

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report



CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

Federal Fiscal Year 2014

(City Fiscal Year 2015 • July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015)

Community Development Department
300 Monroe Avenue, NW
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
(616) 456-3677
www.grcd.info

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
**BUILDING
GREAT**
NEIGHBORHOODS!

Presented to the U.S. Department of
Housing and Urban Development
September 28, 2015
Submitted online via IDIS

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Resources and Investments.....	2
Federal Funds	2
Program Income	2
Location of Expenditures and Geographical Targeting.....	4
Leveraged Funds	5
Match Requirements	6
Racial and Ethnic Composition of Families Assisted	7
II. Goals and Outcomes – Neighborhood Investment Plan	8
Self-Evaluation	46
III. Affordable Housing	48
IV. Homelessness and Other Special Needs (Continuum of Care).....	51
V. Public Housing	60
VI. Consolidated Program Information – General Activities	61
Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing.....	61
Underserved Needs	62
Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control	63
Reduce Families in Poverty.....	65
Institutional Structure.....	66
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.....	67
VII. Program Oversight and Monitoring	68
Monitoring of Federal Programs.....	68
Outreach to Racially and Ethnically Diverse (Minority) and Women Owned Businesses	71
Citizen Participation	72
VIII. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Grants.....	74
Results of On-Site Inspections of Affordable Rental Housing	74
Affirmative Marketing Actions for HOME Units.....	74
Allocation of HOME Funds and HOME Accomplishments	76
Attachments – Specific Program Reports.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A. Community Development Block Grant Supplemental Information	
B. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Supplemental Information	
C. Summary of Consolidated Plan Projects for FFY 2014 (IDIS C04PR06)	
D. Target Area Map	

The FFY 2014 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) describes the results of activities completed by and through the City of Grand Rapids to accomplish the outcomes identified in the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan for the period July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. This is the fourth report year of the FFY 2011-2015 Consolidated Housing and Community Development (HCD) Plan. Following are notable highlights of the plan:

Neighborhood Investment Plan

The HCD Plan focuses on the Neighborhood Investment Plan, which is comprised of seven (7) outcomes that guide investment of grant funds. Accomplishment of the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan's proposed outcomes, outputs, and indicators are listed in this report by outcome area and program.

Funding

Overall, funding available to implement the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan increased by \$60,613 over the prior year with both the CDBG and HOME grant awards increasing and the JAG award decreasing slightly.

Single-Family Housing

Although the City has experienced a moderate reduction in the amount of foreclosures in recent years, the economic downturn and national housing crisis left a lasting impact on the development of quality affordable single-family housing. The extensive nature of necessary improvements, due to the age of the housing stock and limited access to capital, has created the need for additional development subsidies.

The City continues to promote affordable single-family housing by partnering with Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) on single-family acquisition, development, and resale projects. These projects build upon the successful completion of 104 single-family housing projects through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) 1 and 2, and similar HOME projects undertaken in prior years. The City's Homebuyer Assistance Fund Program continues to provide financial assistance to low-income families purchasing a home.

Homelessness

The demands for emergency and transitional housing are being met, but affordable, permanent housing is still needed. The community's ten-year plan, *The Vision to End Homelessness*, recognizes this need. The Coalition to End Homelessness, our local Continuum of Care, supports the implementation of the housing-first model across the homeless system. The housing first model emphasizes immediate access to permanent housing through a coordinated, centralized intake, assessment and referral process. Implemented in 2009, households throughout the greater Grand Rapids area can visit or call The Salvation Army, the central intake entity, to obtain assistance with homeless prevention, diversion and re-housing, through referrals to more than 25 agencies and programs across the system.

I. Resources and Investments

This section identifies resources the City was successful in procuring to implement the goals and objectives outlined in the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan. It identifies the location and targeting of activities and the procedures used by the Community Development Department to monitor performance. Citizen involvement in the development of the Consolidated Plan and this performance report, as well as the institutional structure the City used to carry out its Housing and Community Development Plan, and other various actions and activities undertaken during the reporting period, are also discussed.

Resources identified in the FFY 2014 Housing and Community Development (HCD) Annual Action Plan included formula grants and competitive awards available to the City, the Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC), and for-profit and non-profit housing and community service providers. The following resources were made available within the City of Grand Rapids jurisdiction from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

Federal Funds

During the reporting period, the following funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Bureau of Justice Assistance were made available to the City’s Community Development Department to fund the Neighborhood Investment Plan and emergency shelter activities.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program		\$4,350,000
FFY 2014 Entitlement: B-14-MC-26-0019	\$3,585,526	
Program Income	\$500,000	
Reprogrammed from prior grant years	\$264,474	
HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program		\$1,109,000
FFY 2014 Award: M-14-MC-26-0206	\$1,106,745	
Program Income	\$2,255	
Justice Assistance Grant (JAG)		\$82,902
FFY 2013 Award: 2013-DJ-BX-0621		
Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program		\$297,583
FFY 2014 Entitlement: S-14-MC-26-0019		

Program Income

During the reporting period, the City used program income from both HOME and CDBG. The City does not specifically attribute program income to individual projects. Rather, an estimated amount of program income is added to the amount of the entitlement each year, and the total available funding is then allocated to specific projects with no designation of whether it is from the entitlement or program income. As program income is received during the year it is expended

before drawdowns from the entitlement. During the reporting period, the City of Grand Rapids did not have program income that went to a revolving fund or came from float-funded activities or the sale of real property.

During the reporting period, the City continued implementation of several additional HUD awards that are not covered by this report. Detail regarding these awards follows.

- Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP 1). The City's FFY 2008 NSP 1 award totals \$6,178,686. During the reporting period, the City continued implementation of the NSP 1 program which facilitates the acquisition, rehabilitation and resale of foreclosed, abandoned, and vacant properties. During the period of this report, remaining NSP 1 funds were committed to the development of two (2) single-family homes. As of June 30, 2015, construction was nearing completion on the units that will be sold to income eligible households.
- Neighborhood Stabilization Program 3 (NSP 3). The City's FFY 2010 NSP 3 award totals \$1,378,788. The City continued implementation of the NSP 3 program, which facilitated the redevelopment of vacant properties. During the reporting period, the City contracted with Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. for a residential target market analysis to determine market potential for new housing units over the next five (5) years. The final report was published and presented in April 2015. All NSP 3 funds are expended and program activities complete.
- Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Program. During the reporting period, the City continued expending \$2,480,000 in grant funds from the HUD Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control. The program was extended through August 31, 2015, with the goal of making 180 homes lead-safe.

Assessment. Overall, funding available to implement the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan increased by \$60,613 over the prior year with both the CDBG and HOME grant awards increasing and the JAG award decreasing slightly.

Location of Expenditures and Geographical Targeting

CDBG and HOME program funds are used to support low- and moderate-income persons and neighborhoods. The City implements the majority of its housing and community development activities in target areas. The General Target Area (GTA) includes the largest geographic area with access to a broad range of services, including housing programs and legal assistance. Within the GTA are more concentrated areas of focus, known as Specific Target Areas (STAs), with access to major housing rehabilitation, street improvements, concentrated code enforcement, crime prevention, and organizing activities.

Geographical Distribution and Location of Investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Funds	Actual Percentage of Funds
Creston STA	3%	3%
Stocking STA	3%	3%
Belknap STA	3%	3%
Near West Side STA	1%	1%
Heritage Hill STA	1%	1%
Midtown STA	1%	1%
East Hills STA	1%	1%
Easttown STA	1%	1%
Grandville STA	1%	1%
Garfield Park STA	2%	2%
Southtown STA	7%	7%
General Target Area	54%	54%
City of Grand Rapids (outside GTA)	14%	14%
Cities of Grand Rapids, Kentwood, and Wyoming	8%	8%

General Target Area (GTA). The GTA was selected using income and housing data, and the boundaries have been adjusted over time as decennial Census data at the block group level becomes available. Within the GTA, at least 51% of the residents have low and moderate incomes. Residents of the GTA have access to a broad range of services, including housing programs and legal assistance. As of the 2000 Census, 47.4% of the city’s population, or 93,812 people, lived in the GTA.

Specific Target Area (STA). Within the GTA are eleven (11) Specific Target Areas. The STAs are residential neighborhoods where at least 55% of the residents are low- and moderate-income. Residents of the STAs have access to major housing rehabilitation programs, street improvements, concentrated code enforcement, and support for neighborhood associations. The majority of housing and community development program funds are spent in these neighborhoods.

City-Wide and External Programming. City-wide and external programming is employed for certain programs and activities which promote the deconcentration of poverty. City-wide services are also available to income-eligible residents for handicap accessibility and minor home repairs. HOME and ESG funds may be used anywhere in the City, provided they benefit income-eligible persons.

See Attachment D for the City of Grand Rapids Community Development Target Area map.

Leveraged Funds

Federal funds expended during the program year also leveraged additional resources from private, state, and local funding sources.

- Public Housing Operating Support. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission received \$1,089,326 for the Public Housing Operating Fund.
- Capital Fund Program. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission received \$376,679 from the FFY 2015 Capital Fund Program under the Capital Fund formula.
- Replacement Housing Factor. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission received \$166,255 in Replacement Housing Factor Grant funds.
- Family Self-Sufficiency. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission received a renewal grant for its Family Self-Sufficiency program for \$259,815.
- Section 8. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC) received \$18,812,212 for Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers. The GRHC also renewed Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation housing assistance for Calumet Flats for \$138,469 and Dwelling Place Inn for \$569,664. A Section 8 New Construction subsidy was also received in the amount of \$879,334 for Ransom Tower Apartments, a 153-unit elderly housing project.
- Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG). Heart of West Michigan United Way acted as the fiduciary on behalf of the Continuum of Care for federal ESG funds awarded by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA). A total of \$195,075 was awarded The Salvation Army Social Services, which serves as the local Housing Assessment and Resource Agency.
- Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program. The Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) awarded Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) totaling \$2,282,360 to the following proposed projects:

Project	LIHTC Funding Award
435 LaGrave at Tapestry Square	\$337,098
Grand View Place <i>936 Front Avenue, NW</i>	\$1,213,362
LCH36 Redevelopment Project <i>138, 303, 343, and 349 S. Division Avenue, and 344 Commerce Avenue, SW</i>	\$731,900

- **CHDO Operating Support.** During FFY 2014, the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) awarded CHDO Operating support funds to LINC Community Revitalization, Inc. (\$15,000).
- **Other Funding.** Nearly \$1 million was received by City-funded organizations from state and local government sources not previously mentioned above. A number of organizations funded by the City of Grand Rapids also obtained private funding to support housing and community development activities. The amount received from private foundations, fundraising efforts, financial institutions and others totaled approximately \$750,000.

Assessment. During the program year, the overall leveraged resources above totaling \$26,534,189 were made available for specific housing activities in Grand Rapids. This is an increase from FFY 2013 during which \$24,309,083 was available.

Match Requirements

The HOME program requires a 25% local match. Match is based on HOME expenditures, excluding expenditures for administration and Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) operating support. For FFY 2014, the match requirement was reduced by 100% as Grand Rapids met HUD criteria for severe fiscal distress. For the period of this report, HOME expenditures therefore required no local match. Although not required for FFY 2014, match was contributed, to be carried forward to future years, in a non-cash form via Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) for projects financed with City HOME funds.

The ESG program requires a one-for-one match that was provided by the non-profit agencies receiving ESG funds. The Community Development Block Grant and Justice Assistance Grant program have no match requirements.

Loans and Other Receivables. CDBG loan receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015 included repayments for the City's Housing Rehabilitation program, as well as a repayment of loans to housing developers. At the end of the fiscal year, there were 498 outstanding loans with balances totaling \$3,671,205.64. There were no outstanding float-funded activities. Also, no parcels acquired or improved with CDBG funds were available for sale.

