
- Reduce Homelessness

As reflected in the spreadsheet below, the CDBG and HOME programs funded and implemented project activities during Plan Year Two in communities across the state that will assist income eligible populations once the activities are completed. This table reflects the CDBG activities that were reported on the Timely Distribution Report, submitted to HUD. The table below, Table CR-05A, is a Commerce specific table which contains information for grants that have been awarded in the program year.

Table CR-05A – Projects Awarded During Plan Year 2016-2017

Applicant	County	Funds Awarded	Annual Action Plan Goal	Number of Anticipated Housing Beneficiaries	Number of Anticipated Individual Beneficiaries	Project Description
Havre, City of	Hill	CDBG: \$421,000	Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure	3,906	9,834	Renovate the Boys and Girls Club of the HiLine
Roosevelt County	Roosevelt	CDBG: \$450,000	Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure	489	979	Construct a senior center in Poplar, MT
Kalispell, City of	Flathead	CDBG: \$150,465	Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure		22,876	ADA Improvements at County Fairgrounds Facilities
Hot Springs, Town of	Sanders	CDBG: \$450,000	Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure	392	544	Improvements to the water system
Butte-Silver Bow County	Butte-Silver Bow	CDBG: \$350,000	Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure	144	1,429	Improvements to the storm water infrastructure in the Greeley Neighborhood
Lewis & Clark County	Lewis & Clark	CDBG: \$450,000	Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure	34,985	85,000	Remodel the lower level of the Pure View Center for public health services

Missoula County	Missoula	CDBG: \$373,770	Improve and Sustain Public Infrastructure	37	95	Buena Vista Trailer Park Wastewater Collection
Belgrade, City of	Gallatin	HOME: \$832,000	Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing	24		Multi-family rental rehabilitation of Big Sky Villas
Superior, Town of	Mineral	HOME: \$570,000	Preserve and Construct Affordable Housing	3		New construction of three apartments for senior housing
Glacier County	Glacier	CDBG-ED: \$400,000	Revitalize Local Economies	16	9	Construction of Health Science Building for Blackfeet Community College in Browning
Garfield County	Garfield	CDBG-ED: \$400,000	Revitalize Local Economies	16	9	Rehabilitation of Garfield County Health Center in Jordan
Anaconda-Deer Lodge County	Anaconda-Deer Lodge	CDBG: \$22,000	Plan for Communities			Active Transportation Plan
Blaine County	Blaine	CDBG: \$30,000	Plan for Communities			Capital Improvements Plan and update Subdivision Regulations
Chouteau County	Chouteau	CDBG: \$25,000	Plan for Communities			Mechanical engineering addendum to Missouri River Medical Center's Preliminary Architectural Report and Financial Feasibility on proposed Master Plan expansion
Custer County	Custer	CDBG: \$30,000	Plan for Communities			Capital Improvements Plan
Ekalaka, Town of	Carter	CDBG: \$25,000	Plan for Communities			Master Plan with Floodplain Analysis
Flathead County	Flathead	CDBG: \$40,000	Plan for Communities			Preliminary Architectural Report for County adult detention facility
Glendive, City of	Dawson	CDBG: \$25,000	Plan for Communities			Downtown Master Plan
Hamilton, City of	Ravalli	CDBG: \$15,000	Plan for Communities			Preliminary Architectural Report for Head Start Building
Helena, City of	Lewis & Clark	CDBG: \$25,000	Plan for Communities			Development of Form-Based Zoning Code for Downtown Helena
Hill County	Hill	CDBG: \$40,000	Plan for Communities			System Wide Improvement Framework (SWIF) Plan
Hobson, Town of	Judith Basin	CDBG: \$25,000	Plan for Communities			Growth Policy and Capital Improvements Plan
Lake County	Lake	CDBG: \$30,000	Plan for Communities			Update County Growth Policy
Lewis & Clark County	Lewis & Clark	CDBG: \$35,000	Plan for Communities			Preliminary Architectural Report for West Mont Building
Lewistown, City of	Fergus	CDBG: \$35,000	Plan for Communities			Preliminary Architectural Report for historic Broadway Building
Madison County	Madison	CDBG: \$20,000	Plan for Communities			Master Plan for County Fairgrounds

Plevna, Town of	Fallon	CDBG: \$25,000	Plan for Communities			Development of Zoning Regulations
Ravalli County	Ravalli	CDBG: \$25,000	Plan for Communities			Preliminary Engineering Report to Study the County Wastewater System
Whitefish, City of	Flathead	CDBG: \$40,000	Plan for Communities			Affordable Workforce Housing Plan

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	358	157	109	689
Black or African American	2	1	7	30
Asian	2		0	1
American Indian or American Native		4	11	186
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		1	0	1
Other		2	1	23
Not Identified	8,091		0	8
Total	8,453	165	128	938
Hispanic		8	7	60
Not Hispanic	362	157	121	868
Not Identified	8,091		0	10

Narrative

The CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG programs assisted persons from various racial and ethnic backgrounds during Plan Year Two. 1,313 assisted individuals identified as White; 40 assisted individuals identified as Black or African American; 3 assisted persons identified as Asian; 201 assisted individuals identified as American Indian or American Native; and 2 assisted individuals identified as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. 1,508 of the assisted individuals identified their ethnic background as Not Hispanic and 75 assisted individuals identified as Hispanic. Ethnic and racial data collected from completed CDBG projects did not interface correctly between Commerce’s collection and IDIS report. The demographics listed in Table 2 is the collected data reported to HUD in IDIS and the eCon Planning Suite. These numbers are for Plan Year Two and are not cumulative for the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan.

CR – 15 – Resources and Investments

Identify the resources made available

Table 3 – Resources Made Available

Sources of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	Public/Federal	\$10,741,383	\$5,350,171.62
HOME	Public/Federal	\$5,840,440	\$7,926,809.31
HOPWA	Public/Federal	\$532,355.46	\$532,355.46
ESG	Public/Federal	\$673,738	\$833,277.33
Other	National Housing Trust Funds (HTF)	\$3,000,000	\$0

Narrative

During the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan, HOME received allocations less than the amount expended, which was derived from current and previous plan years in administration and grants and from the use of program income for the HOME program. The HTF received an allocation of \$3,000,000 but has not expended any funds as of the end of the 2016-2017 Program Year. Commerce will commit these funds in the 2017-2018 Program Year after applications have been reviewed June 8, 2017. The Plan Year Two allocation for CDBG was \$5,791,383, and the Plan Year Two allocation for HOME was \$3,023,400. Table 3 – Resources Made Available, reflects Plan Year Two and the previous years' combined resources.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Table 4 – Identify the Geographic Distribution and Location of Investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description

Narrative

As described in the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan and the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan, Commerce does not target any particular geographic area for special assistance, but will allow any non-entitlement community to apply for CDBG and all communities and other eligible entities may apply for HOME Program funding, dependent on eligible activities. While there is, no geographical distribution planned in the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan or 2016-2017 Annual Action plan, the table CR-15A does provide a lookback at the projects awarded during the 2016-2017 Program Year, cumulatively for the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan, and applies a percentage allocation specific to a geographic area. A county, or any eligible entity located within that county,

which has received funding throughout the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan period are listed in Table CR-15A under the respective county. Of the fifty-six (56) counties in Montana, thirty-nine (39) have received either CDBG or HOME, or both, funding any time during the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan period.

