



Fourth Program Year CAPER

The CPMP Fourth Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report includes Narrative Responses to CAPER questions that CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG grantees must respond to each year in order to be compliant with the Consolidated Planning Regulations. The Executive Summary narratives are optional.

The grantee must submit an updated Financial Summary Report (PR26).

GENERAL

Executive Summary

This module is optional but encouraged. If you choose to complete it, provide a brief overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the first year.

Program Year 4 CAPER Executive Summary response:

The City of Ames Planning & Housing Department has prepared a Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan for the next five-year plan period of 2009-14 that provides a continued strategic vision for the community. The Plan has been approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Information regarding program rules, regulations, and other related information can be found on the HUD web site at www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/index.cfm. The Executive Summary and other materials regarding the program in the City of Ames can be found on the City of Ames web site at www.cityofames.org/housing. Please contact the City of Ames Planning & Housing Department at (515) 239-5400 for additional information.

As part of this Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan period, the City of Ames' strategies toward serving the needs of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families are to continue to seek public input, to continue to invest resources both physical and financial, and to continue to implement programs that will address the community's priority needs. The main areas of focus anticipated over the five (5) years will be **to continue** to utilize CDBG and other local and/or state funds to address the following priority need categories listed below:

1. CDBG funds should be used to strengthen neighborhoods by implementing affordable housing programs and services through acquiring, demolishing, and rehabilitating housing units that support homeowners, homebuyers, and renters to obtain and remain in affordable housing;
2. CDBG funds should be used to promote "one community" by implementing programs that support a continuum of new or expanded housing and services targeted for the homeless, transitional housing clients, and persons with special needs; and

-
3. CDBG funds should be used to strengthen neighborhoods by implementing programs that will increase or improve public facilities, infrastructure, and services.

Based on community input, and after examining the five priority needs that were created in the 2004-2009 strategic planning period, it was clear that the above priority needs provided the most positive impacts on addressing the needs of very low-, low- and moderate-income households in the community. The City, as a new entitlement community during the above period, was very successful in implementing the program activities that led to having exceeded the 70% low- and moderate-income benefit expenditure requirement by approximately 25%. Therefore, over the next five-year period (2009-14) the City will continue to administer and focus its programming in the above three priority need areas.

One of the City Council's goals that drive the three priority needs is to **continue** to address the need to Strengthen Neighborhoods. Therefore, in 2012-13 the Annual Action Plan projects set out to focus on various activities that would continue to **strengthen neighborhoods** by implementing housing-related activities (e.g., homeownership assistance, rehabilitation, deposit and/or first month's rent assistance, etc.) and by implementing public infrastructure activities (e.g., sidewalks, street and curb repair, water, sewer improvements, etc.). Additionally, the City Council's priority is to continue to participate and fund the ASSET process. The ASSET process is a successful a vehicle for providing financial assistance for the needs of and service delivery to persons with incomes at 50% or less of the Story County median income limit, and to the homeless.

The City of Ames' Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) will cover the progress in carrying out the City's Consolidated Plan, the three priority goals and the Annual Action Plan project goals for the fiscal year 2012-13. The Annual Action Plan was the fourth plan based on the five-year Consolidated Plan for the fiscal years 2009-2014.

The following is a summary of the Annual Action Plan projects and expenditures that **were able to be accomplished** in conjunction with the priority goals for the July 1, 2012, to June 30, 2013, program year.

1. HOUSING ACTIVITIES OBJECTIVES: CDBG funds should be used to strengthen neighborhoods by implementing affordable housing programs and services through acquiring, demolishing, and rehabilitating housing units that support homeowners, homebuyers, and renters to obtain and remain in affordable housing.

The Neighborhood Sustainability Program is the umbrella program that contains the following core program components: Homebuyer Assistance, Operation/Repair of Foreclosure Properties (Acquisition/Reuse), Dangerous Building Program (Slum and Blight program), Single Family Conversion Project, and the Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program. For the 2012-13 program year \$599,086, (not including administration) was allocated to cover the implementation of **all or some** of the above five project activities.

-
- a) The Homebuyer Assistance Program was designed to assist low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers (80% or less of AMI) with the purchase of a single-family home. The overall goal of the Homebuyer Assistance Program is to allow low- and moderate-income households to gain access to housing and/or improve their housing status. For the 2012-13 program year \$115,500 was allocated for this activity. Applications for the program were solicited during the year. Nine (9) applied for the program and seven (7) applicants participated in the Homebuyer Educational Seminar to learn more about the home buying process and if they qualify for the down payment and closing cost assistance. Determining eligibility and assisting in a home purchase will likely occur in the 2013-14 program year. Approximately \$307 was on spent during the program year for cost associated with the Homebuyer Educational Seminar.
- b) The Operation/ Repair of Foreclosure Properties was designed to improve foreclosed properties needing repair to make them available to low and moderate-income, first time home buyers through the Homebuyer Assistance Program, or to sell them to a non-profit organization, such as Habitat for Humanity for them to rehabilitate and sell the homes to eligible Habitat applicants. The overall goal of the program was to increase the availability of affordable housing to low income families and to maintain decent, safe, and sanitary housing stock in existing neighborhoods.

For the 2012-13 program year \$97,500, was allocated for this activity, including a re-allocation of approximately \$35,000 from the Housing Improvement, and Public Improvements budgets. There are five properties that were purchased under the Acquisition/Reuse Program over the last six years that fall under the Operation/Repair of Foreclosure Program, to be rehabilitated and sold to first-time homebuyers.

All five properties were tested for lead paint and radon as part of the work specifications. One of the five in particular was identified to be rehabilitated utilizing funding under this program of approximately \$40,000 along with funding from our 2009 Community Development Block Grant Recovery Program (CDBG-R) of approximately \$30,000. Under the CDBG-R Program, the funds were designated to utilize an existing single-family home by incorporating "go-green" features as part of the rehabilitation of the property to create an environmentally friendly, healthy, affordable home. The green affordable home would then to be sold to an eligible, low or moderate income, first-time homebuyer, in conjunction with the City's CDBG Homebuyer Assistance Program. The solicitation of bids was completed and the rehabilitation work began in 2012-13, but was not completed by the end of that program year. Approximately \$88,918 was spent in 2012-13, of which \$30,676 was spent on the "go-green rehabilitation property, and the remainder (\$58, 242) was spent on property maintenance on the remaining properties.

- b) The Neighborhood Home Improvement Program was designed to provide financial assistance to qualified low- and moderate-income single-family homeowners at or below 80% of the area median income limits to improve the physical condition of their single-family homes in residentially-zoned areas. The overall goal of the Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program is to allow single-family homeowners to reside in decent, safe, and sanitary housing that will enhance neighborhood sustainability. For 2012-13, the

initial budget was \$378,896. However, the program was delayed from being implemented due to the City not being able to complete a Programmatic Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in order to streamline and expedite requirements when processing program applicants. The City will continue to work with SHPO to complete an agreement.