Lump Sum Agreements. The City of Grand Rapids did not participate in any lump sum agreements during the reporting period.

Racial and Ethnic Composition of Families Assisted

The following table summarizes the demographic makeup of households and persons who received assistance from CDBG, HOME and ESG funded programs during the reporting period:

Race:	CDBG		HOME		ESG	
	Household	Persons	Household	Persons	Household	Persons
White	162	61	26	-	-	677
Black/African American	329	123	114	-	-	1,918
Asian	6	-	-	-	-	-
American Indian/Alaskan Native	3	4	-	-	-	14
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	2
American Indian/Alaskan Native & White	-	-	-	-	-	7
Asian White	-	-	-	-	-	15
Black/African American & White	2	-	-	-	-	134
American Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American	-	-	-	-	-	29
Other Multi-Racial	59	27	2	-	-	19
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnicity:						
Hispanic	64	0	19	-	-	259
Non-Hispanic	498	215	123	-	-	2,559

II. Goals and Outcomes – Neighborhood Investment Plan

Progress made in carrying out the City’s Strategic plan and Action Plan

The Neighborhood Investment Plan is an outcomes-based strategy used to allocate funds for the CDBG, HOME, and JAG programs. It is comprised of the following seven (7) outcomes that support the Community Development Department’s mission of *Building Great Neighborhoods!*

- Improve the condition of existing housing
- Increase the supply of affordable housing
- Increase opportunities for housing stability
- Increase public safety
- Build neighborhood leadership and civic engagement
- Enhance neighborhood infrastructure
- Increase economic opportunities

Results of the use of JAG funds are not required for this report, but are incorporated as the funds directly support *Outcome 4: Increase public safety*, and the funds are incorporated into the request for proposal process.

Each outcome is listed below with an assessment narrative. Following each narrative are charts providing details of each funded project. Organizations self-report their performance evaluations at the end of the grant year, indicating challenges and actions to be implemented. Some note additional accomplishments not described by the performance indicator. These performance evaluations are summarized in the charts.

Neighborhood association crime prevention and neighborhood improvement programs address *Outcomes 1: Improve the condition of existing housing*, *Outcome 4: Increase public safety*, and *Outcome 5: Build neighborhood leadership and civic engagement*. In this report, neighborhood association self-evaluation comments, which address results for all three (3) outcome areas, are noted under *Outcome 4: Increase public safety*.

Outcome 1: Improve the condition of existing housing

Investment: \$2,720,628

Assessment: Nearly all programs met or exceeded planned accomplishments. A shortage of qualified contractors/laborers was cited as a challenge in completing home repairs.

1-1 Housing Rehabilitation Program City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$850,000 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income Homeowners		Target Area GTA
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output: Number of homeowner units repaired to City Rehabilitation Standards.	50	46	
Indicator 1: Number of homeowner units in which a hazardous condition was abated.	20	46	
Indicator 2: Number of homeowner units where exterior code violations were corrected and made lead safe.	30	25	
Indicator 3: Average cost savings to homeowners compared to a market rate home improvement loan.	\$10,000	\$19,263	
Performance Evaluation: While program demand improved dramatically over the prior year, a shortage of qualified contractors made it difficult to meet the increased demand. Rationing contractors between this and the City’s Lead Hazard Control Program, combined with inopportune rain delays, left several projects to be completed the first week of the next reporting period. The average cost savings to homeowners when compared to a market rate home improvement loan was nearly twice the goal.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

1-2 Housing Code Enforcement City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$1,368,688 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods		Target Area GTA
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output: Number of housing, blight, and zoning cases continued or initiated.	6,000	5,968	
Indicator 1: Number of housing units brought into compliance with one or more of the following: Property Maintenance Code, Nuisance Code, or Zoning Code.	3,000	4,211	
Indicator 2: Number of vacant and/or abandoned housing units returned to productive use.	125	307	
Performance Evaluation: While the number of cases initiated was less than planned due to staffing changes, the number of cases brought into compliance significantly exceeded planned goals.			

1-3 Historic Preservation Code Enforcement City of Grand Rapids Planning Department	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$55,000 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods		Target Area GTA
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output: Number of code violation cases continued or initiated.	375	445	
Indicator: Number of housing units brought into compliance with one or more of the following: Housing Code, Nuisance Code, Zoning Ordinance, or Historic Preservation Standards.	325	498	
Performance Evaluation: Historic Preservation Code Enforcement continues to coordinate with neighborhood associations and the Grand Rapids Association of Realtors on public education activities.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

1-4 Accessible Housing Services Disability Advocates of Kent County	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$20,000 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income Households (People with Physical Disabilities)		Target Area Citywide
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output: Number of housing units provided with an environmental assessment for the purpose of making recommendations for accessibility modifications.	28	34	
Indicator: Number of people with disabilities who gained one or both of the following benefits: 1) improved access into and out of the unit, 2) improved access within the unit.	15	15	
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were met or exceeded.			

1-5 Access Modification Program Home Repair Services of Kent County	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2015		Funding \$46,000 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income Households (People with Physical Disabilities)		Target Area Citywide
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output: Number of housing units made accessible for people with disabilities.	12	12	
Indicator: Number of people with disabilities who gained one or both of the following benefits: 1) improved access into and out of the unit, 2) improved access within the unit.	10	12	
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were met. The income limit for program participation was increased to 80% of area median income, thereby expanding the range of clients that can be assisted with wheelchair ramps and bathroom modifications.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

1-6 Minor Home Repair Program Home Repair Services of Kent County	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 07/31/2015		Funding \$380,940 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income Households		Target Area Citywide
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output: Number of homeowner units in which minor home repairs were completed.	475	499	
Indicator: Number of housing units where occupants benefit from one or more of the following: 1) correction of a health or safety hazard, 2) improvement in affordability, 3) increase in home security, 4) lengthen the life of the structure.	455	471	
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were exceeded. The income limit for furnace repairs, one of the most critical of home repairs, was increased to 80% of area median income, thereby expanding the number of eligible households.			

Outcome 2: Increase the supply of affordable housing

Investment: \$998,325

Note: Actual units produced are not shown in the same year they are planned because:

- 1) Agreements are written for periods of one year or more.
- 2) Agreements often begin after the plan year starts.
- 3) For single-family homes, actual units are reported only when houses are completed, sold and occupied.

To view housing accomplishments as of June 30, 2015 with previous years' funding, refer to *Section VIII. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Grants / Allocation of HOME funds and HOME Accomplishments.*

Assessment: Funds provided CHDO operating support for two (2) organizations to facilitate the redevelopment of foreclosed, abandoned and blighted residential properties. Expenditure of Short Term Rental Assistance funds prevented homelessness of at-risk households.

2-1 Southtown ADR ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation	Project Period Varies by Property		Funding \$180,000 HOME
	Planned Beneficiaries Low-Income Households		Project Location General Target Area
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output: Number of affordable homeowner units created.	2	0	
Indicator 1: Number of homeowner units substantially rehabilitated to applicable building code standards and made lead safe.	2	0	
Indicator 2: Number of housing units that meet one or more of the following standards: 1) air infiltration rates were reduced by 20%, 2) eligibility for LEED certification, 3) attained a HERS rating of 4 stars (rehabilitation) or 5 stars (new construction), 4) Michigan Energy Code Compliance.	2	0	
Indicator 3: Number of homeowner units that remain affordable for lower-income families for one of the following periods: five (5) years, ten (10) years, fifteen (15) years.	2	0	
Performance Evaluation: The property located at 1134 Prospect Avenue, SE was acquired. Construction is scheduled to commence during the fall of 2015.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

2-2 Pleasant Prospect Homes 3 (PPH3) Inner City Christian Federation	Project Period 8/1/2014 – 11/30/2015		Funding \$180,000 HOME
	Planned Beneficiaries Low-Income Households		Project Location General Target Area
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output: Number of affordable rental units created.	90	76	
Indicator 1: Number of rental units substantially rehabilitated to applicable building code standards and made lead safe.	60	56	
Indicator 2: Number of rental units newly constructed to applicable building code standards.	30	20	
Indicator 3: Number of rental units that meet one or more of the following standards: 1) air infiltration rates were reduced by 20%, 2) eligibility for LEED certification, 3) attained a HERS rating of 4 stars (rehabilitation) or 5 stars (new construction), 4) Michigan Energy Code Compliance.	90	76	
Indicator 4: Number of rental units that remain affordable for lower-income families for one of the following periods: five (5) years, ten (10) years, fifteen (15) years.	90	76	
Indicator 5: Number of rental units that provide supportive housing for people with disabilities or other special needs.	23	12	
Performance Evaluation: Construction was completed during the reporting period. As of June 30, 2015, 76 of the 90 units were occupied. Full occupancy and final project closeout is anticipated to occur during the fall of 2015.			

2-3 CHDO Operating Support LINC Community Revitalization, Inc.	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$27,669 HOME CHDO
	Planned Beneficiaries N/A		Project Location Southtown
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Funding was used to support HOME-assisted housing development activities.			
Output:	N/A	N/A	
Performance Evaluation: Funds were used to facilitate Acquisition and Development for Resale program activities as well as the Southtown Square (Gilbert Street Townhomes) project.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

2-4 CHDO Operating Support New Development Corporation	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$27,668 HOME CHDO
	Planned Beneficiaries N/A		Project Location Belknap, Creston, Stocking
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Funding was used to support HOME-assisted housing development activities.			
Output:	N/A	N/A	
Performance Evaluation: Funds were used to facilitate Acquisition and Development for Resale program activities.			

2-5 North End Affordable Housing/ ADR New Development Corporation	Project Period Varies by property		Funding \$180,000 HOME
	Planned Beneficiaries Low-Income Households		Project Location Belknap, Creston, Stocking
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output: Number of affordable homeowner units created.	2	0	
Indicator 1: Number of homeowner units substantially rehabilitated to applicable building code.	2	0	
Indicator 2: Number of housing units that meet one or more of the following standards: 1) air infiltration rates were reduced by 20%, 2) eligibility for LEED certification, 3) attained a HERS rating of 4 stars (rehabilitation) or 5 stars (new construction), 4) Michigan Energy Code Compliance.	2	0	
Indicator 3: Number of homeowner units that remain affordable for lower-income families for one of the following periods: five (5) years, ten (10) years, fifteen (15) years.	2	0	
Performance Evaluation: The property located at 842 Jennette Avenue, NW was acquired and construction is in process.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

2-6 Short Term Rental Assistance The Salvation Army Social Services	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 12/31/2015		Funding \$402,988 HOME
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income Households		Project Location Cities of Grand Rapids, Kentwood, and Wyoming
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output: Number of households served with Short Term Rental Assistance up to six (6) months	108	136	
Indicator: Number of households who have increased accessibility to affordable housing	108	136	
Performance Evaluation: During the reporting period, a total of 136 households, representing 420 people, received short-term rental assistance. Planned performance goals have been exceeded. The average assistance provided per household is lower than projected.			

Outcome 3: Increase opportunities for housing stability

Investment: \$149,450

Assessment: Achievements generally exceeded expectations for fair housing and legal services. Funded organizations maintained strong partnerships with agencies and organizations which fostered productive collaboration; a strong referral network to connect individuals with the available resources within the communities that meet their needs; promotion of open, diverse neighborhoods; and greater compliance within the housing industry.