Table CR-15A – Project Geographic Distribution and Percentage of Allocation for CDBG and HOME

County	2015-2016 Funded Amount	2015-2016 % of Allocation	2016-2017 Funded Amount	2016-2017 % of Allocation	2015-2020 Total Funded	2015-2020 Total % of Allocation
Anaconda-Deer Lodge	\$675,000	7.77	\$22,000	0.25	\$697,000	3.98
Beaverhead*						0.0
Big Horn	\$478,140	5.51			\$478,140	2.73
Blaine			\$30,000	0.34	\$30,000	0.17
Broadwater*						0.0
Butte-Silver Bow	\$37,500	0.43	\$350,000	3.97	\$38,7500	2.21
Carbon	\$471,000	5.42			\$471,000	2.69
Carter			\$25,000	0.28	\$25,000	0.14
Cascade	\$161,000	1.85			\$161,000	0.92
Chouteau			\$25,000	0.28	\$25,000	0.14
Custer	\$420,100	4.84	\$30,000	0.34	\$450,100	2.57
Daniels	\$10,000	0.12			\$10,000	0.06
Dawson			\$25,000	0.28	\$25,000	0.14
Fallon	\$22500	0.26	\$25,000	0.28	\$47,500	0.27
Fergus			\$35,000	0.40	\$35,000	0.20
Flathead	\$437459	5.04	\$230,465	2.61	\$667,924	3.82
Gallatin	\$780000	8.98	\$832,000	9.44	\$1,612,000	9.21
Garfield			\$400,000	4.54	\$400,000	2.29
Glacier			\$400,000	4.54	\$400,000	2.29
Golden Valley*						0.0
Granite*						0.0
Hill	\$790000	9.10	\$461,000	5.23	\$1,251,000	7.15
Jefferson	\$15000	0.17			\$15,000	0.09
Judith Basin			\$25,000	0.28	\$25,000	0.14
Lake	\$450,000	5.18	\$30,000	0.34	\$480,000	2.74
Lewis & Clark	\$18,300	0.21	\$510,000	5.79	\$528,300	3.02
Liberty*						0.0
Lincoln*						0.0
McCone	\$450,000	5.18			\$450,000	2.57
Madison	\$437,388	5.04	\$20,000	0.23	\$457,388	2.61

Meagher	\$18,000	0.21			\$18,000	0.10
Mineral			\$570,000	6.47	\$570,000	3.26
Missoula	\$1,450,000	16.70	\$373,770	4.24	\$1,823,770	10.42
Musselshell	\$483,750	5.57			\$483,750	2.76
Park	\$28,000	0.32			\$28,000	0.16
Petroleum	\$22,500	0.26			\$28,000	0.16
Phillips	\$26,800	0.31			\$26,800	0.15
Pondera*						0.0
Powder River*						0.0
Powell	\$30,000	0.35			\$30,000	0.17
Prairie	\$40,000	0.46			\$40,000	0.23
Ravalli	\$827,000	9.52	\$28,333	0.32	\$855,333	4.89
Richland*						0.0
Roosevelt	\$40,000	0.46	\$450,000	5.11	\$490,000	2.80
Rosebud*						0.0
Sanders	\$35,000	0.40	\$450,000	5.11	\$485,000	2.77
Sheridan	\$22,500	0.26			\$22,500	0.13
Stillwater*						0.0
Sweet Grass*						0.0
Teton*						0.0
Toole*						0.0
Treasure*						0.0
Valley*						0.0
Wheatland	\$450,000	5.18			\$450,000	2.57
Wibaux*						0.0
Yellowstone	\$818,000	9.42	\$498,176	5.65	\$1,316,176	7.52
*Counties have not applied for or were not awarded CDBG or HOME funding.						

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 publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

Commerce programs leveraged CDBG and HOME resources with other federal, state and local funding to maximize the impact of the HUD funding and utilize available funding resources to conduct housing and community development activities that will benefit income eligible

households.

The CDBG program requires 25% matching funds for public infrastructure project, be secured from another source for each project awarded. Other CDBG project types are encouraged, but not required, to provide matching funds. However, the maximum amount of CDBG funds that can be awarded to an individual project cannot exceed \$450,000 for grant construction activities, or \$55,000 for grant planning activities.

The match contribution is typically provided by a direct cash contribution or by incurring a loan through bond financing which is re-paid through user charges or property tax assessments. Other local match sources may include loan or grant funds from other federal or state grant programs, local funds expended for predevelopment planning, the value of donated land provided by the applicant, and/or the value of labor performed by the applicant's employees. The 25% match requirement may be waived if the local government demonstrates financial hardship and satisfies the waiver request requirements.

The HOME program requires 25% matching funds for projects from non-federal sources. While the HOME Program has no grant award limitation, the match for a HOME project is typically obtained using Low Income Housing Tax Credits. Other non-federal local match sources are any non-duplicated HOME-eligible activities paid for with non-federal monies within the Program Year.

ESG funds are matched by sub-recipients who provide transitional housing and/or supportive services through the Montana Continuum of Care Program. A significant number of local ESG sub-recipients contribute additional resources such as block grant funds and local philanthropic foundation resources to the homeless programs they operate.

No match is required for CDBG housing or neighborhood renewal grants, but each applicants' relative ability to leverage other private, local, state, or federal funds is considered when ranking a proposed project for CDBG housing or neighborhood renewal grant funding.

CDD internal tracking processes are utilized to record and report all matching funds from CDBG, HTF, and HOME projects. These matching funds are in the form of bank loans, loans from state and federal agencies, Low Income Housing Tax Credit funds, bonds, non-federal grants, foregone property taxes, local and county funds, and in-kind services. Grantees submit invoices and correlate funding sources to specific expenditures. Commerce staff track the eligible matching funds with each invoice and track the cumulative tally throughout the project process. Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match, below, indicates the excess matching funds the HOME

Program carried over from previous Program Years (\$8,648,051), matching funds contributed during the 2016-2017 Program Year (\$7,509,792.35), the total of all matching funds available for the current fiscal year (\$16,157,843.35), the required amount of Match Liability for the current fiscal year (\$1,273,660.14) as noted by the IDIS report PR33 Home Matching Liability Report, and the excess match that will be carried over to the next fiscal year (\$14,884,183.21). The match reported below falls within the State’s fiscal year: April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017 and will be submitted to HUD on the form HUD-40107-A through the eCon Planning Suite.