- c) The Dangerous Buildings (Slum and Blight Program) was designed to demolish deteriorated properties that have been identified by city code regulations as being unsafe and in need of immediate repair or need to be demolished. The program budget for 2012-13 is approximately \$45,000 (including administrative cost). The objectives are to protect and maintain safe neighbors and floodplains by the removal of blighted or other environmentally unsafe areas throughout the City. This program was not implemented in 2012-13 due to staff turnover and staff shortages in the Inspections Division. Funding for the program was re-allocated to the Renter Affordability Program.
- d) The Single Family Conversion Pilot Program was designed to offer loan repair funds to a property owner of a single-family conversion rental unit to convert back into a single-family unit to sell to low- and moderate-income homebuyers. The program budget for 2012-13 was \$25,000. Due to lack of interest from property owners, the funding for this activity was re-allocated to the Renter Affordability Program.

2. PUBLIC SERVICES OBJECTIVE: CDBG funds should be used to promote “one community” by implementing programs that support a continuum of new or expanded housing and services targeted for the homeless, transitional housing clients, and persons with special needs.

- a) The Renter Affordability Program was re-opened late in the 2012-13 program year. Funding from the Dangerous Building, Single-Family Conversion, and savings from the Public Improvements Program activities were re-allocated for a program budget of approximately \$80,141. A Deposit and/or First Month’s Rent activity was implemented under this program. The Deposit and/or First Month’s Rent activity was designed to assist households with incomes at 50% or less of the area median income with funding to rent decent, safe affordable rental units. Although the program was only implemented in the last 4-5 months of the program year, \$8,885 was spent and twelve (12) households were assisted.

2. PUBLIC FACILITIES OBJECTIVE: CDBG funds should be used to strengthen neighborhoods by implementing programs that will increase or improve public facilities, infrastructure, and services.

The Public Facilities Program is the umbrella program that contains the following core program activities: the Public Facilities Improvement Program and the Neighborhood Public Infrastructure Program.

- a) The Facilities Improvement activity was designed to assist non-profit organizations with financial assistance to make repair to their facilities that house and/or provide services to homeless, very-low, and low-income residents. For the 2012-13 program year no funds were allocated for the Public Facilities Program.

b). The Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvement Program was designed to improve and enhance the viability and aesthetics of our core existing neighborhoods by replacing the deteriorated infrastructure such as streets, curbs and gutters, driveway approaches, and installing handicapped accessible sidewalks and dome pads. For the 2012-13 program year, in census tract 13.1, \$378,896 was initially allocated, of which approximately \$348,609 was spent installing approximately 1,537 linear feet (lf) of curb and gutter, 768.5 lf of new street paving, 327 square yards of driveway approaches, 590 square yards of sidewalk ramps, 589 lf of storm sewer pipe and 168 square feet of truncated domes. The population of LMI households in this census tract is 60.4%.

Amended 2012-13 Action Plan Expenditure Budget:

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Budget</u>
Dangerous Building Program (Slum & Blight)	0.00
Renter Affordability Program (Deposit & Rent)	81,141
Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program	386,086
Operation and Repair of Foreclosure Property	97,500
Single-Family Conversion Project	0.00
Homebuyer Assistance Program	115,500
Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvements Program	352,820
2012-13 Program Administration	<u>113,229</u>
Total	\$1,145,276

The 2012-13 Activity Expenditures were as follows:

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Budget</u>
Homebuyer Assistance Program	307
Operation and Repair of Foreclosure Property	\$ 88,918
Renter Affordability Program	8,885
Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvements Program	348,609
2012-13 Program Administration	<u>102,561</u>
Total	\$ 549,280

Approximately \$4,945 of program income was generated in 2012-13, which reduced the overall expenditure outcome as follows: \$1,966 towards the cost of the Operation and Repair for Foreclosure Property; \$2,193 towards the cost of the Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvements Program; and \$786 towards the cost of program administration.

Of the \$446,719 (not including administration costs) that was able to be spent on the above programs during the program year, \$98,110 was spent on housing-related activities and \$348,609 was spent on Neighborhood Sustainability Infrastructure-related activities.

In addition to the above programs, in 2012-13 the City contributed approximately \$1,150,278 to the ASSET Program to support the local Human Service Agencies shelter and preventive needs of homeless and low income families in the community. (See Appendix III).

AMI=Area Median Income; LMI=Low and Moderate-Income

General Questions

1. Assessment of the one-year goals and objectives:
 - a. Describe the accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for the reporting period.
 - b. Provide a breakdown of the CPD formula grant funds spent on grant activities for each goal and objective.
 - c. If applicable, explain why progress was not made towards meeting the goals and objectives.
2. Describe the manner in which the recipient would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:
 - a. Provide a summary of impediments to fair housing choice.
 - b. Identify actions taken to overcome effects of impediments identified.
4. Describe Other Actions in Strategic Plan or Action Plan taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.
5. Leveraging Resources
 - a. Identify progress in obtaining "other" public and private resources to address needs.
 - b. How Federal resources from HUD leveraged other public and private resources.
 - c. How matching requirements were satisfied.

Program Year 4 CAPER General Questions response:

In addition to the responses below, a summary of the accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for the reporting period can be found in Appendix I as follows:

- The Activity Summary (GPR03) lists each CDBG activity that was open during the year. For each activity, the report shows the status, accomplishments, program narrative, and program year expenditures.
- The Summary of Consolidated Plan Projects (GPPR06) outlines progress in implementing projects identified in the Action Plan. This report lists all projects for the plan year. Disbursements are summarized by program for each project's activities.
- The Summary of Accomplishments Report (GRP23) presents data on CDBG activity counts and disbursements by priority need categories. It also provides data on CDBG accomplishments by various units of measure and housing units by racial/ethnic categories.
- The CDBG Financial Summary Report (GRP26) provides CDBG program indicators. This report shows the obligations and expenditures that were made.

Also see Appendix IV for Project Workbook Sheets on each Program Activity.

1a. During this program year, the City of Ames was not able to fully implement all program project activities as outlined in the 2012-13 Action Plan. However, the program activities that were implemented addressed the following goals and objectives for the reporting period: the Neighborhood Sustainability Program, and the Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvements Program.

An outline of the 2012-13 activity expenditures is as follows:

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Budget</u>
Homebuyer Assistance Program	\$ 307
Operation and Repair of Foreclosure Property	88,918
Renter Affordability Program	8,885
Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvements Program	348,609
2012-13 Program Administration	<u>102,561</u>
Total	\$ 563,409

1b. A breakdown of the percentage of funds expended is as follows: 21% on housing-related activities, 62% on the neighborhood infrastructure improvements program activity, and the remaining 17% on program administration.