3-1 Fair Housing Services Fair Housing Center of West Michigan	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$71,450 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries GTA Residents		Target Area GTA
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of hours developing, marketing and conducting educational and outreach activities.	140	153.25	
Indicator 1: Number of people who received fair housing education and outreach.	2,000	6,268	
Output 2: Number of people who attended a fair housing training.	150	299	
Indicator 2: Number of people at training who indicated they learned new and relevant information.	40	77	
Output 3: Number of housing industry professionals who attended a fair housing training.	100	171	
Indicator 3a: Number of housing industry professionals at training who indicated they learned new and relevant information.	75	90	
Indicator 3b: Number of housing industry professionals at training who indicated they would modify their business practices following training.	75	90	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

3-1 Fair Housing Services - Continued	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 4: Number of housing tests conducted to determine compliance with fair housing laws.	50	58
Indicator 4a: Number of housing tests where no evidence of discrimination was found.	35	38
Indicator 4b: Number of housing tests where evidence of discrimination was found and resolved in accordance with established criteria.	14	20
<p>Performance Evaluation: The Fair Housing Center of West Michigan (FHCWM) maintained strong partnerships with agencies and organizations throughout the City which fostered productive collaboration; a strong referral network to connect individuals with available resources; promotion of open, diverse neighborhoods; and greater compliance within the housing industry. The FHCWM worked closely with HUD and the Michigan Department of Civil Rights to develop effective and innovative partnerships to detect and address illegal housing discrimination, particularly working to end practices of systemic discrimination. The organization increased the capacity of housing providers to comply with fair housing laws and conducted efforts to affirmatively further fair housing throughout the City of Grand Rapids. The capacity of community members and home seekers to recognize and report practices of illegal housing discrimination was also increased. The FHCWM not only removed barriers to fair housing choice, but also promoted and enhanced open and equal housing opportunity.</p>		

3-2 Housing Assistance Center Legal Aid of Western Michigan	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$78,000 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income People		Target Area GTA
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people receiving free legal counseling and/or representation.	211	215	
<p>Indicator 1: Number of people who resolved their housing-related legal matter based on one of the following main benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Avoidance of a housing crisis, 2) Improvement in the quality of the person’s housing, 3) Removal of barriers to obtaining or retaining housing, and/or 4) Increased knowledge of the legal system. 	165	185	
<p>Performance Evaluation: Planned indicators have been met and exceeded.</p>			

Outcome 4: Increase public safety

Investment: \$295,077

This outcome supports quality of life and a sense of community in neighborhoods by reducing or preventing crime. This outcome supports neighborhood collaborations with the City of Grand Rapids and use of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles and practices. Specific public safety issues that are successfully resolved may include, but are not limited to, those listed below, which also serve as performance outputs and indicators.

- People who receive training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes,
- People who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of public safety training,
- Housing units that receive safety improvements,
- People, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces,
- Non-residential spaces where public safety design features or practices were implemented,
- Significant public safety issues identified and successfully resolved.

Reported accomplishments may vary based on the needs of the individual neighborhoods, type of service provided, and the length of time required for resolution.

Outcome Assessment: Overall, planned indicators varied from actual results. Most projects met or exceeded all goals, although a few projects did not meet planned performance indicators. Reasons noted for success include volunteers, resident involvement, and strong relationships between property owners, residents, the City, and other organizations including educational institutions.

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-1 Crime Prevention Program Baxter Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$35,305 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Southtown
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	175	275	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	131	174	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	46	60	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	55	101	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	36	67	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	23	29	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	12	12	
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were met or exceeded. Significant emphasis was placed on providing neighborhood stakeholders with personal safety and/or safety design feature training.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-2 Crime Prevention Program Creston Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$18,942 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Creston
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	80	123	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	60	55	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	16	16	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	60	60	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	10	10	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	10	10	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	6	6	
Performance Evaluation: Most goals were met or exceeded due to the Safe Routes partnership with Palmer Elementary School and the Police Department, an annual public safety training, and two new block meetings.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-3 Crime Prevention Program East Hills Council of Neighbors	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$17,879 JAG
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area East Hills
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	85	90	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	65	65	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	20	20	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	60	170	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	5	15	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	10	10	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	5	5	
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were met or exceeded due to increased block club activity and development activities. Social media is identified as a useful tool for organizing and communication.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-4 Crime Prevention Program Eastown Community Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$15,854 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Eastown
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	100	297	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	75	168	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	30	30	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	50	109	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	5	26	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	5	8	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	5	1	
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were mostly exceeded. There was active volunteer involvement in committees and events; improvements and beautification projects in parks and gardens; and cleanup projects. As crime continues to decrease, there are fewer requests for home security surveys and it is harder to get block clubs and groups to meet for updates and training.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-5 Crime Prevention Program Garfield Park Neighborhoods Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$26,721 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Garfield Park
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	147	159	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	110	111	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	23	238	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	46	48	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	10	105	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	20	44	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	10	12	
Performance Evaluation: All planned indicators were exceeded due to outreach efforts to build capacity, increase knowledge, and engage neighbors in improvement projects. With increased neighbor involvement, GPNA addressed a large number of significant public safety issues before they became major issues. In addition, GPNA collaborated with the Fire Department’s Residential Safety Program to address fire safety and other safety improvements for neighbors.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-6 Crime Prevention Program Heritage Hill Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$22,323 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Heritage Hill
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	151	125	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	114	141	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	9	6	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	10	15	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	2	26	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	10	16	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	5	10	
Performance Evaluation: Most planned performance goals were met or exceeded. A graffiti removal program successfully kept hot spots clear of spray paint tags. With the popularity of personal media, neighbors are more likely to depend on e-alerts and the organization’s Facebook page and newsletter (Heritage Herald) for personal safety and home security “training” than participation in traditional block meetings.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-7 Crime Prevention Program Midtown Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015	Funding \$19,294 JAG
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood	Target Area Midtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	150	178
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	113	47
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	23	6
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	37	79
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	32	16
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	23	38
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	12	19
The Midtown area is experiencing significant redevelopment. Because of this, a great deal of staff time was spent on neighborhood improvement and development concerns such as traffic safety and building height/density as it relates to the potential for additional vehicle traffic. Public safety concerns commonly involve graffiti and housing vacancy.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-8 Crime Prevention Program Neighbors of Belknap Lookout	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015	Funding \$16,594 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood	Target Area Belknap
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	92	102
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	69	70
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	9	10
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	28	65
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	5	5
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	9	12
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	7	8
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were met or exceeded. A residential parking permit program was implemented in cooperation with the City's Parking Services Department. A newly formed Development Committee meets with developers to provide input on proposed projects. Crime prevention program activities included hosting a National Night Out event, Back to School Bash and working with local schools and churches on program referrals. Staff and volunteers participated in Michigan Street Corridor and GR Forward Plan development, a Neighborhood Summit, and Housing Community Conversation and meetings with the City Manager and City staff.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-9 Crime Prevention Program Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$26,125 JAG
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Grandville
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	138	599	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	104	615	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	46	34	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	46	48	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	23	57	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	23	29	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	9	28	
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were mostly met and exceeded. The number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes was significantly higher than planned due to the success of a new event held at Cesar Chavez Elementary School. While residents were encouraged to implement safety improvements, the number who followed through was less than anticipated.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-10 Crime Prevention Program Seeds of Promise	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$43,151 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Southtown
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	215	219	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	160	172	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	55	80	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	55	62	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	40	48	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	40	40	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	20	13	
Performance Evaluation: Relationships with residents, property owners, neighborhood partners and business owners were established and strengthened. From organizing volunteers to shovel driveways, sidewalks and bus stops for easier mobility during winter months, to holding meetings and trainings, the organization has, in particular, become a strong advocate for elderly and disabled residents.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-11 Crime Prevention Program South West Area Neighbors	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$24,273 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Near West Side
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	147	322	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	110	152	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	14	35	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	37	367	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	5	43	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	20	61	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	10	48	
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were met and exceeded. Following up on multiple graffiti incidents resulted in new business contacts and relationships. Utilizing “no trespass” letters with property owners as well as crime free lease addendums increased crime prevention program accomplishments. Activities were supported with significant resident involvement and partnerships with businesses and other organizations.			

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

4-12 Crime Prevention Program West Grand Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding JAG \$4,531 CDBG PS \$24,085
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Stocking
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	175	289	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	131	66	
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	10	178	
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	50	261	
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	5	9	
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	30	134	
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	15	12	
Performance Evaluation: Most performance goals were met or exceeded.			

Outcome 5: Build neighborhood leadership and civic engagement

Investment: \$235,674

This outcome supports neighborhood leadership and civic engagement as the means to build great neighborhoods. This outcome supports actions to counteract threats to neighborhood stability, promote choice and opportunity, and encourage sustainable change. Specific housing and condition issues (safety and/or appearance) successfully resolved may include, but are not limited to:

- People receiving leadership, board responsibility and/or capacity building training,
- People reporting increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility and/or capacity building skills,
- People informed about volunteer opportunities in the neighborhood,
- Property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.

Note that the number of residents and neighborhood stakeholders involved in leadership roles to resolve neighborhood issues, or involved in other volunteer opportunities, is likely to include some duplication. Organizations report performance data on a quarterly basis; it is probable and preferable that some individuals participated in more than one quarter due to volunteer retention efforts.

Individual performance evaluations for the neighborhood associations may be found in *Outcome 4: Increase public safety*.

Assessment: Overall, goals for the resolution of housing conditions and the involvement of residents in leadership roles were surpassed due to more active committee memberships, neighborhood beautification programs, and increased collaboration.

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-1 Neighborhood Leadership Program Creston Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$16,453 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Creston
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	32	34	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	25	26	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	26	27	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	4,500	4,500	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	200	207	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	46	51	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	30	34	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-2 Neighborhood Leadership Program East Hills Council of Neighbors	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$15,530 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area East Hills
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	50	136	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	40	70	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	20	32	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	4,835	4,835	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	160	200	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	36	40	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	18	20	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-3 Neighborhood Leadership Program Eastown Community Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$13,772 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Eastown
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	50	81	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	45	53	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	50	122	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	3,500	3,500	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	225	454	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	15	15	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	5	10	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-4 Neighborhood Leadership Program Garfield Park Neighborhoods Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$23,210 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Garfield Park
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	55	101	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	50	99	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	32	309	
Output 2: Number of people informed of who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	11,004	11,004	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	312	321	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	25	97	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	10	50	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-5 Neighborhood Leadership Program Heritage Hill Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$19,389 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Heritage Hill
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	50	99	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	40	47	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	40	68	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	4,000	4,000	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	260	547	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	11	10	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	11	1,812	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-6 Neighborhood Leadership Program LINC Community Revitalization, Inc.	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$47,517 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Southtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	100	100	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	90	176	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	100	314	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	11,318	11,318	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	750	1,056	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-7 Neighborhood Leadership Program Midtown Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$16,758 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Midtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	69	361	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	62	85	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	46	57	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	5,172	5,172	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	250	216	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	23	29	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	12	18	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-8 Neighborhood Leadership Program Neighbors of Belknap Lookout	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$14,414 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Belknap
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	41	92	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	38	49	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	14	24	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	3,786	3,786	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	160	173	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	23	27	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	18	23	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-9 Neighborhood Leadership Program Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$22,692 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Grandville
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	46	134	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	41	80	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	23	213	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	6,612	6,612	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	138	271	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	206	119	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	104	98	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-10 Neighborhood Leadership Program South West Area Neighbors	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$21,083 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Near West Side
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	55	104	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	44	84	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	18	290	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	6,713	6,713	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	230	350	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	41	56	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	39	188	

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-11 Neighborhood Leadership Program West Grand Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2014 – 06/30/2015		Funding \$24,856 CDBG PS
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate- Income Neighborhood		Target Area Stocking
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	45	70	
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	41	69	
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	20	169	
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	16,693	16,693	
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	200	242	
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	150	132	
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	100	174	

Outcome 6: Enhance neighborhood infrastructure

Investment: \$200,000

Assessment: Planning for the Neighborhood Infrastructure Program began during the reporting period.

6-1 Neighborhood Infrastructure Program City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period TBD		Funding \$200,000 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood		Target Area All STA's
	Planned Units	Actual Units	
Output: Implementation and execution of Infrastructure projects.	TBD	0	
Indicator: Number of projects undertaken.	TBD	0	
Performance Evaluation: Eligible infrastructure projects will be identified during the fall of 2015.			