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match

1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	8,648,051
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	7,509,792.35
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	16,157,843.35
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	1,273,660.14
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	14,884,183.21

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year reports each matching fund contribution for Plan Year Two from the HOME Program. Matching funds were recorded between April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017. These funds are contributed from either the Homebuyer Assistance grants and multi-family rental developments or rehabilitations. Matching funds are recorded in the form of either bond financing or cash, as noted in the table on the following page.

Table 6 – 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
4608	10/13/2015						\$30,015.00	\$30,015.00
4598	10/14/2015						\$37,249.00	\$37,249.00
4602	10/21/2015						\$43,701.75	\$43,701.75
4599	10/26/2015						\$19,897.75	\$19,897.75
4613	11/02/2015						\$40,359.75	\$40,359.75
4597	11/06/2015						\$26,966.00	\$26,966.00
4606	11/13/2015						\$23,319.75	\$23,319.75
4614	11/16/2015						\$36,375.00	\$36,375.00
4616	11/20/2015						\$28,897.00	\$28,897.00
4607	11/24/2015						\$41,866.75	\$41,866.75
4605	12/04/2015						\$36,889.25	\$36,889.25
4615	12/14/2015						\$34,704.25	\$34,704.25
4622	12/29/2015						\$21,172.00	\$21,172.00
4619	01/04/2016						\$30,334.00	\$30,334.00
4618	01/07/2016						\$30,951.00	\$30,951.00
4636	01/27/2016						\$33,068.75	\$33,068.75
4632	01/29/2016						\$22,596.25	\$22,596.25
4628	02/05/2016						\$30,077.00	\$30,077.00
4634	04/05/2016						\$2,312.00	\$2,312.00
4478	04/13/2016						\$470,403.23	\$470,403.23
4633	04/18/2016						\$34,085.50	\$34,085.50
4645	04/18/2016						\$51,865.00	\$51,865.00
4537	05/02/2016						\$171,375.47	\$171,375.47
4639	05/13/2016						\$29,643.25	\$29,643.25
4579	05/27/2016						\$889.45	\$889.45
4579	06/01/2016						\$1,353,636.19	\$1,353,636.19
4640	06/16/2016						\$36,719.35	\$36,719.35
4670	06/17/2016						\$34,402.25	\$34,402.25
4673	06/17/2016						\$49,886.00	\$49,886.00
4679	07/11/2016						\$109,293.00	\$109,293.00
4642	07/28/2016	\$455.15						\$455.15
4642	07/28/2016	\$2,144.00						\$2,144.00
4685	08/04/2016						\$33,032.00	\$33,032.00

4687	08/05/2016						\$47,488.25	\$47,488.25
4689	08/11/2016						\$20,970.75	\$20,970.75
4635	08/15/2016						\$91,780.00	\$91,780.00
4682	08/15/2016						\$47,523.75	\$47,523.75
4579	08/17/2016	\$2,325.99						\$2,325.99
4627	08/24/2016						\$324,015.35	\$324,015.35
4683	08/30/2016						\$55,843.75	\$55,843.75
4684	08/30/2016						\$39,405.00	\$39,405.00
4693	09/22/2016						\$43,298.00	\$43,298.00
4681	09/23/2016						\$40,993.75	\$40,993.75
4579	09/30/2016	\$1,567.22						\$1,567.22
							TOTAL	\$3,663,793.90

No CDBG housing, public and community facilities program income was received or expended during Plan Year Two. According to the IDIS report PR09, the HOME began the program year with -\$123,727.25 in program income, received \$874,936.83 in program income during the program year and expended \$837,666.73. The balance of program income was \$37,270.11. During the beginning of the program year, Commerce worked in IDIS to balance the program income funds over several years to reconcile the IDIS record of program income with Commerce’s record. This process likely caused the negative balance of program income in the IDIS report PR09 and is reflected in Table 7. The balance of program income from the program year is from HOME homebuyer assistance in the process of receiving funds, but not yet closed out in IDIS at the time of the program year ending, and therefore not included in the CAPER reporting. In Table 7 – Program Income, the Balance on hand at the beginning of the reporting period shows an amount of 0*. This is present as IDIS does not allow for a negative balance to be entered in this table. However, the correct balance of program income at the beginning of Plan Year Two is - \$123,727.25.

Table 7 – Program Income

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at the beginning of the reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at the end of reporting period \$
0*	874,936.83	837,666.73	0	37,270.11

HOME MBE/WBE Report

Commerce collects and records Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE), Minority Business Enterprise (MBE), and Women-Owned Business Enterprise (WBE) information throughout the Program Year and reports it to HUD for the Federal Fiscal Year in the Contract and Subcontract Activity Report. Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises, shows the number of contracts reported for both CDBG and HOME grants, the dollar amount of these contracts, and if the contractors report to be a DBE, MBE, or WBE. For Plan Year Two, Commerce has recorded no DBE or MBE contracts, but does have a WBE contract for \$1,070,000.

Table 8 – 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						
Number	12					12

Dollar Amount	22,852,520					22,852,520
Sub-Contracts						
Number	2					2
Dollar Amount	1,013,175					1,013,175
	TOTAL	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Number	12	1	11			
Dollar Amount	22,852,520	1,070,000	21,782,520			
Sub-contracts						
Number	2	0	2			
Dollar Amount	1,013,175	0	1,013,175			

During Plan Year Two, Commerce received no report of any Minority Owner of Rental Property for housing grants. This is reflected in Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property below.

Table 9 – 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

During Plan Year Two, three households were temporarily relocated because of rehabilitation activities on their apartments. Relocation costs incurred during the program year totaled \$5,529.65. This information is reflected in Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition. No parcels were acquired, no businesses were displaced, and no nonprofit organizations were displaced. No households were displaced during the program year.

Table 10 – 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	3	\$5,529.65				
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

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 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	1340	938
Number of non-homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	40	185
Number of special-needs households to be provided affordable housing units	25	6
Total	1405	1129

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through rental assistance	600	85
Number of households supported through the production of new units	2	40
Number of households supported through the rehab of existing units	4	82
Number of households supported through the acquisition of existing units	50	43
Total	656	250

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

CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs have made progress towards the goals and objectives identified in the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan and 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan. Commerce awarded CDBG and HOME funds during the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan year to activities that, cumulatively, addressed all five goals. CDBG-funded activities provided critical assistance to 8,333 individuals through housing, infrastructure, public and community facilities, and economic development. HOME-funded activities provided critical affordable housing development and financing to 122 households and 43 individuals. The number of individuals and households assisted for both HOME and CDBG were derived from the IDIS reports PR23: CDBG Sum of Actual Accomplishments by Activity Group and Accomplishment Type, and HOME Disbursements and

Unit Completions. All owner and renter households assisted meet Title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, Section 215 definition of affordable housing. ESG provided assistance to 938 individuals.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

Internal and external measures to collect and report data will be completed in future Action Plans through modified subgrantee reporting processes from application submission through project completion. CDD modified grant processes to meet these goals and be successful at reporting the accomplishments of the CDBG and HOME programs from each activity necessary to report on all goals and objectives identified in Action Plans. Additionally, Action Plans will properly transmit within the format prescribed through the electronic consolidated plan suite.