1c. This is the City's ninth year as an entitlement community. Although the activities outlined for 2012-13 are continuing and well-established activities, the lack of staffing resources to fully implement the program activities greatly impacted being able to assist a larger number of low- and moderate-income households, or targeted low-income areas. Additionally, having difficulty establishing partnerships with SHPO due to their staffing constrains has really impact the implementation of the Home Improvement Program, along with the lack of being able to find contractors who have their lead safely renovator certification.

2a. The City is still in the process of addressing staffing needs and will continue to adjust and/or expand its programming as a result of being able to fill the needed position, as well as rely on customer feedback, check market conditions, and receive citizen input during this next five-(5) year plan cycle. Despite not being fully staffed, activities were implemented that would have the greatest impact on the goals and objectives, especially in the areas of direct benefit to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. The City will also communicate with SHPO to finalize a programmatic agreement so that the environmental review process can become more streamlined and efficient to process.

3a. As outlined in the data in the City's 2009-14 Consolidated Plan, impediments to fair housing choices that were identified in the City are as follows:

- Lack of knowledge about fair housing laws and enforcement
- Lack of affordable housing and/or gap in obtaining affordable housing in both rental and homeownership markets
- Lack of knowledge about mortgage products, credit, and income affordability
- Lack of financial capacity to maintain and update the housing stock and/or service buildings
- Need to increase and/or improve accessibility to public facilities (sidewalks, curbs, etc.), and to other facilities, both public and non-public
- Lack of dollars to address all of the needs of an increasing community population

Additionally, during the 2007-08 program year, an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice study was conducted and completed just prior to the end of the program year. The study was concluded by outlining six (6) perceived impediments, with recommended actions, as outlined below:

- Lack of available decent rental units in affordable price ranges
- Excessive application fees and/or rental deposits
- Attitudes of landlords
- Cost of housing
- Job status
- Lack of knowledge of how to file a fair housing complaint

The City prepared a response, and during the 2010-11 Action Plan year sought to address each recommendation where feasible. An update to the Impediments Study has been completed and is anticipated to be adopted in the 2013-14 program year.

3b. For the Program Year 2012-13, the City re-opened the Deposit Assistance component of the Renter Affordability Program by hiring a temporary part-time staff to assist with the day to day program administration. The Deposit Assistance activity was expanded to include assistance with the First's Month Rent. Both of these activities directly addresses the impediments of rental deposits and the cost of housing for households at 50% or less of the area median income needing gap assistance in finding affordable rental units.

Annually, the City has been making efforts towards addressing the "lack of knowledge of how to file a fair housing complaint" and other impediments noted above through community event/activities such as Fair Housing Month, with a public proclamation, followed by an event where the general public, families in low-income housing programs, human service agencies, religious organizations, neighborhood associations, property owners and managers, and realtors are invited to attend and become educated about Fair Housing issues and concerns in the community. These events have been in partnership with the Ames Human Relations Commission, the Ames Board of Realtors, and the Ames Rental Property Managers Association. The City of Ames also connects with the area religious organizations, city and county human service organizations and the local continuum of care group to discuss and to update and share program information to refer families needing various types of service and/or assistance. Additionally, although the City no longer administers the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program, in partnership with the administering Housing Authority, the City has been able to correspond directly to Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher participants.

4. Other actions that the City continues to take to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs in the community are through educating the community by participating in dialogs with other community groups (e.g. Continuum of Care Agencies and Neighborhood Associations), participating in and/or sponsoring diversity celebrations (e.g., FACES), and sponsoring Community Forums (e.g. Impediments Study, Public Awareness events, Hunger and Homelessness Awareness events, etc.) and its' annual partnership with the Ames Human Relations Commission, Central Iowa Board of Realtors and the Ames Rental Property Managers Association to promote and educate the public about housing issues and concerns. Additionally, the City, through its partnership in the ASSET process, funds human services agencies to address economic and housing needs, and through its Economic Development Program funds businesses to create jobs for low- and moderate-income persons.

5a. The City, as one of four partners, continues to contribute the highest percent (37%) of the funding to various human services agencies, which enables them to provide housing and basic services for low-and moderate-income, homeless, elderly and disabled households. Some of the various human services agencies that received funding through this process, which helped address obstacles for this population are as follows:

- ACCESS-Women’s Assault Care Center
- ACPC-Ames Community Pre-School
- American Red Cross
- The ARC of Story County
- Boys and Girls Club
- Boy Scouts
- Campfire Boys and Girls
- ChildServe
- Center for Creative Justice
- ERP-Emergency Residence Project
- Girl Scouts
- Good Neighbor
- Heartland Senior Services
- Homeward
- Legal Aid Society
- Lutheran Social Services in Iowa
- Mainstream Living Employment & Learning
- MICA-Mid-Iowa Community Action Agency
- National Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Central Iowa
- Orchard Place
- RSVP-Retired and Senior Volunteer Program
- Story Time Child Care Center
- University Childcare
- The Volunteer Center
- Youth and Shelter Services
- YWCA Ames-ISU

5b. Through the administration of CDBG and other City programs, both public and private resources were utilized to address the needs as follows:

- Through the administration of the Neighborhood Public Infrastructure Program, the City leveraged financial resources by covering the engineering cost for the administration of the project that allowed 100% of CDBG dollars to go directly to the project to serve that LMI Census tract.
- Utilized various human services agencies and referrals from citizens about households and persons with needs for various forms of assistance and services
- Through the administration of the Homebuyer Assistance Program, the program’s down payment and closing cost assistance is leveraged with partnerships with local lenders who are able to provide better lending products.
- Through the ASSET process, City, County, Iowa State and United Way funds are used to provide administrative support and basic need services to various human services agencies are also leveraged with dollars that the agencies contributed from private donations and fundraisers. A few agencies also received funding from HUD through the State for Emergency Shelter Funds (ESG), Supportive Housing funds, and State programs such as VOCA) - Victims of Crime Act; FVP-Family Violence Prevention; Sexual Abuse Funds and DA - Domestic Abuse Funds. Also, Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP) funding administered through FEMA.

5c. For 2012-13 Under the both the Operation and Repair of Foreclosure Property, and the Homebuyer Assistance Program non-profit organizations and/or low and moderate income first time home buyers have and will be able to purchased properties bought by the City at a reduced rate. Non-profits can pass on the savings

to low income families and homebuyers by contributing a percentage towards the down payment assistance. Through the ASSET process, the City spreads its dollars to other needed services or fund gaps rather than pay for the full need.

Managing the Process

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to ensure compliance with program and comprehensive planning requirements.