Outcome 7: Increase economic opportunities

Investment: \$0

Assessment: No projects were funded under this outcome for the period of July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015.

Completed Projects from Prior Funding Years – CDBG

It is common for infrastructure-related activities to require more than one (1) year to complete. The following is a summary of CDBG projects funded prior to the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan that progressed during the reporting period.

6-1 Neighborhood Infrastructure Program City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period 1/1/2015 – 9/30/2015		Funding FFY 2012 Up to \$190,000 CDBG
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods		Target Area All STA's
	Planned Units		Actual Units
Output: Number of sport courts improved.	4		4
Indicator: Number of parks improved.	4		4
Performance Evaluation: Work was substantially complete on the improvement of sport court surfaces, related sport court fixtures, and enclosure fencing at Campau, Coit, Dickinson, and Douglas parks.			

Self-Evaluation

This section provides an opportunity to reflect on the year's progress and to answer some important questions. Most of the following questions are recommended by HUD.

Are the grantee's activities and strategies making an impact on identified needs? What indicators would best describe the results?

Housing in Grand Rapids is old, with over 70 percent of the housing in the General Target Area dating pre-1950. Activities to improve housing conditions such as code enforcement, housing rehabilitation, and affordable housing are addressing needs, although the impact is limited by the amount of investment available through CDBG and HOME funds. Geographic targeting also helps keep resources concentrated in areas of most need. The grantee has essentially halted new construction of single-family housing and is placing priority on housing rehabilitation to reduce the number of vacant, foreclosed and abandoned homes. Policies for increased energy efficiency and water conservation have been implemented to increase long-term affordability.

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

- The overall level of Federal entitlement and local funding available has declined significantly over the last decade, while the cost of administering and implementing projects continues to increase.
- The staffing level for grant administration in the Community Development Department has also decreased, as the Department must rely solely on the administrative funds provided through the grant awards.
- While there has been improvement in the economy, unemployment rate, and housing market, significant demand continues for housing services such as rental assistance.

How have some of these barriers been addressed?

- Staff continues to adjust the workload demand with streamlined processes using Administrative Lean tools. During the period of this report, staff continued to use SharePoint, an interactive data management software application, for document management and collaboration with partner organizations.
- Staff costs and operating expenses have been reduced to keep administration expenses within budget.
- During a prior reporting period, a consultant engaged by Kent County and the cities of Grand Rapids and Wyoming to study the administration of federal housing and community development programs issued a report recommending possible efficiencies via collaboration. Officials from each jurisdiction continue to meet in an effort to define administrative tasks that can be accomplished jointly and result in greater efficiency. During the reporting period, a consultant was engaged to prepare a regional Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan for the three (3) jurisdictions.
- Funded organizations have been encouraged to combine resources or seek additional funding from other sources.

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

It has been challenging for developers to acquire properties for Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resale activities. This is attributed to both an improving housing market which increases competition for available property and a significant inventory of bank owned real estate.

Are major goals on target?

Despite many challenges, most goals were met or nearly met.

Are grant disbursements timely?

Grant disbursements are timely, with funds expended within HUD guidelines, and projects reimbursed as funds are requested and approved.

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.

Program objectives are identified in the FFY 2011-2015 Consolidated Housing and Community Development (HCD) Plan. The City will evaluate those goals as part of drafting the next five-year plan. *Adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities made to meet community needs more effectively may include:*

- Strategic and limited new construction of single-family homes.
- Rehabilitate existing vacant homes.
- Encourage collaboration among or consolidation of providers of similar services.
- Encourage subrecipients to find alternative or supplemental funding.
- Support projects that encourage mixed-income neighborhoods.

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.

Assessments of individual activities undertaken with CDBG and other funding during the reporting period can be found in Goals and Outcomes: Neighborhood Investment Plan section of this report.

Certifications for Consistency

Certifications for Consistency from organizations that received HUD funds other than those received through the Community Development Department are reviewed for consistency, approved by the City Manager, and returned to the originating party for HUD submission.

Plan Implementation

The FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan was not hindered by action or willful inaction.

III. Affordable Housing

The City is committed to maintaining existing housing as affordable to low- and moderate-income people and to expanding the supply of affordable housing. Activities that support these goals are reported in *Section II. Goals and Outcomes, Outcomes 1, 2, and 3*. Below is a summary of one year goals identified in the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan and the outcome of each.

Number of Households to be Supported	Goal	Actual
Number of homeless to be provided affordable housing units	0	0
Number of non-homeless to be provided affordable housing units	214	212
Number of special-needs to be provided affordable housing units	0	0
Total	214	212

Number of Households Supported Through	Goal	Actual
Rental Assistance	120	136
The Production of New Units	30	20
Rehab of Existing Units	64	56
Acquisition of Existing Units	0	0
Total	214	212

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

The above goals reflect Short-Term Rental Assistance (STRA), four (4) single-family housing rehabilitation projects, and a 90-unit rental development undertaken with HOME funds. The number of households assisted with STRA exceeds the planned units as the average amount of assistance required per household is less than anticipated. Housing development projects generally require more than one year to complete. During the report period, two (2) properties were acquired for resale; construction is expected to be completed during the FFY 2015 plan year. Development of 76 rental units (56 rehabilitated/20 new construction) was completed.

Impact of these Outcomes on Future Annual Action Plans

Progress has been made as anticipated. Demand for STRA and single-family housing rehabilitation remains strong. Continued support for these activities will be considered during development of the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan, and next five-year HCD Plan.

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 eligibility.

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	392	107
Low-income	341	104
Moderate-income	44	1
Total	777	212

Further Actions. In addition to activities undertaken under the FFY 2014 Annual Plan, further efforts were made to promote Affordable Housing activities during the reporting period. These include:

Disposal of City of Grand Rapids Owned Residential Property. The City continued to support non-profit and for-profit efforts to undertake infill housing development. Non-federal City resources (e.g. land) were made available to the extent practicable and consistent with other City policies and practices. The City’s policy for the “Disposal of City of Grand Rapids Owned Residential Property” offered non-profit housing developers the first opportunity to purchase vacant lots from the City. For property located within the Community Development General Target Area, non-profit developers were allowed sixty (60) days to identify and purchase vacant lots in the City’s inventory before they were offered to the general public. During the reporting period, no properties were disposed to a non-profit housing developer for redevelopment through this process.

Acquisition and Transfer of Tax Foreclosed Properties. In 1999, the State of Michigan enacted a new system for the collection of delinquent taxes and disposition of tax reverted property to address redevelopment of urban areas. Under the new process, tax reverted properties are transferred to Michigan counties which are to make them available for public auction each year. Before the first public auction is held, local governments may purchase properties for public purposes at the minimum bid price which includes unpaid taxes, interest, penalties and fees. The City’s policy for the “Acquisition and Transfer of Tax Foreclosed Properties Acquired in Accordance with P.A. 123 of 1999” guides the acquisition and disposition of tax foreclosed properties for the public purposes of facilitating public works projects, restoring blighted properties and neighborhoods, and providing for affordable housing. On May 28, 2013, the City Commission approved an amendment to the City’s policy to include the Kent County Land Bank Authority (KCLBA) in negotiations that support the goals of the policy. Approved non-profit entities and the KCLBA may request properties in conformance with this policy, provided they demonstrate the public purpose for which the property will be used and that funds necessary to cover all acquisition costs are deposited with the City before the City attempts to purchase the tax foreclosed properties from the Kent County Treasurer’s Office. On June 3, 2014, the City Commission approved the acquisition of 125 tax foreclosed properties to be transferred to the KCLBA in FFY 2014. The KCLBA is required to complete redevelopment, repurpose, or resale of the property in fulfillment of the public purpose within eighteen (18) months of the City’s conveyance.

Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT). Enabled by State law, the City Commission provided conditional approval of tax exemption and PILOT for the following projects during the report period:

Project Name	Number of Assisted Units
LCH36	49
501 Eastern	19 (of 24)
Lexington Senior Apartments	39
Weston Apartments	190
Marsh Ridge I & II	190
Stonebrook Townhomes I & II	102 (of 150)
Breton Village Green	162

Continuum of Care. The City of Grand Rapids continues to participate in the Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County Continuum of Care (CoC). The CoC has a Permanent Supportive Housing Subcommittee to address housing needs for targeted populations such as people who are homeless, at risk for homelessness, people with disabilities (mental illness, substance addictions, and/or HIV/AIDS), as well as other special populations.

Households and People Assisted with Federal Housing Resources. During the report period, 49 housing units received assistance with housing rehabilitation or repair. This represents achievement of 98% of the proposed goal to assist 50 units. Following is a break-down of the households that occupy these units by income category and tenure.

Households Assisted with Housing Rehabilitation/Repair July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015					
Income Category	Percent of Area Median Family Income (MFI)	Households Assisted			
		Owner	Renter	Total	Percent
Extremely-Low	<=30%	24	2	26	53%
Low	>30% - <=50%	12	1	13	27%
Moderate	>50% - <=80%	10	0	10	20%
Non-Low/Moderate	>=80%				
Total		46	3	49	100%

Special Needs Housing. The City continued to provide funding for the housing-related needs of people with disabilities through Home Repair Services’ Access Modification Program and Disability Advocates of Kent County’s Accessible Housing Services Program. During the reporting period, access modifications were completed on owner- and renter-occupied dwellings through these programs benefiting twelve (12) people.

Acquisition, Rehabilitation, or Demolition of Occupied Real Property. During the reporting period, the City’s Housing Rehabilitation program did not have any cases where occupants were required to permanently relocate subject to the Uniform Relocation Act and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (URA), as amended. Further, no clients were required to permanently relocate subject to the URA during lead remediation activities.

IV. Homelessness and Other Special Needs (Continuum of Care)

The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (CTEH), the community's Continuum of Care (CoC), continues to build system infrastructure that shifts from managing homelessness to increased access to quality, affordable, permanent housing. CTEH goals include:

- Increase homeless prevention resources/services;
- Increase rapid re-housing services;
- Increase the number of permanent supportive housing units with an emphasis on units for chronically homeless;
- Fully integrate and coordinate the Housing Assessment Program, which serves as the CoC's central intake, for all housing crisis services;
- Increase collaboration/coordination with additional rent assistance providers as appropriate;
- 100% Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data entry by all homeless providers;
- Fully incorporate housing first approach in all homeless and housing related services;
- Integrate system-wide outcome indicators to track the impact of housing services/resources;
- Secure additional resources or re-align existing resources to support the emerging system and affordable housing needs.

Community Development Department staff actively participates in the community planning process for homeless shelter and services. FFY 2014 Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) funds, which included \$297,583 from the City and \$195,075 designated by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), were handled through community application processes, with funding recommendations developed by the CTEH Funding Review Panel.

The City of Grand Rapids received \$297,583 for the FFY 2014 (FY 2015) ESG program from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to support homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing activities. The City retained \$22,318 for grant administration.

A portion (\$214,990) of the prevention and rapid re-housing funds (primarily rent assistance) was allocated to a Financial Assistance Fund administered by The Salvation Army. These funds were accessible to qualified homeless service providers that employ the Housing Resource Specialist model of strength-based case management through a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process. Each service provider entered into a MOU with the lead agency, The Salvation Army. The following tables detail the total persons served during the period of this report.