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 13 – Number of Persons Served

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	19	48
Low-income	25	62
Moderate-income	288	55
Total	332	165

Narrative Information

Table 13 – Number of Persons Served, reports on the proposed number of beneficiaries served by CDBG and HOME activities. Data was derived from the IDIS reports PR23: CDBG Sum of Actual Accomplishments by Activity Group and Accomplishment Type, and HOME Disbursements and Unit Completions. CDBG assisted nineteen (19) Extremely Low-Income persons, twenty-five (25) Low-Income persons, and 288 persons of Moderate-Income. HOME provided assistance to forty-eight (48) Extremely Low-Income persons, sixty-two (62) Low-Income persons, and fifty-five (55) persons of Moderate-Income.

For example, during Plan Year Two, the HOME Program assisted Reach, Inc. in constructing an independent living complex for ten (10) developmentally disabled adults. This complex, Greenway Apartments, has six (6) apartments, a common recreation area, and an on-site staff office with 24 hour-a-day staff. The tenants at the newly constructed Greenway Apartments moved from an older complex which would be considered substandard by Uniform Physical Condition Standards.

Commerce received approval of its HTF Allocation Plan, with which it plans to address “worst case” needs, i.e., individuals who are homeless, at-risk of homelessness, extremely low-income seniors and persons with disabilities, households who are seriously rent-burdened, or live in seriously substandard housing. Commerce accepted letters of intent to apply in advance of the Allocation Plan approval, and will accept and award applications on June 8, 2017 to specifically address those “worst case” needs.

CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs

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

Outreach

DPHHS coordinates and aligns its goals for ESG with the efforts of the Montana Continuum of Care (MT CoC). The continued role of the statewide CoC is critical in meeting the needs of the homeless population in Montana.

While MT CoC strives to meld and leverage programs and resources at the state level, it also strives to assure homeless persons can access these programs through effective, coordinated case management and service delivery at the local level. It does so by encouraging strong community continuum of care organizations that bring all providers of homeless services together to identify needs, close gaps, coordinate client services across all programs, and to identify new and innovative approaches to eradicating homeless conditions.

Outreach, especially to the unsheltered, is being met primarily through the outreach activities of the state's emergency shelters, the SSVF program which now operates statewide, local Veteran groups, faith-based programs and the federally funded PATH programs (but only in Billings, Butte, and Missoula). Intake assessment is currently done using various tools and methods, but Coordinated Entry planning and local workshops are resulting in adoption of VISPDAT as the uniform assessment tool which will be implemented at intake.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Emergency Shelter (ES): The MT CoC's annual Point-In-Time (PIT) and Housing Inventory continue to show an adequate supply of Emergency Shelter. ES inventory increased 17% over the previous year due to growth in faith-based programs and utilization rates for emergency shelter was 68% on the PIT night of January 26, 2017.

The 2017 PIT disclosed a modest decrease of 4.3% homelessness among households with children from 2016 and, conversely, adult individuals increased by 8.3% for the same period, the first increase since 2013.

Transitional Housing (TH): The TH component facilitates the movement of homeless individuals and families to permanent housing. Homeless persons may live in TH for up to 24 months and receive supportive services such as childcare, job training, and home furnishings that help them live more independently. TH is being replaced more and more by Rapid Rehousing (RR) as a more efficient form of housing assistance. As of the 2015 CoC Grant cycle, Montana no longer has any transitional housing beds.

The MT CoC has been reallocating transitional housing into Rapid Rehousing consistent with HUD's deprioritizing transitional housing. As of the Fiscal Year 2015 grant awards, all remaining CoC funded transitional housing was reallocated to RR or Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). The remaining transitional housing in Montana is now provided solely by domestic violence shelters, faith-based programs, Family Promise, and VA GPD funded veterans' programs.

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

ESG funds are used for Homelessness prevention activities. 469 individuals were served with these funds.

All the housing programs are required to provide case management and assist clients in accessing cash benefits from mainstream programs that include: Supplemental Security Income, Social Security Disability Insurance, Veterans Disability, TANF, retirement and pensions or child support. These programs also assist clients to access non-cash mainstream benefits from Medicaid, Medicare, State children's health insurance, WIC, VA medical services, TANF childcare, temporary rental assistance, and Section 8 or other public rental assistance.

There are many vital programs providing other services to the homeless, such as:

*Health Care for the Homeless (HCH) is a federally funded HRSA program that provides temporary medical services to homeless individuals and families. There are two clinics in Billings and Missoula and six satellite service sites in Billings, Butte, and Helena.

* The PATH program coordinates the SOARS training which helps all homeless case managers successfully assist homeless clients apply for SSI and SSDI assistance.

*Volunteers of America, Billings, is a recent recipient of a Veterans Administration's Supportive Services for Homeless Veteran Families grant which provides services and some rental assistance to veteran households in the Billings area.

*The 10 Human Resource Development Councils provide a statewide network of no-wrong-door accessibility to homeless assistance, including short-term rental assistance, emergency shelter, food banks, and referral assistance to a myriad of other programs.

Discharged Persons from Public Institutions: Both the ESG and CoC Rapid Rehousing programs serve discharged persons. Although the MT CoC does not specifically target funding toward discharged persons, the ESG and CoC programs assist these individuals within the limitations of the funding and program regulations. The community coordinated entry systems assist in these efforts.

The Montana Department of Corrections works with incarcerated individuals to develop individualized plans for the offender reentry. Efforts include connecting offenders with potential housing leads, engaging landlords, onsite reviews of potential housing opportunities to identify safe and supportive environments and networking with other community resources.

The Statewide Reentry Task Force reviews and compiles policy recommendations related to offender reentry. The DPHHS, the Human Resource Development Councils (HRDCs), and the Department of Corrections may partner and review solutions for increasing the effectiveness of reentry objectives related to stable housing, then bring their ideas to the Reentry Task Force for consideration. Statewide Reentry Task Force public policy recommendations are provided to the Law and Justice Interim Committee to create, where appropriate, supportive legislation.

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 MT CoC 10 Year Plan does not contain specific objectives for outreach, emergency shelter, transitional housing or even prevention. The plan focuses entirely on providing sufficient permanent housing beds (PSH, RRH, or other voucher type rental assistance) to meet the number of homeless as identified in the PIT. The overwhelming unmet need continues to be for more vouchers for permanent or rapid rehousing for both individuals and families.

Chronically Homeless (CH): The number of beds dedicated to chronically homeless individuals and families dramatically increased by about a third with the addition of 45 new CH beds in Fiscal Year 2015 and again by 23% or 23 beds with the Fiscal Year 2016 CoC grant awards. This increases a current inventory of dedicated CH beds is now 120 which, unfortunately, is about the same number of persons (125) still chronically homeless in emergency shelters or sleeping outside so the need for more dedicated CH beds continues. The MT CoC Coalition is preparing to update its' 10 Year Strategic Plan and intends to include revamping targets for chronically homeless persons.