Program Year 4 CAPER Managing the Process response:

The City of Ames administrative staff continues to actively attend and/or participate in the various training opportunities that HUD and/or professional organizations have sponsored regarding the administration and implementation of the CDBG Program regulations. City staff actively participates in quarterly conference calls with HUD field staff and other entitlement communities in Iowa and Nebraska. City staff has actively utilized the various tools and templates that have been made available and are suggested to be used by HUD to comply with all the reporting requirements. The City actively communicates with other experienced entitlement communities for guidance about implementing various CDBG-eligible programs. City staff works closely with other City departments (e.g. Finance Department, City Attorney, Inspections, Public Works, etc.). The City also utilizes various Departments at Iowa State University to conduct research or implement surveys for comprehensive planning requirements.

Also, on a program level, through the administration of the various programs, City staff continues to utilize various area human services agencies, etc. to advertise the program availability to their clientele. This continues to be the main source for all of the assistance that has been provided to date. City staff continued to attend the local Continuum of Care meetings throughout the year and conducted public forums to disseminate and receive feedback about the City's CDBG Programs and requirements. The City had partnerships with local commissions, realtors, and area non-profit organizations to help identify and address housing needs. The City also has relationship with the new Housing Authority that administers the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program for the Ames jurisdiction to disseminate information regarding CDBG Forums, Homelessness Hunger Events, etc.

Citizen Participation

1. Provide a summary of citizen comments.
2. In addition, the performance report provided to citizens must identify the Federal funds made available for furthering the objectives of the Consolidated Plan. For each formula grant program, the grantee shall identify the total amount of funds available (including estimated program income), the total amount of funds committed during the reporting period, the total amount expended during the reporting period, and the geographic distribution and location of expenditures. Jurisdictions are encouraged to include maps in describing the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of minority concentration). The geographic distribution and expenditure requirement may also be satisfied by specifying the census tracts where expenditures were concentrated.

*Please note that Citizen Comments and Responses may be included as additional files within the CPMP Tool.

Program Year 4 CAPER Citizen Participation response:

1. No comments were received during the public comment period nor at the public hearing.
2. For the 2012-13 program year, approximately \$549,280 of CDBG funds were spent on the following program activities: Homebuyer Assistance (\$307,000); Operation/Foreclosure and Repair (\$89,918); Renter Affordability (\$8,885) and Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvement (\$348,509). All of the programs were a 100% benefit directly to low and moderate-income households or HUD designated to low and moderate-income census tracts. The majority of the programs are open to eligible households city-wide.
3. **See Appendix II for maps and budgets.**

Institutional Structure

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to overcome gaps in institutional structures and enhance coordination.

Program Year 4 CAPER Institutional Structure response:

Although the City of Ames no longer administers the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Rental Subsidy Program (which is the largest federally funded subsidized housing program to assist very low-income families for the community), the City of Ames continues to maintain a good relationship with the current Housing Authority by providing meeting rooms to conduct name up sessions, briefings, etc. so that citizens of Ames will continue to have access to the service. The Housing Authority also provides information to the City so that we can disseminate information regarding CDBG programs and/or events. Also, through the ASSET process, the City continues to work cooperatively with the County, Iowa State University and United Way to fund an array of social services agencies (including Continuum of Care agencies) for the community and its citizens.

Throughout the reporting period, the City of Ames continued to invite neighborhood associations, the Ames and Gilbert School Districts; Story and Boone Counties, Iowa State University, area developers and builders, community organizations, business leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, citizens, etc., to participate in various public forums, workshops, and citizen panels to create this vision for the community. For 2012-13, in addition to regularly scheduled council meetings, the City Council continued to conduct a third City Council Workshop meeting each month specifically set aside for discussions on various issues and concerns expressed by the community. The topics included the following agenda items:

- Joint Meeting with Ames Community School Board - School District's Master Facilities Plan
- Flood Mitigation Study Progress Update and Neighborhood Summit
- Flood Workshop No. 2

-
- Capital Improvements Plan
 - Joint Meeting with the Electric Utility Operations Review and Advisory Board (EUORAB) - Presentation of Gasification Financial Analysis Report from HDR and Discussion of Energy Resource Options

The City also continued to conduct public forums and other meetings to gain public input for the CDBG Programs, City Town Budget Meeting, and Visioning. The City also offers Citizen's Academy Course as well as a Police Academy Course to educate citizens about how the City works for its citizens.

Monitoring

1. Describe how and the frequency with which you monitored your activities.
2. Describe the results of your monitoring including any improvements.
3. Self Evaluation
 - a. Describe the effect programs have in solving neighborhood and community problems.
 - b. Describe progress in meeting priority needs and specific objectives and help make community's vision of the future a reality.
 - c. Describe how you provided decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunity principally for low and moderate-income persons.
 - d. Indicate any activities falling behind schedule.
 - e. Describe how activities and strategies made an impact on identified needs.
 - f. Identify indicators that would best describe the results.
 - g. Identify barriers that had a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and overall vision.
 - h. Identify whether major goals are on target and discuss reasons for those that are not on target.
 - i. Identify any adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities that might meet your needs more effectively.

Program Year 4 CAPER Monitoring response:

1. On a program level, the staff continues to monitor the program guidelines of the various CDBG programs on a monthly basis to ensure that they are implemented in a efficient and effective manner and/or need to be clarified to accommodate unforeseen situations regarding determining applicant eligibility, documentation of necessary information, staff time for the various programs, and/or requiring administrative budget adjustments. The overall financial program and administrative expenditures continue to be monitored monthly by the Finance Department with monthly spreadsheet on expenditures and any generated program income so that monthly draws and/or quarterly reports are completed accurately and timely. Staff regularly communicates with various field representatives to ensure that the programs implemented are in compliance with the various HUD regulations. Staff regularly participates in the quarterly conference calls with Omaha Community Development staff to stay up to date on any regulatory changes or new reporting requirements being required or initiated. Staff also submits quarterly reports in a timely manner and monitors its activities in the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS).

2. The CDBG overall program is monitored viewed as part of the City's annual external financial audits. To date no major findings have been flagged or revealed. The City also has received regular onsite monitoring visits of its operations and programs from the area field office and staff from other HUD program offices. To date, no major findings or issues have been discovered. The field office also regularly monitors the City's reporting activities in IDIS.

3a. By conducting community forums, contacting human service agencies and administering the various programs, neighborhood and community problems have been brought forward and/or addressed through education and improving accessibility, affordability, and sustainability regarding housing choices throughout the community for both rental and homeownership. Being an Entitlement Community continues to bring about the opportunity to educate the public about the program requirements, fair housing, and how federal dollars are allocated and spent in the community. It also has allowed for more feedback and input from citizens regarding the process.

The need to continue to support the rental housing needs of very low-income households was one of the concerns addressed during the public forums; in response to that concern the City re-opened and enhanced a component of the Renter Affordability Program, which was the Deposit and/or First Month's Rent activity. The Neighborhood Public Infrastructure Improvement Program was another program implemented based on the concerns about improving the infrastructure in low and moderate-income census tract neighborhoods. The Homebuyer Assistance Program was a concern expressed by low-income households looking for assistance with down payment and/or affordable priced homes. These programs have made a positive impact in not only addressing the City Council's goals of Affordability and Sustainability but concerns addressed by our citizens.