*Persons Served with Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Funds
July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015*

Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	52
Children	94
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	146

Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	46
Children	56
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	102

All Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	1,931
Children	1,490
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	20
Total	3,441

Gender

Number of Persons in Households	
Male	1,219
Female	2,202
Transgender	2
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	18
Total	3,441

Age

Number of Persons in Households	
Under 18	1,490
18-24	469
25 and Over	1,462
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	20
Total	3,441

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

Special Populations Served – Complete for All Activities

Subpopulations	Persons Served – Prevention	Persons Served – Rapid Re-Housing	Persons Served in Emergency Shelter	Total
Veterans	0	4	0	53
Victims of Domestic Violence	7	8	0	387
Elderly	1	0	0	42
HIV/AIDS	1	0	0	3
Chronically Homeless	0	3	0	45
Persons with Disabilities				
Severely Mentally Ill	4	10	0	200
Chronic Substance Abuse	0	4	0	25
Other Disability	19	19	0	376
Total	18	21	0	400

Note: At the time of this report, subrecipient staff was unable to generate a report from HMIS for the Housing Assessment Program that separates persons assisted with prevention and rapid re-housing from the total number of persons assisted. Where data is broken out by prevention and rapid re-housing, only Financial Assistance Fund data is represented.

Following is a description of progress made toward meeting specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness by reaching out to persons experiencing homelessness (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs.

The Salvation Army Social Services Housing Assessment Program, which provides a centralized intake program, continues to devote staff to outreach efforts and work with the community's two (2) missions where individuals experiencing homelessness for long periods of time can be reached.

Using HMIS, staff complete assessments of individual strengths and obstacles, while focusing on housing and helping to facilitate contact with housing, employment, and health-related services. Once housing is secured, housing program staff work with participants to maintain housing and reduce barriers that threaten stability. In addition, Arbor Circle, an agency serving homeless and runaway youth, continues to carry out street outreach activities, and has increased staff capacity dedicated to this role. In October 2014, the Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool (SPDAT), a nationally recognized tool that assists with the prioritization of clients to receive housing assistance intervention and identification of the type of assistance needed, was incorporated into the central intake process. A Coordinated Assessment and Referral System policy was adopted by the CoC in August 2014. Since this time, the Coordinated Assessment Committee has worked to implement various changes detailed in the policy.

How emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of persons experiencing homelessness were addressed.

The CoC prioritized increasing the availability of permanent housing through rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, and housing choice vouchers. Emergency shelter beds and transitional housing units are available in the community and supported with funding other than the Continuum of Care and Emergency Solutions Grants Program resources. Emergency shelter and transitional housing programs are encouraged to employ the least restrictive eligibility requirements to prevent large numbers of individuals and families from becoming ineligible. Employing the housing first approach, the CoC seeks to rapidly move persons experiencing homelessness into permanent housing.

How persons experiencing homelessness (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) were assisted in making 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.

Historically, there have been a low number of local unsheltered homeless households with dependent children. Of the 26 unsheltered persons identified during the 2015 point-in-time count, none were in households with dependent children (or households with only children). Homeless households are encouraged to obtain an assessment and linkage to available services to help resolve the housing crisis through the community's coordinated assessment system. The CoC coordinates with major systems (Community Mental Health, Correctional Facilities, Department of Health and Human Services, health care providers, etc.), which assist with outreach efforts by publicizing the role of the central intake provider and making referrals when appropriate. Outreach staff is strategically placed in the community to ensure households experiencing homelessness are aware of and connected to community resources to end homelessness.

CoC coordinated assessment continues to assess at-risk households with children to prevent homelessness by using available prevention resources, shelter diversion tactics and linkage to mainstream resources to avoid loss of housing. An intake specialist works with each household to create a plan to resolve the housing crisis. The CoC targeted prevention and diversion resources to persons most closely matching the current homeless population profile, ensuring resources are used for those most likely to become homeless. When resources were available, households were referred to a Housing Resource Specialist who assisted the family in implementing their plan and linking them to appropriate resources for long-term housing stability. The CoC worked collaboratively with mainstream systems (e.g. schools, child protective services and mental health systems) to identify at-risk households and connect them to appropriate prevention resources.

The CoC is committed to expanding permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless population. Community Rebuilders has a development project with Woda Development, Inc. for permanent supportive housing serving chronically homeless veterans, homeless veterans and chronically homeless households. Inner City Christian Federation is developing permanent

supportive housing in collaboration with Bethany Christian Services, a youth services and foster care provider, to target youth aging out of foster care. Under the FFY 2013 CoC Program, permanent supportive housing programs to serve chronically homeless individuals and families were created by both Community Rebuilders and Inner City Christian Federation.

Under the FFY 2014 CoC Program, The Salvation Army and Grand Rapids Housing Commission reconfigured two (2) transitional housing programs to rapid-rehousing programs for families coming from shelters or places not meant for human habitation. Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids, Inc., in partnership with the YWCA of West Michigan, is developing permanent supportive housing and reconfiguring housing that was previously only transitional to be a permanent housing solution for households homeless due to fleeing domestic violence. Community Rebuilders and several other housing providers expanded efforts to serve chronically homeless families by building upon strong relationships with private landlords.

How low-income individuals and families were assisted in avoiding 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.

Homelessness prevention efforts continue to focus largely on access to mainstream resources to assist families with various barriers to permanent housing. According to 2014 Annual Performance Report (APR) data, 89% of participants in CoC-funded projects received mainstream (non-cash) benefits which significantly increased the ability of individuals and families to support their own long-term housing. Collaboration with mainstream providers such as the Department of Health and Human Services which oversees Temporary Assistant for Needy Families (TANF), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and Medicaid eligibility, continues to support effective and efficient access to mainstream benefits by eligible participants. The CoC is making substantial strides in securing income and benefits for the most vulnerable citizens by improving implementation of the SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access and Recovery (SOAR) Program. Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services, as the designated SOAR Lead Agency, coordinates with other service providers through its Street Reach program to ensure those with disabling conditions avoid housing crises. Local housing providers continue to assist participants in establishing links to mainstream resources in order to sustain housing on a long-term basis.

The CoC supports protocols established by the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services to help prevent youth aging out of foster care from being discharged into homelessness. With changes in policy for youth at the state level, greater flexibility ensures youth are not routinely discharged to homelessness. Youth are able to remain in foster care beyond age eighteen, and youth that have aged out of foster care are eligible to return voluntarily if they need additional support.

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

Since December 2011, network180, the Community Mental Health Authority in Kent County, has been working with the Community Medicine Division at Spectrum Health Systems to implement the Center for Integrative Medicine (CIM). The CIM is designed to provide comprehensive evaluation, intervention and stabilization of physical and behavioral health issues for Spectrum patients who have frequented the emergency room ten or more times in the prior twelve (12) months (approximately 950 patients). Network180 has two (2) staff at the CIM. Program evaluation includes attention to social determinants of health, which includes housing.

The State Mental Health Code (Section 330.1209b) requires the community mental health program, including McKinney-Vento programs, to produce a written plan for community placement and aftercare services, ensuring patients are not discharged into homelessness. The written plan must identify strategies for assuring recipients have access to needed and available supports identified through a needs assessment. Service providers adhere to state and local requirements. The Michigan Department of Corrections identifies stable housing as a critical need for the successful re-entry of released prisoners. Staff from the county correctional facility and the CoC's central intake provider created a protocol for homeless persons who enter and exit the corrections system. The results are evaluated and protocol amended as necessary. CoC staff participates on the Community Re-entry Coordinating Council (CRCC) to maintain links between the two systems and to keep the Council abreast of housing/homeless-related information.

ESG Expenditures for Prevention

Type of Expenditure	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Rental Assistance			
	\$0	\$0	\$0
Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services			
Financial Assistance	0	19,500.00	46,377.85
Services	0	4,735.57	35,326.70
Subtotal Prevention	\$0	\$24,235.57	\$81,704.55

ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

Type of Expenditure	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Rental Assistance			
	\$0	\$0	\$0
Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services			
Financial Assistance	0	114,263.61	77,173.82
Services	0	0	15,140.02
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	\$0	\$114,263.61	\$92,313.84

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

No funds were expended on emergency shelter activities during the reporting period.

Other Grant Expenditures

Type of Expenditure	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Street Outreach	\$0	\$0	\$0
HMIS	0	0	0
Administration	\$0	\$5,528.26	\$20,582.71

Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
	\$0	\$144,027.44	\$194,601.10

Match Source

	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	\$0	\$0	\$105,840.00
Other Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Government	\$0	52,000.00	\$144,277.00
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$50,000.00
Private Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0
Program Income	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Match Amount	\$0	\$52,000.00	\$300,117.00

Total FY 2012 – FY 2014

Total Expended on ESG Activities	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
	\$0	\$196,027.44	\$494,718.10

Total FFY 2013 ESG (only) through June 30, 2015

Fiscal Year	Expenditure	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$106,249.47	\$210,046.00	\$316,295.47
FFY 2014	144,027.44	52,000.00	\$196,027.44
Total	\$250,276.91	\$262,046.00	\$512,322.91

Continuum of Care (CoC) Program

The 2014 Continuum of Care (CoC) process was coordinated by the Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (CTEH), operating as the local CoC and as the Housing Subcommittee of the Kent County Essential Needs Task Force. The CTEH is led by a Coordinator, whose position is partially funded by Community Development Block Grant funds from the City of Grand Rapids. The CTEH general membership meets bi-monthly, while roundtables, subcommittees and the Steering Committee meet monthly to analyze and create strategies to further implement the goals and objectives of the ten-year plan, the *Vision to End Homelessness*. A comprehensive, on-going planning process is used to involve a broad cross section of stakeholders including housing providers, consumers, government, business, social services and other key partners.

As part of the comprehensive planning process, housing providers that apply for Continuum of Care (CoC) funds are required to participate in a local application, analysis and review process including both a local application and a HUD application to the CTEH to be reviewed by a local funding review panel. This group is tasked with reviewing all of the applications, scoring them based on criteria identified by the CTEH, and ranking programs for funding allocations.

For the 2014 funding round, the community was eligible to submit an application for renewal projects and new projects created through reallocation. The community was awarded \$4,965,496 in renewal projects, \$63,319 for CoC planning activities, and \$100,000 for HMIS administration activities, for a total of \$5,128,815.

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) Program 2014 Project Listing			
Rank	Sponsor/Program	Type	Award
1	<i>Community Rebuilders</i> Housing Solutions	PSH	\$516,390
2	<i>Inner City Christian Federation</i> Permanent Supportive Housing Program	PSH	\$35,379
3	<i>Community Rebuilders</i> Long-Term Opportunities for Tenancy (LOFT)	PSH	\$118,824
4	<i>Community Rebuilders</i> HEROES Veteran Housing	PSH	\$125,180
5	<i>Genesis Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Oroiquis Apartments	PSH	\$26,750
6	<i>County of Kent</i> TRA - Community Rebuilders	PSH	\$846,135
7	<i>County of Kent</i> SRA - Community Rebuilders	PSH	\$409,917
8	<i>Genesis Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Heron Courtyard	PSH	\$33,170
9	<i>Genesis Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Kingsbury Place Apartments	PSH	\$37,450
10	<i>Grand Rapids Housing Commission</i> Home At Last III	PSH	\$123,794
11	<i>Grand Rapids Housing Commission</i> Home At Last II	PSH	\$122,373
12	<i>Grand Rapids Housing Commission</i> Home At Last I	PSH	\$120,257
13	<i>Heartside Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Verne Berry Place	PSH	\$116,667
14	<i>Heartside Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Commerce Apartments	PSH	\$204,374
15	<i>County of Kent</i> SRA - Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids, Inc.	PSH	\$137,730
16	<i>Heartside Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Ferguson Apartments	PSH	\$63,000
17	<i>Community Rebuilders</i> Keys First	RRH	\$820,794
18	<i>The Salvation Army Booth Family Services</i> Kindred Transitional Housing	RRH	\$146,746
19	<i>Grand Rapids Housing Commission</i> Hope Community	RRH	\$159,663
20	<i>YWCA West Central Michigan</i> Project Heal	TH	\$399,368
21	<i>Heart of West Michigan United Way</i> Planning	Planning	\$63,319
22	<i>The Salvation Army Booth Family Services</i> Homeless Assistance Program (HAP)	SSO	\$228,488
23	<i>The Salvation Army Booth Family Services</i> HMIS Dedicated Project	HMIS	\$100,000
24	<i>Inner City Christian Federation</i> Rapid Re-housing Program	RRH	\$80,064
25	<i>Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids, Inc.</i> Liz's House	PSH	\$85,855
TOTAL			\$5,121,687

V. Public Housing

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing.

The Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC) is the local public housing authority (PHA). The Housing Commission was established in 1966 as a special purpose body authorized to purchase, acquire, construct, maintain, operate, improve, repair or extend housing facilities and eliminate adverse housing conditions. Funded primarily by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the GRHC is independently administered and governed by a five-member board appointed by the City Commission. The GRHC serves lower-income residents through a diverse portfolio of housing programs.

Public Housing Improvements Supported through the Capital Fund. Through the use of Capital Funds, the GRHC completed the following work items at Adams Park Apartments, Campau Commons Apartments, Creston Plaza Apartments and Scattered Sites: landscaping improvements; replacement of windows, appliances, water heaters, and exterior doors; and complete concrete and roof repairs. In December 2012, the GRHC received approval to participate in HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program. This enabled the GRHC to convert the 100-unit Creston Plaza Apartments from the Public Housing Program to the Section 8 Program. The conversion helped the GRHC secure funding needed to undertake the \$23.4 million redevelopment of Creston Plaza. The redeveloped units will be targeted to households earning less than 60% of the area median income. Re-construction is scheduled to be completed by December 2015.

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

Resident Participation. Resident Advisory Board members continued to meet and advise the GRHC on matters pertaining to administration of various housing programs, capital needs, and necessary resident services.

Resident Initiatives. The GRHC provided numerous services and activities to support and encourage Public Housing residents in assuming economic and social self-sufficiency. These activities, which include, but are not limited to, computer training, substance abuse counseling, academic, skill assessment/training and employment programs, and homeownership counseling, take place at various Public Housing sites.

Homeownership Activities. Through collaboration with the Inner City Christian Federation and Habitat for Humanity of Kent County, Inc., the GRHC offers classes and budgeting sessions to improve the ability of low-income families to purchase a home. Section 8 Voucher holders may use their voucher to purchase a home. Public Housing residents may purchase a single-family Scattered Site home through the 5(h) Home Ownership Program.

Actions taken to assist troubled PHAs. The GRHC is not designated as troubled.

VI. Consolidated Program Information – General Activities

Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing

Comprehensive Master Plan/Zoning Ordinance. The City’s 2002 Master Plan provides a set of long-range objectives, policies and maps to guide the growth and development of the community. The Master Plan is based on the principles of Smart Growth, with concepts of walkable neighborhoods, transit-oriented centers, mixed-use, housing choices, community character and partnerships. The Master Plan includes a section on “Great Neighborhoods (GN),” which recommends the promotion of a broad range of high quality housing choices through the following actions:

- Maintain and increase the number and variety of housing units (e.g., owner-occupied and rental serving young adults, seniors, low- and moderate-income households, special needs populations, middle- and upper-income households) to meet the diverse needs of existing residents and to attract new residents to the city.
- Allow for new housing products. For example, small-lot single-family housing, site condominiums, live/work units, upper story residences in commercial districts and accessory apartments in single-family neighborhoods where adequate parking can be provided.
- Allow for a range of housing types within all neighborhoods to provide residents the opportunity to progress through various life stages while maintaining their attachment to a particular area of the city.

While the Master Plan serves as a guide for managing change, the City’s Zoning Ordinance is used to implement the Master Plan. In late 2007, the 1969 Grand Rapids Zoning Ordinance was rescinded and a new Zoning Ordinance adopted by the City Commission. It was an outgrowth of the 2002 Master Plan process and a year and a half of citizen input. The new ordinance supports affordable housing in a number of ways.

Residential Neighborhoods. The new Zoning Ordinance supports in-fill housing by permitting new construction on existing lots where the lot width and lot area is similar to the surrounding properties, even where the Zone District may otherwise have higher standards. This minimizes the number of non-buildable lots that can result from demolition. Also, the demolition of a single-family house and the construction of a replacement home on the same site can now be reviewed and approved by staff instead of the Planning Commission. This shortens the approval process by four (4) weeks. Design standards for new construction in residential neighborhoods require that all housing, regardless of whom it serves, is built to the same standards. This ensures that residents of affordable housing are not labeled as “poor people” by their neighbors. These design standards also promote the long-term health and stability of older neighborhoods by preventing disjointed in-fill development. The old ordinance did not require garages and contained requirements for minimum lot sizes. These items were retained in the new ordinance.

Accessory dwelling units can be added to existing single-family properties as a building addition or in a separate building. This encourages the development of small units for single people and seniors at affordable price points. The new Zoning Ordinance also permits, with

Planning Commission approval, residential rehab facilities, foster care homes, Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) units, and shelters in all Mixed-Density Residential Districts across the City, contrary to the old code which only permitted these uses in a few high-density districts concentrated in the central city.

Mixed-Use Commercial Districts. All commercial zone districts now permit and encourage mixed-used development. A wide range of housing opportunities can be developed in these zones, ranging from apartments over storefront businesses, to live-work units, to high density housing near transit nodes. This mix of uses is intended to provide employment and shopping opportunities within a walkable neighborhood, and reduce reliance on automobile usage. Furthermore, mixed-income housing is rewarded with bonus heights and reduced lot area requirements in a number of zone districts. Reduced parking requirements, and opportunities for partial or full waivers of parking, also supports the construction of affordable housing.

Other. Process improvements have been adopted in the new Zoning Ordinance as well. For example, minor variances from the code can often be handled as administrative departures by the Planning staff. This saves lower-income homeowners from the time and expense of a Variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Non-profit Housing Tax Exemption. In late 2006, the State legislature passed legislation that allows the City to provide an exemption from property taxes for properties being developed by non-profit organizations for homeownership. In March 2008, the City Commission approved a Policy providing a tax exemption for properties owned by certain types of non-profit organizations that are intended for sale to low-income people. The exemption remains in effect for two (2) years or until ownership is transferred to a low-income homebuyer. The short term tax relief provided through the Policy is intended to provide an incentive to non-profit developers to undertake affordable housing development activities by reducing carrying costs. During the reporting period, two (2) non-profit developers, HFH Nonprofit Housing Corporation and New Development Corporation, requested and received exemptions for a total of seven (7) properties.

Underserved Needs

In 2011, the Community Development Department assembled and submitted to HUD its Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (HCD Plan), which is a five-year strategy that provides the basis for assessing performance and tracking results in meeting HUD's three fundamental goals of decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities. In the course of developing this Plan, the Community Development Department conducted extensive research to identify priorities for allocating funds and obstacles to addressing underserved needs. Housing priority needs and obstacles to meeting those needs are covered in the Housing Priorities, Strategies and Goals section of the HCD Plan. Non-housing community development priorities, strategies, goals, and obstacles can be reviewed in the Community Development section of the HCD plan.

Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control

City of Grand Rapids Lead Hazard Control Program. In June 2012, the City of Grand Rapids commenced work on a new Lead Hazard Control grant. This grant provides \$2,480,000 to make 180 homes lead-safe. Operations will continue through August 31, 2015. Since 2003, the City has received six (6) grants totaling \$16 million to combat childhood lead poisoning. The Lead Hazard Control Program operates in partnership with the following organizations: Kent County Health Department, LINC Community Revitalization, Inc., the Rental Property Owners Association of Kent County, and the Healthy Homes Coalition. All of these organizations are members of the Get the Lead Out! Coalition.

The goals of the program are to:

- Train homeowners and tenants how to clean lead dust from their homes.
- Train contractors and landlords in lead-safe work practices.
- Assist Section 3 eligible individuals to obtain certification as lead professionals.
- Make housing units lead-safe.
- Address additional housing-related health issues in units made lead safe.

As of June 30, 2015, the program has accomplished the following:

- 1,386 individuals have been trained in lead-safe cleaning methods.
- 1,271 landlords, contractors, and handymen have been trained in lead-safe work practices or as Certified Renovators.
- 92 women, minority, and Section 3 eligible individuals received assistance with obtaining lead professional certification.
- 1,309 homes have been made lead-safe. The program has invested \$13,123,842 in lead remediation repairs to rental and owner-occupied properties, \$9,534,208 of which were Office of Healthy Homes Lead Hazard Control grant funds.
- 60 homes were assessed for additional housing-related health hazards utilizing the Healthy Homes Rating Tool. The Program invested \$41,380 to correct identified non-lead hazards.

It is important to note how much the City's program and Lead Hazard Control programs across the country depend on Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to support lead remediation activities. For example, grants from the HUD Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control require the recipient to match 10% to 25% of the award amount with local funds. Per statute, CDBG funds are considered local funds and are used to meet match requirements.

Get the Lead Out! Coalition. Get The Lead Out! (GTLO!) was conceived in the fall of 2000 by the Community Leadership Institute at Aquinas College as a way to "bring the community together in strategic action that ends childhood lead poisoning in Kent County." This collaborative effort engaged more than twenty (20) organizations, with representation from local government, human services, environmental advocacy, health care, education, child advocacy, housing providers, neighborhood-based organizations, and others. As a result of the success of the program, GTLO! partners formed a non-profit corporation for the purposes of preserving and expanding the work of the collaborative. The Healthy Homes Coalition of West Michigan was formed in 2006 to sustain the

work of GTLO! and to link the work on childhood lead poisoning to wider children’s environmental health issues related to housing. Work to curb childhood lead poisoning continues under GTLO!.

Advocacy

- GTLO! continues to track and impact federal, state and local legislation. To date, nine (9) state bills have been signed into law. In addition, the Coalition has engaged local partners in a statewide effort that advocated for a state investment of general fund dollars in lead hazard control. In 2013, a \$1.25 million appropriation was approved. In 2014, that amount was increased to \$1.75 million and that same amount has been included in the State’s 2015 budget. Legislation passed previously addresses the following issues:
 - Withholding of incentive bonuses for Medicaid payment plans not screening at 80%. Plans are not receiving the same level of compensation from the State of Michigan if they are under-performing.
 - Requiring electronic reporting of lab results.
 - Creation of a Childhood Lead Poisoning Commission.
 - Creation of a Lead-Safe Housing Registry.
 - Penalties for landlords who knowingly rent units with lead hazards.
 - Revising the State childhood immunization database to include lead testing data.
 - Requiring lead testing in WIC clinics.

- GTLO! has sought changes to local policy, including amendments to the City’s Housing Code that address paint failure, cleanup of paint chips and dust, a prohibition on bare soil surrounding older housing, and requiring lead-safe work practices. The Healthy Homes Coalition was an active member of a local coalition that worked with the City of Grand Rapids to expand the reach of its proactive rental certification inspection program to include single-family rental housing, greatly increasing the reach of this program to promote improved housing conditions in homes where at-risk children reside.

Education and Prevention

- The Healthy Homes Coalition conducts numerous training and professional development opportunities each year. The Healthy Homes Coalition is a partner in the national Healthy Homes Training Center (Healthy Housing Solutions) and offers trainings to general practitioners, community health workers, and code enforcement officials in topics including: integrated pest management, lead poisoning prevention, and the *Essentials of Healthy Housing* course. To date, more than 750 professionals have been trained.
- The Healthy Homes Coalition conducts routine community education and outreach activities, such as health fairs, community meetings, and media appearances on childhood lead poisoning, asthma triggers, and other topics related to healthy housing.
- The Healthy Homes Coalition maintains a direct-service program to assist families with assessing their homes and taking corrective action for lead and other children’s health hazards. Since 2008, more than 3,300 households have been served through this program.
- The Healthy Homes Coalition is a regional consultant for other communities seeking to

deploy healthy housing programs using a community-based, coalition approach. The Healthy Homes Coalition’s Executive Director, Paul Haan, co-chaired the Michigan Department of Community Health’s Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Advisory Committee, which recently completed a healthy homes strategic plan for the State of Michigan.