Rapid Rehousing: Since HUD implemented changes in the CoC grant competition encouraging TH projects to reallocate funds to RR, the MT CoC has reallocated all of its' TH projects (six) to RR which now accounts for 26% of all CoC funding in Montana and provides about 149 beds.

Eligible applicants for all program components include States, local governments, other government agencies (such as public housing authorities), private nonprofit organizations, and community mental health associations that are public nonprofit organizations.

ESG funds are used for RR activities; 469 were served with these funds.

Permanent Supportive Housing: This component provides long-term housing with supportive services for homeless persons with disabilities. This type of supportive housing enables special needs populations to live as independently as possible in a permanent setting. Montana currently receives about \$1.76 million in PSH grant funding which provides about 274 beds to homeless individuals or families with serious disabilities through the Veterans Administration VASH vouchers and another 90 beds through the HOPWA program.

Currently, neither TANF nor Medicaid are used to provide homeless housing assistance.

CR-30 – Public Housing

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

HOME program funds were awarded to complete activities through public housing authorities in the state, however, beyond the specific project activities listed in the activity award table (Table CR05-A) for HOME, no specific actions by CDBG were taken to address the needs to Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) in the state. During Plan Year Two, the HOME Program worked with two PHAs: Housing Authority of Billings and the Missoula Housing Authority. The Billings PHA is in the process of developing a new multi-family rental development that will provide housing to fifteen (15) HOME-assisted households. The Missoula PHA was continuing construction of a six (6) unit apartment complex where all the units will be HOME-assisted, targeting persons/households of low-income.

Commerce and Public Health and Human Services have completed the 2015-2020 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, and continues to work with a vast array of public entities and key stakeholders, through numerous public meetings to create more clearly defined objectives. These objectives are the focus of action steps, currently being further refined, that can be used by entities and ultimately initiated at the local level. PHAs have been involved with this process and have provided essential feedback.

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

HOME program funds were awarded to complete activities through PHAs in the state, however, beyond the specific project activities listed in the activity award tables for HOME, no specific actions by CDBG were taken to address the needs to PHAs in the state.

With every Homebuyer Assistance application that comes to the HOME Program, applicants must identify if the prospective homebuyer is coming from public housing. The Community Development and the Housing Divisions, within Commerce, work collaboratively to encourage LMI residents to attend Homebuyer Education courses offered throughout the state by various qualified agencies. These courses are advertised across the state at the various PHAs, with key partner agencies, and through a multi-media approach to increase the awareness of their availability.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

HOME program funds were awarded to complete activities through PHAs in the state, however, beyond the specific project activities listed in the activity award tables for HOME, no specific actions by CDBG were taken to address the needs to public housing authorities in the state. Neither the HOME Program nor CDBG identified a troubled PHA during Plan Year 2016-2017, therefore no actions to provide assistance were developed.

CR-35 – Other Actions

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

Commerce administers the Community Technical Assistance Program (CTAP). CTAP provides direct technical assistance to local governments and elected officials, land use planners, associated professionals and members of the public on issues related to land use planning and development throughout the state. CTAP is currently completing an update of its model subdivision regulations, which will be distributed to cities and counties throughout Montana for adoption. These model regulations promote affordable housing and support resilient community and economic development.

Through CDBG funding, local communities can prepare or update various planning documents, including comprehensive land use planning, including zoning, subdivision, and annexation regulations in support of the amelioration of barriers to affordable housing. In 2015, CDBG Planning Grant guidelines were revised to further promote community resiliency, including the development and preservation of an affordable, reliable housing stock.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.

All the activities funded under the CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs addressed obstacles to meeting underserved needs. CDBG, HOME, and HTF all promote projects that align with the resiliency goals set forth by CDD which include projects aimed at strengthening local independence, stability, and sense of community.

During Plan Year Two, CDD finalized several grants to provide clean, safe, affordable, decent, and sanitary housing for special needs populations. These projects include: Ron's Place and Greenway Apartments. Additionally, Parkside Apartments, a senior housing complex, was completed.

During Plan Year Two, the HOME Program, with Reach, Inc., completed construction of a six (6) unit apartment complex for developmentally disabled adults. These individuals have access to 24-hour onsite staff, community room, and communal amenities. All the first-floor apartments are fully adaptable, and one of the units is fully accessible. The District XI Human Resource Council

(HRC) completed a rehabilitation of a twenty-four (24) unit apartment complex for seniors in Hamilton. This project provided much needed updates to the aged building, and added several essential features to the apartments to allow the seniors to age-in-place in their community of choice.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards.

Commerce uses HOME and CDBG funds to support acquisition and rehabilitation activities to ensure that households, particularly those with children, benefit from federal housing programs that practice proper lead-based paint (LBP) protocols and comply with current requirements of Title X of the Residential Lead Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992. Both Commerce and DPHHS provide education and information on LBP hazards to parents, families, healthcare providers, grant recipients, and contractors. Commerce requires that any contractor or subcontractor engaged in renovation, repair, and/or paint activities that disturb LBP in homes, and child care facilities built before 1978 must be certified and follow specific work practices to prevent lead contamination. In addition to complying with LBP regulations, UPCS inspections will be performed at rental properties assisted with HTF, HOME, and CDBG, as well as Section 8 rental properties throughout the state.

The Community Development and Housing Divisions added HUD's on-line Lead-Based Paint Visual Assessment Training to its employee on-boarding process to ensure that all staff involved in the funding of housing projects through Commerce are trained in identifying deteriorated paint and awareness increased risk of the presence of LBP hazards.

The rehabilitation of Parkside Apartments by the District XI HRC required some LBP remediation. The HRC informed all the tenants of the potential for LBP upon their move-in, and during the rehabilitation the contractor worked to remediate LBP.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families.

Commerce and DPHHS, in coordination with non-profit organizations and the private sector, helped individuals and families in poverty by supporting local and regional efforts to improve family and individual incomes. All the strategies and priorities identified in the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan targeted the improvement of economic conditions of Montanans of lower income, from the rehabilitation and construction of affordable housing, provision of homebuyer assistance, and the availability of temporary shelter services to investment in compact walkable development where efficiencies of public infrastructure, community services, and employment center encourage healthy, vital, and resilient communities. Additionally, all CDBG housing, public

and community facilities projects indirectly support reducing poverty-level families.