3b. Through the implementation of the various programs outlined during the 2012-13 program reporting period, all four priority needs outlined in the City's 2009-14 Consolidated Plan for addressing the low- and moderate-income households have been met and are directly tied to the City Council's past and current priorities and to all of its vision statements.

3c. Administration of the programs outlined for 2012-13, low and moderate income households have greatly benefitted from having assistance with their rental, homeownership, and infrastructure needs by addressing their suitable living environments. In particular the Neighborhood Public Improvements Program expanded the economic opportunity for low and moderate-income persons due the contractors working on CDBG funded infrastructure projects having to make a good faith effort to hire low and moderate-income persons under the Section 3 requirements to fill positions for the project.

3d. For 2011-13 the Single Family Conversion project and the Dangerous Buildings Program both fell behind schedule due to lack of interest by property owners and/or the dangerous buildings that were identified or sought were either repaired by the existing property owner or were sold and repaired by the new property owner. For the remainder of 2012-13 both of these activities have been suspended at this time. In regards to the Housing Improvement Program the inability to reestablish a programmatic agreement the Iowa State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has really delayed the start of this needed program. Staff is still working with SHPO to hopefully come to an agreement in the 2013-14 program year.

Additionally, the loss of essential staff resources, impacts the administration of the entire program by having to delay start dates, or by becoming behind schedule or by having to postpone projects from being implemented which impacted the number of low and moderate-income households that could have been assisted.

3e. Through implementation of the Neighborhood Public Infrastructure Program, families living in the low- and moderate-income census tracts benefited from a stable living environment by having deteriorated streets, curb, and gutter repaired, and by giving households with disabilities better access to their neighborhood through the installation of handicapped accessible sidewalks with dome pads. Through the implementation of the Renter Affordability Program (Deposit and/or First Month's Rent Assistance activity) very low-income households (50% or less of the AMI) have been able to secure decent, safe affordable rental housing units, because this activity funds the expensive upfront gap of having to pay Deposits and First Month's Rent that can easily exceed \$1,200, which at this income level is not affordable. Through the implementation of the Homebuyer Assistance Program nine households with low and moderate-income (80% or less of the AMI), who participated in the Homebuyer Educational Seminar, may be able to purchase their first home in 2013-14. Through the implementation of the Operation/Foreclosure Program, an affordable priced home may be available for purchase through the City's Homebuyer Assistance Program or through our partnership with Habitat for Humanity of Central Iowa.

3f. The best indicator that would describe the results for the Neighborhood Public Improvements Program is that 60.4% of the households living in the targeted Census Tract # 13.1 were low and moderate income households. They now have a much improved driving surface on their streets, sidewalks with handicap access, less flooding and drainage onto their properties, and better connection throughout the neighborhood. Overall this program has preserved and enhanced the viability and aesthetics of this core neighborhood. The best indicator that would describe the results of the Renter Affordability Program (Deposit and First's Month Rent Assistance activity) is that 100% of the households who benefitted from the assistance were at 50% or less of the Area Median Income (AMI), and 25% were at 30% or less of the AMI.

3g-h. Barriers that had a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and overall vision, were lack of internal staffing and budget resources (City Staff); communication barriers when working with other state or federal agencies that have their own lack of resources and staffing turnovers (SHPO); activities that resolved themselves (Dangerous Buildings) or activities that did not meet an interest of groups in the community (Single Family Conversion Program). One major goal that was not on target is the Housing Improvement Program. Needing a partnership with a major state or federal agency that does not have the same goals makes it very difficult to implement, and it impacts if and when it will administered. Over the last 2 ½ years, the City has diligently pursued a partnership with SHPO to revise and renew the programmatic agreement so that we can implement our Housing Improvement Program. We have sought assistance from HUD, the mid-west National Trust for Historic Preservation, Preservation Iowa, the Office of the State Archaeologist and other agencies to accomplish this task. In addition, we had to delay the Renter Affordability Program for about 1½ year due to a shortage in City staff and funding resources.

3i. An adjustment or improvement/strategy that has been identified is to reduce the number of program activities to be implemented each year. While this approach may not spread the dollars over all of the goals outlined in the Consolidated Plan, it will continue to benefit and concentrate on addressing the greatest impacts and needs in our community. Other factors that will improve things to meet the needs more effectively are: hiring temporary and part-time personnel to help with program administration, and continuing to communicate and solicit partnership with the required state or federal agencies to accomplish the desired outcome.

Lead-based Paint

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards.

Program Year 4 CAPER Lead-based Paint response:

For 2012-13, although no specific programs were implemented utilizing CDBG funds to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards. City staff has established a partnership and is attending the semi-annual meetings of the Lead Coalition Team. The Lead Coalition team is the Story County Public Health Department comprised of case managers, environment inspector, health screening technicians, and child health coordinators who are under the direction of the Story County Board of Health, in which one of their responsibilities is Lead Poisoning Prevention Education. The City in partnership with this group will work to educate, evaluate, address in hope to reduce lead-based paint hazards in our City/County more specifically in the 2013-14 program year.

Additionally, through the administration of the Renter Affordability and Homebuyer Assistance Program, verbal and written information is provided to eligible applicants about the dangers of lead-based paint hazards. Through the Operations/Foreclosure Repair activity, staff contracted with a certified lead paint tester to have all of its properties inspected for lead paint prior to any rehabilitation. Staff in its partnership with Habitat for Humanity requires their construction supervisor to become certified. Staff also encourages and refers contractors to become certified before being eligible to participate in any rehabilitation work.

HOUSING

Housing Needs

*Please also refer to the Housing Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Describe Actions taken during the last year to foster and maintain affordable housing.

Program Year 4 CAPER Housing Needs response:

- Utilizing CDBG fund the City was able to re-open its Renter Affordability Program (Deposit and/or First Month's Rent activity) in late spring 2013; this program provides much needed financial assistance to very low-income households (50% or less of AMI) to gain access to decent, safe and affordable rental housing units.

-
- Also, applications for the Homebuyer Assistance Program was begun in late spring; this program provides down payment and closing cost assistance to low and moderate-income (80% or less of the AMI) to assist them with the purchase of an affordable home. This will help low and moderate-income first-time homebuyers purchase affordable housing units throughout the city, especially our core vital neighborhoods that contain a good stock of housing in their income price range.
 - The City was unable to implement the Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program that was designed to provide financial assistance to qualified low- and moderate-income, single-family homeowners at or below 80% of the area median income limits to improve the physical condition of their single-family homes in residentially-zoned areas, due to being unable to renew and update its programmatic agreement with the Iowa Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). However, once this program is up and running, it will provide a major financial structure for low and moderate-income, single family homeowners in maintaining affordable housing.