Other Accomplishments

- GTLO! was a 2006 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Children’s Environmental Health Excellence Award winner.
- Between 2000 and 2014, Kent County experienced a sustained decrease in the number of children with elevated blood lead levels. Since 2000, blood lead levels in Kent County have fallen nearly 92%, from a high of 6.2% of all children tested. In 2014, forty-eight (48) or 0.5% of all children tested had elevated blood lead levels (≥ 10.0 ug/dL). Meanwhile, testing has increased more than 40% among one- and two-year-olds and service providers report record requests for service.

The Healthy Homes Coalition, by leveraging United Way and local philanthropic funding, has expanded community program offerings to address wider home concerns: asthma triggers, integrated pest management, fire safety, carbon monoxide, radon, and more. The Healthy Homes Coalition offers comprehensive support services to more than 100 families with young children each year, including healthy homes assessments and connecting families with resources for environmental controls. The Healthy Homes Coalition is currently participating in an asthma home intervention project funded by local hospital community benefits and is part of a consortium exploring Pay For Success as a long-term funding mechanism for funding healthy housing interventions for low-income households.

For more information on the GTLO! Coalition and the Healthy Homes Coalition, go to www.healthyhomescoalition.org.

Reduce Families in Poverty

The strategy to reduce families in poverty is primarily the work of the Kent County Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). It is the lead agency in the State’s welfare to work initiative called Project Zero. This project is intended to bring welfare recipients into employment and, subsequently, independence from government assistance.

However, various community organizations share the responsibility of reducing poverty. The City’s Community Development Department worked with DHHS through the Kent County Essential Needs Task Force with staff representatives serving on the housing committee and economic and workforce development committee. The Housing Continuum of Care also provides strategies for reducing poverty.

The City is limited in the amount of support it can provide for antipoverty efforts. This is primarily due to the restrictive use of funds for social service activities. However, the seven (7) outcomes of the Neighborhood Investment Plan support projects that benefit low- and moderate-income individuals. In particular, the outcomes *Increase opportunities for housing stability* and *Increase*

economic opportunities support the anti-poverty strategy. The City also supports anti-poverty efforts through administration of its Section 3 Program, which provides employment and training preference to low-income persons and businesses that substantially employ low-income persons.

Institutional Structure

The City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department administers the funds used to carry out activities which support the HCD and Annual Plan objectives. Activities are implemented by City departments or through agreements with primarily non-profit organizations. A request for funding process occurs around January of each year. Emergency Solutions Grants funding awards are determined in coordination with the Housing Continuum of Care. A proposal review team led by the Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness develops funding recommendations consistent with *The Vision to End Homelessness* plan to be approved by the Grand Rapids City Commission.

The local governmental structure encourages citizen involvement and supports cooperative ventures. The HCD Plan is carried out through collaborations and partnerships with neighborhoods, businesses, investors, non-profit organizations, and private and public institutions. A detailed list is available in the HCD Plan at www.grcd.info.

Actions to Enhance Coordination Between Public and Private Housing and Social Service Agencies.

Once a year, the City Commission holds a public hearing on general housing and community development needs within Grand Rapids. This hearing is held prior to the start of the annual funding process and allows for public input to the Annual Plan and the Five-Year HCD Plan (as applicable). In addition, the City may periodically seek input on housing and community development needs via other methods, including but not limited to surveys, outreach meetings, special study groups, and community reports and plans.

The City continued to initiate, facilitate and participate in coordination efforts between housing providers, social service agencies, and other local funders. Endeavors include those described in the Citizen Participation Plan as well as other collaboration and coordination opportunities, as necessary.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing. The Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing is a requirement for CDBG program compliance (Section 570.904[c]). The purpose of the analysis is to determine the possible existence of impediments to fair housing choice based on race, religion, sex, color, national origin, disability, or familial status. According to the analysis, the following impediments exist:

- Inability to successfully prosecute violations of the local fair housing ordinance.
- Lack of education and awareness of fair housing laws.
- Language barriers for non-English speaking populations.
- Limited minority access to credit from prime lenders.
- Limited supply of accessible housing.
- Funding for fair housing activities.

During the period of this report, the following actions were taken to address the identified impediments to fair housing choice:

- The City provided the Fair Housing Center of West Michigan (FHCWM) \$71,450 in CDBG funds to perform housing tests, investigate complaints of housing discrimination and provide educational and outreach activities.
- The FHCWM performed 58 tests to determine compliance with fair housing laws in the areas of sales, rental, insurance and financing. In 20 of these housing tests, evidence of discrimination was found and resolved in accordance with established criteria. The remaining 38 tests revealed no evidence of discrimination.
- The FHCWM trained 90 people in the real estate industry, all of whom reported they would modify their business practices as a result of the training.
- A system was established to provide Disability Advocates of Kent County (DAKC) with information about building permit applications, so DAKC staff may review development plans and provide comment about suggested accessibility features.
- In May 2015, City staff attended an event that addressed topics related to fair housing. A total of six (6) staff attended workshops with three (3) staff attending a workshop entitled “Neighborhood Stabilization,” two (2) staff attending an “Aging in Place” session, and one (1) staff attending a session entitled “Fair Housing Best Practices.” Eight (8) staff attended a Fair Housing Luncheon. Both the workshop and the luncheon were facilitated by the FHCWM.

VII. Program Oversight and Monitoring

The following procedures are used by the City of Grand Rapids in on-site monitoring of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Emergency Shelter/Solutions Grants (ESG) program subrecipients. Monitoring procedures for entities receiving funding through the HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) are modeled after these procedures, but may differ based on the nature of the assisted project and the use of HOME funding. Some projects or uses of funds do not require on-site reviews (i.e. a property acquisition where the City has previously required full documentation prior to the disbursement of funds).

Monitoring of Federal Programs

The Community Development Department (CDD) monitors the City's performance in meeting goals and objectives set forth in the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan. In particular, performance measurement indicators supporting outcomes identified under the Neighborhood Investment Plan are tracked. Results are reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) due each September, ninety (90) days from the start of the fiscal year (July 1).

Internal fiscal controls are in place and generate accounting system reports that are regularly reviewed by CDD staff. These reports identify the dollar amount allocated for each federal grant-funded activity, the amount obligated, and the amount expended. Timeliness of expenditures is monitored regularly to ensure compliance with HUD requirements.

CDD staff review all expenditures of federal grant funds for eligibility and adequate source documentation. All expenditures of federal funds, once approved by the CDD, are sent to the City's Comptroller's Office for processing and further oversight. A single audit of the City's federal grants is performed annually by an independent auditor. Additionally, a physical inventory of all fixed assets acquired with federal funds is conducted every two (2) years.

Grantee (City) Project Monitoring Standards. The CDD monitors all activities using federal grant funds, including those implemented by the CDD and other City departments. Internal "contracts" called Intra- and Inter-Departmental Agreements are used to establish responsibilities and performance expectations. As with Subrecipient contracts, these agreements are monitored by CDD staff and performance data is tracked and reported in the CAPER.

Subrecipient Project Monitoring Standards. The CDD monitors all Subrecipient projects receiving Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program, Emergency Shelter/Solutions Grants (ESG), and Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funds. Subrecipients are certified annually including review of articles of incorporation, tax and insurance certifications, and bylaws. When an organization has expended more than \$500,000 in federal funds during a fiscal year, an agency single audit is required. Written agreements between the City and Subrecipients identify activities to be performed and measures of success, as well as specific federal and local program requirements.

Subrecipient Monitoring Procedures. Program/Project monitoring is comprised of three (3) components: financial reporting, performance reporting and on-site monitoring review.

- **Financial Reporting.** Financial reports are submitted on a monthly or quarterly basis. The financial reports provide information regarding actual program expenditures. These expenditures are reviewed by CDD staff to determine if the expenditures are within the approved budget, if they support contractual activities, and if costs are eligible.
- **Performance Reporting.** Performance reports are submitted to the CDD on an annual, semi-annual, or quarterly basis and are used to provide the CDD with a tool to measure a program's progress in providing contracted services.
- **On-Site Monitoring.** Staff conduct ongoing desk audits of subrecipient contract files. Annually, a determination is made whether an expanded monitoring review is necessary. This determination is based on prior findings that remain open, closed findings that need to be verified, outstanding independent audit, performance reporting issues, fiscal issues, and/or other appropriate areas that warrant additional monitoring. If it is determined that an expanded monitoring review is necessary, staff will conduct an on-site review. An on-site monitoring review may include examination of subrecipient programmatic records to validate information reported on performance and financial reports. A review of financial records may include an in-depth examination of invoices, time sheets and other documentation to support expenses charged to the contractual budget. Documentation for program activities is reviewed to corroborate performance reports and to verify that program activity costs allocated to the contractual budget are eligible.

After completing the on-site monitoring review, results are provided in writing to the Subrecipient within thirty (30) days. If concerns and/or findings are identified during the review, the monitoring letter will outline the identified issues and include recommendations and/or corrective actions for resolving issues. If there were no findings or concerns identified during the monitoring visit, the Subrecipient is provided with a letter stating such.

If concerns and/or findings are identified, the Subrecipient is instructed to submit a written response within thirty (30) days of the date of the City's monitoring letter. The response is reviewed by staff to determine if information submitted and/or actions taken are adequate to clear monitoring concerns and/or findings. Staff continues to work with the Subrecipient until all issues are resolved. At such time, the Subrecipient receives written notification that concerns or findings identified during the monitoring have been satisfied and the case is closed.

HOME Rental Project Monitoring. The HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program requires long-term monitoring of rental projects to ensure compliance with HOME regulations throughout the HOME affordability period. The period of affordability is between five (5) and twenty (20) years for most HOME rental projects. The primary factors used to determine the affordability period are the project type and the amount of HOME dollars invested in each unit.

Owners of HOME funded rental projects are required to submit an annual Tenant Income Rental Report (TIRR) to the Community Development Department. The TIRR is used to verify continued compliance with income limits and rent rates. HOME rental projects are also subject to on-site monitoring for the duration of the affordability period. Tenant files are reviewed during the monitoring session to confirm information reported in the TIRR and to ensure compliance with other HUD requirements. Tenants may also be interviewed during the monitoring session.

HOME rental projects also require on-going City inspections to ensure properties are in compliance with the City Housing Code. The frequency of inspections is determined by the number of HOME units in a project and the City's Housing Code mandated inspections.

Programmatic Agreement (Section 106) Monitoring. HUD has delegated responsibility to the City of Grand Rapids via programmatic agreements to act on their behalf as the responsible federal agency in the Section 106 process, which takes into consideration the effects of their undertaking on historic properties. The City has two (2) agreements with the Michigan State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The General Programmatic Agreement was renewed June 29, 2012 and applies to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Shelter/Solutions Grants (ESG) programs, Neighborhood Stabilization Programs (NSP), and Special Purpose Grants for the following activities: residential and commercial rehabilitation, public improvements and infrastructure, handicapped accessibility, demolition, and new construction and additions. The Lead Programmatic Agreement applies to the Lead Hazard Control, Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) programs for lead hazard reduction activities (CDBG/HOME – emergency activities only).

The City prepares an annual report summarizing activities carried out pursuant to the terms of the Agreements. Copies of this report are provided to the SHPO, the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and other parties that may so request.

Outreach to Racially and Ethnically Diverse (Minority) and Women Owned Businesses

To encourage use of minority and women’s business enterprises invitation to submit Requests for Proposals for eligible HOME projects were published in local minority publications, in addition to the newspaper of general circulation.