Two CDBG Economic Development (ED) projects were completed during the Plan Year Two, one in Flathead County and the other in Mineral County. Together, these two businesses created twenty (20) new jobs. Of these twenty (20) jobs, four (4) were taken by persons of low-income and eight (8) persons of moderate-income.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure

Gaps in the institutional delivery system exist primarily due to funding limitations that are outside the control of the State of Montana. CDBG, HOME, and ESG resources are inadequate to meet the needs of Montanans of low-moderate income, with special needs, or experiencing homelessness. However, effectively relaying information regarding grant opportunities and technical assistance from the State of Montana to eligible entities continues to be one of the State's greatest challenges. These are areas of opportunity for increased collaboration across and between agencies, organizations, and the private sector to ensure that services are delivered to the greatest number of eligible entities and individuals in the state. As an example, during the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan year, the state actively engaged the public and private sectors in broad discussions; which include a continued discussion on the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice in Montana, and educational opportunities regarding the economic, social, environmental, and health benefits of creating walkable communities with increased opportunities and access to affordable housing, community services, existing public, infrastructure efficiencies, and jobs.

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

As a part of the Consolidated Plan and certification process of the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, Commerce coordinated with both public and private partners for continued discussions on the impediments to fair housing choice in Montana. Commerce coordinates with public and private partners to discuss current projects and methods to coordinate efforts throughout the State. Coordinated efforts occurred during the implementation and completion of many awarded project activities in providing planning grants, grants for public facilities, housing and infrastructure, while working toward reducing or eliminating impediments to Fair Housing choice in the state. DPHHS was represented on various social service state advisory groups to ensure coordination with social services for needy populations in Montana. DPHHS worked proactively with its MT CoC partners to facilitate efficient and effective coordination of services between affordable housing and social service organizations.

Commerce and DPHHS have continued to work with a vast array of public entities and key stakeholders, through numerous public meetings to create more clearly defined objectives to Affirmative Further Fair Housing. These objectives are the focus of action steps, currently being further refined, that can be used by entities and ultimately initiated at the local level. Commerce and DPHHS are working closely with key stakeholders to engage participation between public and private housing and social service agencies and reduce impediments to fair housing choice.

The Analysis of Impediments (AI) Steering Committee is led by CDD staff and involves advocates from Commerce's Housing Division, DPHHS, Montana Fair Housing, Montana's Human Rights Bureau, and Helena's HUD representative. The Steering Committee ensures that the direction of the AI discussion moves towards addressing the action items, objectives, and measurable outcomes and that they are consistent with the 2015-2020 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice in Montana, which was submitted to HUD on August 14, 2015.

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

In May 2016, at the Montana Housing Conference, CDD lead table discussions for all attendees to participate and provide feedback regarding the identified fair housing impediments, action items, and measurable objectives. These separate table discussions were facilitated by Commerce staff to solicit participants to join a further discussion to determine what partners should be involved, is there already a process in place to fill the action items, what tools and/or resources help or address the impediment and if there are any other comments or considerations. Additionally, contact information was collected for all those interested in continuing the discussion. In July 2016, the AI Steering Committee was provided an update from the Montana Housing Conference via a listserv and informed of the dates for the next round of table discussions regarding the nine impediments. In September 2016, the Steering Committee was provided an update that detailed the timeline for the next round of table discussions to be held by CDD. In October, November, and December 2016, further discussions were held in person, webinar, and by toll-free call-in to discuss the nine identified impediments and to identify action items to address these impediments. At the end of the program year, CDD had compiled the action items that were generated from the previous discussions held in the fourth calendar year quarter of 2016. Commerce staff have created a plan to follow-up at the May 2017 Montana Housing Partnership Conference to facilitate input from stakeholders to discuss next steps and determine who would be involved in working to complete each action item.

Additionally, Commerce is collaborating with a state-wide partnership that includes the three entitlement communities (Great Falls, Missoula and Billings) and the many public housing authorities across the state to begin development of a state-wide Affirmative Fair Housing plan. This plan will be developed and released for public comment according to the 2020-2024 5-year Consolidated Plan for all entities. Planning meetings began during this program year and will continue for the state-wide partnership to develop a state-wide approach to reducing or eliminating impediments to Fair Housing Choice through the Affirmative Fair Housing plan.

CR-40 – Monitoring

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

Commerce works closely with all grantees to ensure compliance with program requirements. Currently, CDD is working on updating the grant administration manuals for CDBG and HOME programs to provide consistent guidance on program administration. These updates have included feedback from our various grantees and are geared towards ensuring the program requirements are met during all stages of the grant process. CDD program staff also hold regular calls with grantees throughout the project to ensure that technical assistance is always available.

CDBG project activities are all monitored at least once during the project's scope of work. The monitoring includes a review of the grantee's project file, the facility constructed or rehabilitated, an inspection of relevant, and a review of the financial processes the grantee uses. CDD staff will notify the grantee and all relevant partners of the intended monitoring visit with ample notice to establish the monitoring date. If problems arise or technical assistance is needed, project may be monitored more than once before closeout. After the project has been monitored, the Program issues a monitoring letter, and (if necessary) corrective action is taken by the grantee in a timely manner.

HOME project activities are monitored twice during the project's scope of work. One monitoring includes a site-visit and a detailed desk audit of all relevant records and documents related to the project. The second monitoring is a site visit to the construction site and project completion to conduct UPCS inspections and ensure project completion. Finally, HOME projects are monitored during the first year of the period of affordability within one year of the project closeout per HUD regulations. This first monitoring is designed to be a longer monitoring to provide essential discussion time for questions about the HOME Program, reporting requirements, tenant files, and other relevant issues related to the period of affordability.

Additionally, HOME monitors projects that are no longer considered active construction projects and have occupied units accordingly for rental or single family homebuyer assistance. The HOME Program has embarked on a plan to continually evaluate and improve processes to ensure compliance with HOME regulations. HOME staff are tracking the monitoring dates for previous years' visits closely and meet at the beginning of the calendar year to identify the projects which require monitoring and establish a rotation. Staff work directly with the

grantee/owner/responsible entity to ensure all relevant files and households are available on the day of the monitoring. During the onsite monitoring the staff sets time aside to discuss any issues that may have been noticed during the visit and works closely with the grantee/owner/responsible entity to bring the project back into compliance. This increased level of technical assistance has already shown results with the many projects currently in the period of affordability.

During this period, seven (7) CDBG projects, four (4) HOME projects, ten (10) ESG projects were monitored during on-site visits. HOME construction projects monitored: Parkside Apartments, Greenway Apartments, Antelope Court Apartments, and Sweetgrass Apartments. CDBG projects monitored: Madison County, Mineral County, City of Hamilton, Town of Stevensville, City of Hamilton, Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and Prairie County. All projects mentioned in this paragraph were funded during previous program years, but needed to be monitored by CDD staff during the program year.

During the program year, DPHHS and the Montana State University administered the Tri-State HOPWA grant. Given the large geographical area covered by the Tri-State HOPWA grant, the entire states of Montana, South Dakota, and North Dakota, the grantee elected to contract with Montana State University to provide oversight, monitoring, data collection, APR reporting and sponsor support and coordination. Monitoring of all sponsor activities consists of ongoing collaboration between the grantee and the project sponsors; it is an important part of the HOPWA Program's success. By utilizing the HOPWA Grantee Oversight Guide, the grantee can assess the management responsibilities to achieve the HOPWA Program's housing stability performance outcome measures of maintaining stable housing arrangements, reducing risks of homelessness, and improving access to care. Monitoring for STRMU assistance consists of monitoring client files: which include documentation of need, time limits (five months or twenty-one weeks) and records detailing the timeline of assistance. Sponsor Monitoring is conducted remotely on an annual basis and on-site on a rotating schedule in conjunction with the grantee/sponsor annual meetings.