The City of Ames continued to participate and funds the ASSET process that supports the local human service agencies administrative and program basic human services needs for various needy households. The City provides specific funding (\$1,150,278) to human service agencies that provide emergency rent assistance, utility assistance, transportation assistance, childcare, and food assistance that allows very low-income households, elderly and disabled individuals to stay in their homes thereby fostering and addressing affordable housing needs.

In addition to the City funded activities, there are a number of local churches who are also providing emergency rent, utilities, transportation, food and clothing. Staff hosted meeting among these groups to share information about their services so that gaps and duplications can be addressed.

Specific Housing Objectives

1. Evaluate progress in meeting specific objective of providing affordable housing, including the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income renter and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
2. Evaluate progress in providing affordable housing that meets the Section 215 definition of affordable housing for rental and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
3. Describe efforts to address “worst-case” housing needs and housing needs of persons with disabilities.

Program Year 4 CAPER Specific Housing Objectives response:

1a. The Renter Affordability Program was re-opened during the last quarter of the program year and not submitted as a program for 2012-13, the goal in the short timeframe for the remainder of the program year was to assist ten (10) households. However, from March to June 13, the number of households assisted under the Deposit and First Month’s rent activity were twelve (12) as follows:

- Households at 30% or less of the AMI: 3 (extremely low-income)
- Households at 31% to 50% of the AMI: 9 (very low-income)
- 3 participants were in the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program
- 10 participants were Female Head Households
- 2 were disabled
- 5 were households with dependent children
- 2 were from Homeless Shelters

1b. Under the Homebuyer Assistance Program, nine (9) households applied and of the nine, seven (7) attended the home buyer educational seminar. All seven attendees had income at 80% or below the AMI.

1c. Under the Operation/Repair Foreclosure Activity, the City is working to remove environment hazards and make other repairs so that several of the properties can be sold to applicant households from the Homebuyer Assistance Program. Also the City is working with the local Habitat for Humanity to sell at least two of the homes for them to rehabilitate and sell to eligible Habitat homebuyers. It is hoped that all 5 remaining properties will be updated and sold in the 2013-14 program year.

1d. Through the City's on-going participation as a funder through the ASSET process, (Analysis of Social Service Evaluation Team). ASSET provides a large portion of its funding to various Ames/Story County human service agencies to assist with housing and basic needs to help families avoid becoming homeless. This particular level of service is well-known outside of the City's service delivery area and thereby attracts more persons of need to the jurisdiction; it continues to address the needs of affordable housing.

For fiscal year 2012-13, the ASSET partners' recommendations have planned for the investment of funds to address the needs of the homeless and chronic homeless, homelessness prevention, and other non-homeless population needs and services for the jurisdiction as follows:

Story County - all sources	\$ 1,029,339
United Way	820,586
GSB	136,755
City of Ames	<u>1,150,278</u>
Total	\$ 3,136,958

The funding contributed by the City of Ames is very closely aligned with the City's order of priorities, and helps to sustain those services demonstrated to meet the needs of extremely low-, low-, and moderate-income residents, by providing for basic needs, crisis intervention, and the prevention of homelessness (www.storycountyasset.org - Funder priorities).

Additionally, the agencies that provide the services for the homeless and near homeless, as well as other service needs populations, receive funding from various state, federal, and private sources. The City of Ames, along with the City of Ames ASSET volunteers, will continue to work with homeless agency providers to seek ways to partner to maintain and/or expand programs and activities that will address and/or bring awareness to needed solutions to work on eliminating chronic homelessness by 2015.

2. The progress made in providing affordable housing that meets the Section 215 definition of affordable housing for rental households has been extremely effective through the implementation of the Renter Affordability Program. Since the inception of the program in 2004, the number of households assisted over the last eight years (2004-11) was 650 households, compared to the proposed goal to assist 185 households over the same time period. Although for the program year 2011-12, the program was not implemented. The program was re-opened in 2012-13 and 12 additional households were assisted, for an updated total of number of households assisted to 662, which this continues to exceed the number projected to date.

Under the Homebuyer Assistance Program during the 2004-12 program period the goal was to assist 19 low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyer households. During this timeframe, only four (4) households have been assisted. The housing market crisis from 2010-2012 sufficiently affected the City's ability to implement this program, and during the first part of the 2012-13 program, the City had difficulty finding a partner lender to be able to commit to working with programs geared towards low and moderate-income first-time homebuyers, due to the demand from existing homeowners needing to take advantage of the historical lower interest rates. However, in the spring of 2012-13 the City was able to partner with a lender and began soliciting for applications and anticipates assisting households in 2013-14.

Under the Acquisition/Reuse Program during the 2004-12 program period, the goal was to purchase and rehabilitate/resell 17 properties. During that timeframe, fifteen (15) properties were purchased, and eight (8) of the fifteen (15) were sold to Habitat for Humanity of Central Iowa that were then re-sold to first-time homebuyers at 60% or less of the AMI. Two (2) properties were sold to first-time homebuyers at 80% or less of the AMI, through the City's Homebuyer Program. Five homes remain to be repaired and sold. For the 2011-12 program year, the proposed number to purchase was one (1); however, the program was not implemented for the program year. Instead the City concentrated on getting the remaining 5 properties rehabilitated and/or sold to Habitat in 2012-13 program year. However, the market crisis affected Habitat's fundraising goals and staff shortages in construction managers affect their ability to take on both building and rehabilitation at the same time. It is anticipated that they will have the means to purchase and rehabilitate at least two of the five properties in 2013-14. And the City is working to complete the remaining three properties.

Under the Neighborhood Housing Improvements Program that was not introduced as a program until 2008, the objective of this activity is to provide grants to low and moderate-income, single family homeowners to make repairs to their homes to maintain decent and safe and affordable housing stock in the community. There have been several obstacles that have caused the City to postpone implementing this activity. The most critical are 1) creating a pool of eligible contractors who have their Lead Safe Renovator Certifications. In 2009 CDBG funds were used to provide training for contractors to receive their certifications to establish a pool; however, only a small percent completed the process to receive their certification from the State. 2) HUD and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) have made significant changes in the environmental review process for rehabilitating properties. The City to date is still in the process of negotiating a programmatic agreement with SHPO that will allow for a more efficient and effective manner for processing environmental reviews for properties to be rehabilitated using CDBG funds. It is hoped that an agreement can be reached in 2013-14.

Under the Single-family Conversion Pilot Program created in program year 2010-11 and continued for 2011-12, the City was unable to find property owners interested in partnering with the City to convert single-family rental conversions back into single-family homes to be purchased by first-time homebuyers. This program has been placed on hold at this time.