All development agreements include a provision pertaining to the inclusion of small businesses. It is anticipated Assisted Entities will seek bids from and use where possible small businesses, including but not limited to, micro local business enterprises (Micro-LBE), veteran owned small businesses (VOSB), minority business enterprises (MBE), and women-owned business enterprises (WBE). A list of businesses certified as Micro-LBE and/or VOSB is available from the City’s Office of Diversity and Inclusion. For construction projects, Assisted Entities provide information on the actual use of small businesses, as indicated above, on the Contractor and Subcontractor Activity Report submitted after completion of construction or rehabilitation of the property.

The City of Grand Rapids Office of Diversity and Inclusion provided outreach and took steps to engage in activities inclusive of all groups, including Racially and Ethnically Diverse Businesses (REDB, replaces MBE), Women-Owned Business Enterprises (WBE), Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSB), and other area disadvantaged small businesses. Following is a summary of actions taken between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015 to encourage participation of racially and ethnically diverse businesses and women-owned businesses in contracting opportunities.

- Continued oversight of Equal Business Opportunities (EBO) policies and guidelines established by the City Commission in 2004. These guidelines use an array of bid discounts that help create equity for small businesses bidding to the City.
- Continued the Micro-Local Business Enterprise program established in 2009. Micro-Local Business Enterprises now comprise 44% racially and ethnically diverse businesses and woman-owned businesses. Program elements that provide for discounted bids have been adopted and expanded by Grand Rapids Community College and Grand Rapids Public Schools.
- Continued to provide strategic guidance, networking opportunities, and construction bid information to the West Michigan Minority Contractors Association, the West Michigan Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and the Grand Rapids Black Chamber of Commerce in the same manner as provided to all contractors.
- Made forecast information from City Departments to vendors, including REDBs, WBEs and VOSBs, and all others who requested it.
- Reviewed 40 construction bids of which 21 had 76 subcontracts. Seven (7) projects used 7 subcontracts with REDBs and/or VOSBs.

- Continued consultations with City buyers and City Departments on sole source and single source requests to ensure opportunities for all small businesses, including REDBs and WBEs, were not overlooked.
- Participated in the City/State’s reviews of new financial system development to ensure that opportunities to track special classes of businesses such as REDBs, WBEs, VOSBs, and Micro-LBEs are included and elements of the EBO programs can continue.
- Participated in all scheduled “Monday Group” meetings to help the West Michigan Minority Contractors Association and majority contractors develop value proposition to project owners and general contractors to increase minority participation on public and private sector construction projects. Emphasis was placed on cash flow and bonding initiatives.
- Provided on-going consultative assistance to two (2) Mentor-Protégé program participants and a several potential relationships.
- Provided general technical assistance to eight (8) businesses, five (5) REDBs, one (1) WBE, and twelve (12) business-support or non-business entities.
- Made 18 referrals to small business resource organizations.

Citizen Participation

Citizen Participation Plan. The Citizen Participation Plan describes the policies and procedures for involving citizens in critical planning issues related to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), and Emergency Shelter/Solutions Grants (ESG) programs. The Citizen Participation Plan can be found in the Five-Year HCD Plan, the Annual Action Plan, and at www.grcd.info.

FFY 2011-2015 Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan. The FFY 2011-2015 HCD Plan was developed by aligning community needs identified by citizens directly involved in various City visioning and strategic planning processes, most notably with the City of Grand Rapids Master Plan. The Neighborhood Investment Plan focuses on seven (7) outcomes derived from the community’s vision for Grand Rapids neighborhoods.

FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan. The Housing and Community Development Annual Action Plan was made available for public comment from March 21, 2014 through April 21, 2014. The plan was available for review at the City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department offices and on the Community Development website. A summary of the Plan was also published in three (3) community newspapers: the Grand Rapids Press, the Grand Rapids Times, and El Vocero Hispano. Additionally, notices were mailed to organizations that applied for funding.

A public hearing was held on April 15, 2014. A summary of citizen comments can be found in the FFY 2014 Annual Action Plan. The Plan was adopted by the City Commission on May 5, 2014.

FFY 2014 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report. A public comment period for the purpose of receiving comment on the performance of housing and community development activities funded through the City of Grand Rapids for FFY 2014 was held from August 28, 2015 through September 11, 2015. Opportunity for public review and comment regarding the draft Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) was promoted through publication in three (3) community newspapers: The Grand Rapids Press, El Vocero Hispano and the Grand Rapids Times. The draft report was available for review at the City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department office and on the Community Development Department web site.

A public hearing on the report was held before the City Commission on the evening of September 8, 2015. One comment was received from Home Repair Services of Kent County, Inc. expressing thanks for the City's support of its programs.

VIII. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Grants

Results of On-Site Inspections of Affordable Rental Housing

Rental Rehabilitation Program Compliance. During the reporting period, eight (8) Rental Rehabilitation Program units were inspected for compliance with applicable property standards by the Department's Code Compliance Division. An additional four (4) units were inspected by Housing Rehabilitation Division staff in compliance with the requirement to inspect within twelve months of project completion. All inspected units were certified as compliant.

Multi-family Rental Program Compliance. During the reporting period, nine (9) multi-family rental projects were inspected for compliance with applicable property standards by the Department's Code Compliance Division. All inspected units were certified as compliant. These include Allen Manor, Carmody Apartments, Goodrich Apartments, Heron Courtyard, Madison Avenue Apartments, Madison/Hall Townhomes, New Hope Homes, Scattered Site Rentals, and Serrano Lofts.

Tenant Income Rent Reports (TIRR) and Affirmative Marketing Summary Reports, when applicable, were collected and reviewed by Community Development Department staff for all multi-family projects.

Affirmative Marketing Actions for HOME Units

During the period of this report, the Community Development Department carried out the following activities with respect to Affirmative Marketing Actions:

On an annual basis, the Community Development Department requests property owners that participate in the City's HOME Program notify the following organizations when they have housing units available: ACSET, Association for the Blind & Visually Impaired, Baxter Community Center, Fair Housing Center of West Michigan, Grand Rapids Housing Commission, Grand Rapids Urban League, Heart of West Michigan United Way, Hispanic Center of West Michigan, ACSET Michigan Works (Godfrey, SW Office), ASCET Michigan Works! (Franklin Office), Inter-Tribal Council of Grand Rapids, Inter-Tribal Council of Michigan (Sault Ste. Marie), ACSET Michigan Works! (Leonard, NE Office), ASCET Community Action Center (Southeast Complex), ACSET Community Action Center (West Side Complex), ASCET Community Action Center (Northeast Complex), Kent County Department of Human Services, The Salvation Army (Housing Hub) and Disability Advocates of Kent County.

During the current review period, the Community Development Department was responsible for monitoring Allen Manor Senior Housing Apartments, Alten House, The Avenue Apartments, Bridge Street Place, Carmody Apartments, Carrier Crest Apartments, Division Park Avenue Apartments, Ferguson Apartments, Goodrich Apartments, Grandville Avenue Homes, Herkimer Commerce Apartments, Heron Court Apartments, Heron Manor Apartments, Kelsey Apartments, Madison Hall Townhomes, Martineau Apartments, New Hope Homes, Oroiquis Apartments, Pleasant Prospect Homes II, Roosevelt Park Lofts, Scattered Site Rentals, Serrano Lofts, Southtown Square II, Verne Barry Place, and 1102 & 1131 Madison. All of the above projects were found to be in compliance with the City's affirmative marketing requirements.

Amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner/tenant characteristics.

The City did not use program income to fund HOME-assisted projects during the reporting period.

Other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing.

The City is committed to maintaining the existing affordable housing stock for low- and moderate-income persons and to expanding the supply of affordable housing. These efforts include the implementation of activities to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed, abandoned and blighted properties using federal funds. Monitoring activities to ensure program compliance of City-assisted affordable housing projects will continue. A number of activities undertaken during the reporting period maintain and increase the supply of affordable housing.

Allocation of HOME Funds and HOME Accomplishments

During FFY 2014, HOME funds were used to support the Neighborhood Investment Plan outcome to increase affordable and high quality housing.

FFY 2014 HOME Allocations, Objectives Addressed and Population Groups Assisted			
Outcome 2: Increase Affordable and High Quality Housing			
<i>Organization: Program/Project</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Funding</i>
<i>ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation</i> Southtown Acquisition, Development, and Resale (ADR)	Substantial redevelopment of single-family structures to create affordable housing units for sale to two (2) low-income households.	Low-Income Households	\$180,000
<i>New Development Corporation</i> North End Affordable Housing/ADR	Substantial redevelopment of single-family structures to create affordable housing units for sale to two (2) low-income households.	Low-Income Households	\$180,000
<i>ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation</i> Pleasant Prospect Homes 3 (PPH3)	Create 90 affordable rental units through new construction (30 units) and substantial rehabilitation (60 units).	Low-Income Households	\$180,000
<i>The Salvation Army Social Services</i> Short-Term Rental Assistance	Households serviced with Short-Term Rental Assistance for up to six (6) months.	Low-Income Households	\$402,988

In addition to the project funding shown above, \$55,337 in Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) operating support was provided to LINC Community Revitalization, Inc. (\$27,669) and New Development Corporation (\$27,668) to support the implementation of HOME-assisted activities.

FFY 2014 HOME Accomplishments as of June 30, 2015	
Project	Assessment
<i>ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation</i> Southtown Acquisition, Development, and Resale (ADR)	One (1) property was acquired during the reporting period. Construction and sale is anticipated to occur during the FFY 2015 reporting period.
<i>New Development Corporation</i> North End Affordable Housing/ADR	One (1) property was acquired during the reporting period. As of June 30, 2015, overall construction work was approximately 20% complete. Construction completion and sale is anticipated to occur during the FFY 2015 reporting period.
<i>ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation</i> Pleasant Prospect Homes 3 (PPH3)	Construction was completed during the reporting period. As of June 30, 2015, 76 of 90 units were occupied. Full occupancy and final project closeout is anticipated to occur in the fall of 2015.
<i>The Salvation Army Social Services</i> Short-Term Rental Assistance	A total of 136 households, representing 420 people, received short-term rental assistance during the reporting period. Additional households will be served during the FFY 2015 reporting period.

During the reporting period, progress was made on special projects funded with HOME funding from previous fiscal years.

- **ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation.** – The City has provided up to \$90,000 in FFY 2013 HOME funds to ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation to acquire, rehabilitate and sell one (1) existing single-family home located in the Community Development General Target Area. The property located at 417 Elliott Street, SE was completed and sold to an income-eligible household.
- **LINC Community Revitalization, Inc.** – The City has provided up to \$180,000 in FFY 2013 HOME funds for LINC Community Revitalization, Inc. to acquire, rehabilitate and sell two (2) existing single-family homes located in the Southtown target area. One (1) property located at 511 Umatilla Street, SE was completed and sold to an income-eligible household. The other property, completed at 814 Hancock Street, SE, will be sold to an income-eligible household during the next report period.
- **New Development Corporation** – The City has provided up to \$270,000 in FFY 2012 HOME funds to New Development Corporation to acquire, rehabilitate and sell three (3) existing single-family homes located within the Belknap, Creston, and Stocking target areas. One (1) property located at 440 Fernando Street, NE was completed and sold to

an income-eligible household (previously reported). The property, located at 1540 Forrest was sold to an income eligible household during the report period. Construction on the third property, located at 228 Spencer Street, NE is nearly complete. It is anticipated this unit will be sold to an income-eligible household during the next report period.

The City also provided up to \$180,000 in FFY 2013 funds to New Development Corporation to acquire, rehabilitate and sell two (2) existing single-family homes located within the Belknap, Creston, and Stocking target areas. One unit located at 239 Palmer Street, NE sold to an income-eligible household during the report period. It is anticipated the second property will be acquired during the fall of 2015.

- **City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department** – No new units were completed under the Rental Rehabilitation Program this year, although repairs were nearly complete on three (3) units by the end of the year.