In 2016, the HOPWA Program Coordinator conducted three (3) desk monitoring reviews: Open Aid Alliance, Community Action Region VIII in Bismarck, North Dakota, and Sioux Falls Housing and Redevelopment Commission. Yellowstone AIDS Project was up in rotation for an onsite monitoring visit, however, the business closed and a new sponsor, RiverStone Health, was transitioned into serving the organization's clients and geographical region. Onsite monitoring is conducted on a yearly rotating schedule.

Citizen Participation Plan

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

Commerce announces the availability of draft documents through a listserv of approximately 1,300 individuals, towns, counties, non-profits, and interested parties. The draft document was available electronically on the Community Development Division's website. There are twenty-two organizations across Montana which have also agreed to be a repository for all draft documents through the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan period for all relevant draft documents including each year's Annual Action Plan (including any amendments) and the Consolidated Performance Evaluation Report (including any amendments). Each repository was mailed a physical copy of the draft document to help make it available for public review during the relevant comment periods. Citizens were invited to comment on draft documents via oral testimony during a public hearing, or via email or letter to the Department of Commerce. If a citizen requested an alternative form of the draft documents, then the Department of Commerce would make all reasonable efforts to comply with the request.

The Public Comment period for the Draft 2016-2017 CAPER began June 12, 2017 and ended June 26, 2017. A public hearing was held on June 19, 2017 in Helena. The public hearing was announced through the Commerce website, listserv, and multiple newspapers across the state. The draft document was at the twenty-two (22) Repositories across the state or at the Consolidated Plan website. Two (2) people attended the public hearing via webinar/teleconference. Once the public comment period ended a record of the public hearing transcript was made available through the website below. These comments were considered and responses provided in Appendix A of this document.

<http://commerce.mt.gov/conplan>

CR-45 – CDBG

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

There have not been any changes in Commerce's program objectives during the 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan year.

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

N/A

CR-50 – HOME

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

See Appendix B for a table of projects monitored, the date monitored, issues noted, and compliance status of the HOME POA projects monitored between April 1, 2016 and March 31, 2017. These projects were funded previously by the HOME Program and are currently in their POA. The HOME Program will continue to monitor the projects currently in their period of affordability. Each monitoring visit will include a review of the HOME-assisted tenant files, source documentation review, income eligibility, rent review, and inspection of HOME-assisted units. Eleven (11) projects were not monitored during the April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017 period. These projects were scheduled for monitoring, but were cancelled because of hazardous road conditions as a result of extreme weather. MDOC is remedying this by monitoring the eleven (11) projects during the April 1, 2017 to March 31, 2018 program year in addition to the required POA monitoring.

HOME projects that are under construction are monitored at least twice during the grant. At least one construction site visit will be conducted and one full monitoring visits, which includes a full review of the grantee file and inspection of the HOME-assisted project and units are conducted. The HOME program also coordinates with additional funding agencies (when applicable) to communicate any issues or concerns regarding the project during construction.

Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units.

CDD reviews all Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plans (AFHMP) for the HOME-assisted projects. Each project with five (5) or more HOME-assisted units is required to complete and submit an AFHMP for review and approval. During the Annual Rental Certifications, CDD requests all updated documentation is submitted and kept in project records. CDD provides technical assistance for updating AFHMP to grantees and property owners/managers during the construction phase and on an ongoing basis during the period of affordability.

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

No CDBG housing, public and community facilities program income was receipted or expended during Plan Year Two. According to the IDIS report PR09, the HOME began the program year with -\$123,727.25 in program income, received \$874,936.83 in program income during the program year and expended \$837,666.73. The balance of program income was \$37,270.11. During the beginning of the program year, Commerce worked in IDIS to balance the program income funds over several years to reconcile the IDIS record of program income with Commerce's record. This process likely caused the negative balance of program income in the IDIS report PR09 and is reflected in Table 7. The balance of program income from the program year is from HOME homebuyer assistance in the process of receiving funds, but not yet closed out in IDIS at the time of the program year ending, and therefore not included in the CAPER reporting.

The Commerce Economic Development Administration (EDA) grants or loans receipted \$36,351 in program income during the same period. Commerce used this program income to partially fund a \$100,000 project in Missoula during this same period.

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

CDD and the Housing Division, which administers the LIHTC program, have been working together through increased communications, meetings, and projects to continue fostering and maintaining affordable housing in Montana. LIHTC is a typical leveraged funding source for HOME projects, as well as for some CDBG projects. This coordination has increased the communication with our grantees and other possible interested parties regarding the HOME Program and the opportunities that it provides.

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

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served, below, reports on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing using HOPWA activities for short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of individual or families; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments	31	48
Tenant-based rental assistance	85	85
Units provided in transitional housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	N/A	N/A
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	N/A	N/A
Total	116	133

Narrative

HOPWA funds support HUD’s national goal of increasing the availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing for meeting the housing needs of persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. Grantees are encouraged to develop community-wide comprehensive strategies and to form partnerships with area nonprofit organizations to provide housing assistance and related services for eligible persons.

DPHHS administers competitively-funded HOPWA grants for a three-state region that includes Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The Tri-State Housing Environments for Living Positively (TS HELP) is a partnership between DPHHS and four private agencies: the Sioux Falls Housing and Redevelopment Commission in South Dakota, Community Action Region VII, Bismarck, North Dakota, and Open Aid Alliance and RiverStone Health in Montana. The HOPWA grant allows TS HELP to operate its programs, which provide a continuum of housing assistance and related supportive service opportunities for people living with HIV/AIDS and their families.

HUD awarded the TS HELP (3-State) Program a renewal HOPWA grant in 2014, for a three-year funding period, September 1, 2014 through August 30, 2017, for \$1,474,000 of which \$797,663

is distributed to Montana sub-grantees and a second renewal grant named internally as HOPWA Plus for the period of 9/1/2015 through 8/31/2018 in the amount of \$1,482,040 of which \$914,299 is distributed to Montana sub-grantees.

Funds assisted the TS HELP Program to provide tenant-based rental assistance, emergency assistance, permanent supportive housing and housing coordination services to individuals living with HIV/AIDS in Montana through the management of the Yellowstone AIDS Project (YAP), and the newly transitioned sponsor RiverStone Health in Billings and the Open Aid Alliance (OAA) in Missoula.

- YAP served the MT-Billings Eastern Region that includes 40 counties, and reported serving 61 clients accessing the program. The clients were able to live in safe affordable housing, continue consistently to access case management and medical services, ultimately improving quality of life. YAP’s clients and geographical area have been assumed by a new sponsor, RiverStone Health.