Under the Minor Repair Program for Non-Profit Organizations during the 2004-12 program period, the goal was to assist fifteen (15) organizations with loan/grant funds to make repairs (e.g. roofs, furnaces, water heaters, siding, windows, etc.) to their facilities (shelters and/or offices) that will allow use by a limited clientele that have incomes at or below 30% of the AMI to access and utilize decent, safe, and handicapped-accessible shelters or office space for services. The actual number assisted in this time period has been ten (10). The program has not been scheduled to be implemented in 2011-12 and 2012-13. In 2013-14 if a programmatic agreement is reached with SHPO, it may be possible to include non-profit organizations under the Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program.

Under the Neighborhood Public Improvements Infrastructure Program during the 2004-11 program year, it was proposed that 50 deteriorated curbs/sidewalks and over 5,000 linear feet of curb and gutter would be repaired or replaced in HUD-designated Census Tracts, where 51% of the households are of low- and moderate-incomes (80% or less of the AMI) and reside in both rental and owner-occupied housing units. The actual number completed during this time period has been over 145 handicapped ramps and dome pads, and over 8,653 of linear feet of driveway approaches, curb, and gutter and street paving. For the 2011-12 program year, approximately 1,264 linear feet (lf) of curb and gutter, 6,319 linear feet (lf) of new street paving, 224 square yards of driveway approaches, 88 square yards of sidewalk ramps, 222 linear feet (lf) of storm sewer pipe and 136 square feet of truncated domes. The project was completed in the HUD designated low and moderate income census tract 10. For the 2012-13 program year, approximately 1,537 linear feet (lf) of curb and gutter, 768.5 lf of new street paving, 327 square yards of driveway approaches, 590 square yards of sidewalk ramps, 589 lf of storm sewer pipe and 168 square feet of truncated domes was completed in the HUD designated low and moderate income census tract 13.1

Under the Slum and Blight Program during the 2004-09 program years, it was proposed that three (3) properties be purchased and demolished that was located in a 100-year flood plain. The actual number purchased and demolished was two (2). Both purchases occurred in a HUD-designated low- and moderate-income census tract. The program was not implemented in 2009-10. In 2010-11, under the Slum and Blight program, the purchase and demolition of 13 commercial and residential properties was being proposed due to an unforeseen flooding event that destroyed and/or damaged these properties; however, the City was unsuccessful in receiving the matching funds from the State to implement the program. For the 2011-12 year, a new activity was implemented called the Dangerous Building Program. The goal for this activity was to demolish owner-occupied and/or rental properties that had been identified by the City Inspections Department as having city code violations because the properties had deteriorated to the condition that they were a health hazard to the neighborhood and community. In 2012-13, there were three (3) properties that were identified and determined eligible under the program; however, the property owner(s) either sold or demolished the properties before the City received final approval to move forward.

-
3. Implementation of the Renter Affordability Program continues to address the "worst-case" housing needs and needs of persons with disabilities. Only one component the Deposit and/or First Month's Rent activity was re-opened and implemented at the end of the 2012-13 program year. The program assists households that have incomes that are mostly at or below 30% of the area median income limits. This population consists of elderly and disabled persons on fixed incomes, single mothers, the homeless as well as the working poor. Since the City is no longer the local Housing Authority, the City continues address and implement programs that provide interim financial gap assistance to very low-income income households, elderly, disabled and homeless households.

Additionally, the City's participation and funding through the ASSET process continues to address the "worst-case" housing needs and needs of persons with disabilities. For 2012-13, of the \$3,136,958 funded, \$242,352 was directed towards Shelter Assistance (homelessness) and of that amount, the City contributed \$102,123 (42%); in addition \$172,450 was directed to Prevention Assistance (adult daycare and meals for the elderly and disabled households) and of that amount the City contributed \$107,515 (62%).

4. These contributions do not include local churches that provide emergency assistance for rent, utilities, food and clothing that help to address the needs of very low-income income households, elderly, disabled and homeless households in the community.

Appendix I, Summary of Accomplishments Data

See Appendix VI-Consolidated Plan Five-Year Strategy: Performance Measurement

See detailed information can be found in the 2012-13 ASSET Human Services Budget Manual at www.storycountyasset.org.

Public Housing Strategy

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to improve public housing and resident initiatives.

Program Year 4 CAPER Public Housing Strategy response:

The City of Ames does not own or operate any public housing units and no longer operates as the local housing authority. However, the staff communicates with private developers, who own and/or manage public housing (project-based) units with referrals and other types of collaboration where needed. Staff also works with the local housing authority to disseminate information about public forms, programs, events and other information to participants on the Section 8 Housing Voucher Program. The City is a member on the Housing Authority's Board of Commissioners.

Barriers to Affordable Housing

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to eliminate barriers to affordable housing.

Program Year 4 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

The City during this past program year has taken the following actions to implement and/or eliminate barriers to affordable housing as outlined in the City's 2009-14 Consolidated Plan.

Through the implementation of the following housing-related programs: 1. The Renter Affordability Program (Deposit and First Month's Rent Activity). This activity was designed to assist very low-income households (50% or less of the AMI) in gaining access to rental housing units that will improve their housing status, and help them to secure economic stability in order to remain in their housing units. During the 2012-13 year, twelve (12) households were assisted that were female-headed households, elderly and/or disabled individuals, homeless individuals and families on the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program.

2. The Homebuyer Assistance Program. The objective under this program is to provide financial assistance to qualified low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers, with incomes at or below 80% of the area median income limits, in order to purchase existing and/or newly constructed single-family housing in residentially-zoned areas. The overall goal of the Homebuyer Assistance Program is to allow low and moderate-income households to gain access to housing and/or improve their housing status. For the 2012-13 program, applications were solicited and the City conducted a Homebuyer Educational Seminar in which, nine (9) households applied and seven (7) participated in the seminar. The seminar is the first step in eliminating barriers through education to first-time homebuyers.

3. The Neighborhood Public Infrastructure Improvements Program. This activity is designed to strengthen the infrastructure in the City's core LMI Neighborhood(s). The overall goal of the program is to preserve and enhance the viability and aesthetics of our core existing neighborhoods. These improvements eliminate barriers to low and moderate-income, first-time homebuyers and existing homeowners by making affordable housing sustainable and accessible for motor vehicles and for pedestrian foot traffic, especially for those who are handicapped. For 2012-13, approximately 1,537 linear feet (lf) of curb and gutter, 768.5 lf of new street paving, 327 square yards of driveway approaches, 590 square yards of sidewalk ramps, 589 lf of storm sewer pipe and 168 square feet of truncated domes were installed.

The City in partnership with the County, Iowa State and the United Way, through the ASSET process provides funding for area human service agencies to address and/or eliminate barriers to affordable housing. The program range from emergency rental assistance, transportation, job training and education, food and clothing, childcare and health care, which allows the low-income household to leverage their financial resources to towards housing costs. For 2013-12 approximately \$3,136,958 was provide to address these basic needs, of which 37% was contributed by the City of Ames.