• Male37	Female..... 24	Average Age:..... 31 - 50 years
• Individuals living in situation that meets HUD definition of Homeless: 0		
• % of Area Medium Income: 0-30%: 40 31-50%: 16 51-80%: 5		
• Special Need Category: Chronically Homeless: 0 Veterans: 0		
• Total Expended Funds: TBRA: \$158,824 ST: \$30,539 and SS: \$62,841		

- OAA serves the MT-Missoula Western Region, which includes 16 counties. OAA reported 70 clients accessing the program. The clients were able to live in safe affordable housing, continue access case management and medical services, ultimately improving quality of life.

• Male52	Female..... 18	Average Age:..... 31 - 50 years
• Individuals living in situation that meets HUD definition of Homeless: 8		
• % of Area Medium Income: 0-30%: 66 31-50%: 4 51-80%: 0		
• Special Needs Category: Chronically Homeless: 3 Veterans: 0		
• Total Expended Funds: TBRA: \$180,839 ST: \$31,625, and SS: \$49,911		

The HOPWA programs in Montana have been successful in networking with other programs; Ryan White, SNAP, Section 8, SSI/SSDI, and LIEAP and have created a streamlined approach to Housing and Healthcare initiatives. The Open Aid Alliance, Yellowstone AIDS Project, and now RiverStone Health work well with community partners and strive to meet the targeted goals.

DPHHS contracts with Montana State University to provide program coordination, technical assistance, reporting, and monitoring between the four sponsor agencies.

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information – All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	MONTANA
Organizational DUNS Number	809790579
EIN/TIN Number	810302404
Identify the Field Office	DENVER
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Ms
First Name	Marcia
Middle Name	
Last Name	Lemon
Suffix	
Title	Energy and Community Services Program Manager

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	1400 Carter Drive
Street Address 1	
City	Helena
State	MT
ZIP Code	59808
Phone Number	4064474276
Extension	
Fax Number	
Email Address	mlemon@mt.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	
First Name	
Last Name	

Suffix
 Title
 Phone Number
 Extension
 Email Address

2. Reporting Period – All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date 04/01/2016
Program Year End Date 03/31/2017

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

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	Northwest Montana Human Resources
City	Kalispell
State	MT
Zip Code	59903-1058
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$87,922

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	HRDC of District IX, Inc.
City	Bozeman
State	MT
Zip Code	59715-6241
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$67,294

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	Human Resources Development Council
City	Missoula
State	MT
Zip Code	59801-5763
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$93,428

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	Action Inc - Human Resources Council District XII
City	Butte
State	MT
Zip Code	59701-9362
DUNS Number	

Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$49,632

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	Rocky Mountain Development Council, Inc.
City	Helena
State	MT
Zip Code	59624-1717
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$49,632

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	District IV HRDC
City	Havre
State	MT
Zip Code	59501-4960
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$17,256

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	Action for Eastern Montana
City	Glendive
State	MT
Zip Code	59330-1309
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$22,994

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	HRDC District 7
City	Billings
State	MT
Zip Code	59101-2114
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$94,574

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	District 6 - HRDC VI
City	Lewistown
State	MT
Zip Code	59457-1700
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$12,265

Subrecipient or Contractor Name	Opportunities Incorporated
City	Great Falls
State	MT
Zip Code	59401-2605
DUNS Number	
Is subrecipient a victim services provider	N
Subrecipient Organization Type	Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount	\$74,923

CR-65 – Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

Not applicable to ESG.

Attached eCart file to CR-00

The Excel file must be embedded into a word file.

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Table 15 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	261
Children	208
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	469

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Table 16 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	352
Children	117
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	469

4c. Complete for Shelter

Table 17 – Shelter Information

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

4d. Street Outreach

Table 18 – Household Information for Street Outreach

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

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Table 19 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	613
Children	325
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	938

5. Gender – Complete for All Activities

Table 20 – Gender Information

	Total
Male	405
Female	533
Transgender	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	938

6. Age – Complete for All Activities

Table 21 – Age Information

	Total
Under 18	325
18-24	90
25 and over	523
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	938

7. Special Populations Served – Complete for All Activities

Table 22 – Special Population Served

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans	13	4	9	
Victims of Domestic Violence	118	39	79	
Elderly	22	11	11	
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	
Chronically Homeless	27			
Persons with Disabilities				
Severely Mentally Ill	102	52	50	
Chronic Substance Abuse	6	2	4	
Other Disability	91	57	34	
Total (unduplicated if possible)	938	469	469	

10. Shelter Utilization

Table 23 – Shelter Capacity

Number of New Units – Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units – Conversion	0
Total Number of bed – nights available	13870
Total Number of bed – nights provided	8988
Capacity Utilization	65%
Total Persons served (unduplicated)	306

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

Agencies receiving ESG funds have continued to focus funding on Rapid Rehousing and Homeless Prevention activities as directed by the MT CoC’s Strategic Plan. There are two agencies that receive funding that have allocated to Shelter Services and only one of those two fund Essential Services: District IV Human Resource Development Council (funds Shelter Operation and Essential Services) and District VII Human Resource Development Council (funds Shelter Operations).

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

Table 24 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	\$24,296.00	\$50,510.01	\$91,391.24
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services Financial Assistance	\$8,373.00	\$11,670.00	\$28,379.50
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services – Services	\$13,813.00	\$32,791.89	\$62,610.87
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	\$46,482.00	\$94,971.90	\$182,381.61

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	\$10,832.00	\$36,750.13	\$57,755.61
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services Financial Assistance	\$15,738.00	\$41,577.91	\$72,193
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services – Services	\$23,345.00	\$63,756.62	\$94,352.82
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	\$49,915.00	\$142,084.66	\$244,301.43

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Essential Services	\$881.00	0	\$2,500
Operations	0	\$3,177.33	\$10,009.48
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	\$881.00	\$3,177.33	\$12,509.48

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

Table 27 – Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Street Outreach	0	0	\$1,384.66
HMIS	\$42,000.00	\$54,105.14	\$67,374
Administration	\$8,572.00	\$18,625.94	\$32,361.18

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds**Table 28 – Total ESG Funds Expended**

	2014	2015	2016
	\$147,850.00	\$312,964.97	\$520,312.36

11f. Match Source**Table 29 – Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities**

	2014	2015	2016
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	\$4,264.00	\$15,512.98	\$94,027.90
Other Federal Funds	\$17,639.00	\$107,301.16	\$68,778.90
State Government	0	0	0
Local Government	\$173,348.00	\$24,518.24	\$81,737.96
Private Funds	\$248,797.00	\$1,121.94	\$193,163.83
Other	\$4,185.00	\$29,446	\$5,065
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	\$448,233.00	\$267,900.32	\$432,773.59

11g. Total**Table 30 – Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities**

	2014	2015	2016
	448,233.00	580,865.29	953,085.95