The City provides meeting accommodations and attends the local Continuum of Care group meetings to discuss housing issues and concerns. The City partners with them and other groups to promote community awareness events to educate and engage the public regarding the barriers and needs of low-income and homeless families in the community. The group has been very active in bringing in speakers to discuss the programs that they implement and discuss ways the group could partner to continue to find ways of address the need for housing and supportive services.

In 2012-13, the City began updating its an Analysis to Impediments to Fair Housing Choice Study to be adopted in the 2013-14 program year. The Study, which includes a survey from housing consumers, providers and producers regarding their perceptions of housing barriers and impediments in our community, which will further assist the City in identifying areas that will need to further explored or addressed.(see Appendix V for the current Analysis to Impediments to Fair Housing Choice Study Action Plan).

HOME/ American Dream Down Payment Initiative (ADDI)

1. Assessment of Relationship of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using HOME funds, including the number and types of households served.
2. HOME Match Report
 - a. Use HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A to report on match contributions for the period covered by the Consolidated Plan program year.
3. HOME MBE and WBE Report
 - a. Use Part III of HUD Form 40107 to report contracts and subcontracts with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and Women's Business Enterprises (WBEs).
4. Assessments
 - a. Detail results of on-site inspections of rental housing.
 - b. Describe the HOME jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions.
 - c. Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

Program Year 4 CAPER HOME/ADDI response:

The City is not eligible to receive HOME/ADDI funding. However, the City does encourage non-profits to seek these funding dollars from the State to help leverage and expand programs for low-income and homeless households in the community.

HOMELESS

Homeless Needs

*Please also refer to the Homeless Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Identify actions taken to address needs of homeless persons.
2. Identify actions to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.
3. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.

Program Year 4 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

1-2. The City's re-opening of the Renter Affordability Program, specifically the Deposit and First's Month's Rent activity was a direct action taken to address needs of homeless persons. The program is designed to assist very low-income and homeless individuals gain access to decent affordable housing. The cost to upfront the deposit and pay the first month's rent is simply out of reach for homeless households. Also, if they have just started employment, and have not received a paycheck and/or their paycheck will not cover both of these required costs from property owners, this gap financing will aide them in the transition from the shelter to permanent housing and independent living. For 2012-13, twelve (12) households were assisted, of which, two (2) were living in shelters.

The City of Ames continues to partner with Story County, Iowa State University, and with the local continuum of care agencies in trying to address services needed to assist homeless persons in making the transition to permanent housing and independent living. Additionally, the ASSET group (Analysis of Social Services Evaluation Team) which is comprised of the City of Ames, Story County, United Way, and the ISU Government of the Student Body, each set yearly funding priorities (see Appendix III) directly targeted at preventing homelessness in the community. They are the largest funder for agencies implementing programs for special needs, homeless, and non-homeless populations in the community. For 2012-13 \$3,136,958 dollars were invested, of which the City contributed \$1,150,278 (37%). The funding assist agencies with providing assistance to homeless households transiting from the traditional shelters to transitional housing units and/or into permanent housing. They assist households in finding the appropriate resources for housing, medical benefits, clothing, transportation, daycare, state benefits, job training, etc. Some of the agencies provide financial literacy, and job interview skills. The City through the ASSET provides funding of approximately \$ 242,352 specifically to Shelters to help address the ever growing need. Yearly each of the ASSET funders (along with the Department of Human Services set their priorities, to address the shelter and basic needs of homeless, and other individuals and households. (See Appendix III for Funder's Priorities).

3. In 2012-13 the following agencies received federal resources obtained from homeless Super NOFA; 1) Youth and Shelter Services, Inc. received approximately \$58,893 in Supportive Housing Program Funds to provide support and assistance to homeless youth and young mothers under the age of 25 with their housing needs. They also received \$128,330 in Emergency Solutions Grant Funds (ESG) of which approximately \$33,000 was designated for Ames/Story County. 2) The Assault Care Center Extending Shelter and Support (ACCESS) received \$40,000 in Emergency Solutions Grant Funds (ESG); and approximately \$ 128,122 in state domestic assistance funds and approximately \$5,500 in Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP) from FEMA.

(See Appendix III for the Housing Inventory Counts and the Point In Time Summary as prepared the Iowa Institute for Community Alliances for the State of Iowa State Continuum of Care Group for 2012-13.) The Point In Time information for Ames/Story County is included in the Balance of the State Continuum of Care Chart due to the size of County. Des Moines/Polk County is the only area that the count is separate.

Specific Homeless Prevention Elements

1. Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

Program Year 4 CAPER Specific Housing Prevention Elements response:

1. The largest actions directly taken targeted to preventing homelessness in the community is addressed through the Analysis of Social Services Evaluation Team (ASSET). The City of Ames, Story County, United Way, and the ISU Government of the Student Body, comprise the ASSET funding team. For 2012-13, the following human services agencies were funded through this process to address the Shelter and Prevention Assistance for homeless persons, for households and individuals in the community who would be homeless without the financial assistance provided by these funders and the services provided by these agencies: ACCESS-Women's Assault Care Center, Emergency Residence Project (ERP), Good Neighbor, Heartland Health Services (HHS), Lutheran Social Services, Mid-Iowa Community Action Agency (MICA), and Youth and Shelter Services (YSS). From the ASSET funders, \$242,352 was directed towards Shelter Assistance (homelessness) and of that amount, the City contributed \$102,123 (42%); in addition \$172,450 was directed to Prevention Assistance (adult daycare and meals for the elderly and disabled households) and of that amount the City contributed \$107,515 (62%).

In addition to the ASSET funding, agencies also received funding from HUD through the State for Emergency Shelter Funds (ESG), Supportive Housing funds, and State programs such as VOCA) - Victims of Crime Act; FVP-Family Violence Prevention; Sexual Abuse Funds and DA - Domestic Abuse Funds. Also, Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP) funding administered through FEMA. Also, Youth and Shelter Services, Inc. received approximately \$58,893 in Supportive Housing Program Funds to provide support and assistance to homeless youth and young mothers under the age of 25 with their housing needs. They also received \$128,330 in Emergency Solutions Grant Funds (ESG) of which approximately \$33,000 was designated for Ames/Story County. 2) The Assault Care Center Extending Shelter and Support (ACCESS) received \$40,000 in Emergency Solutions Grant Funds (ESG).

The re-opening of the CDBG Deposit and First Month's Rent Assistance, for 2012-13, \$80,000 was allocated and any unspent funds will be rolled over to continue the assistance program in 2013-14.

Additionally, local churches and other non ASSET agencies (such as: Food at First, Bethesda Lutheran Church, Home For A While, St. Thomas, 1st Evangelical, and the Salvation Army) provide emergency rent assistance, deposit assistance, transportation assistance, medical assistance, food and clothing assistance and temporary housing.

All of the above resources and actions are provided in this community to aid in the prevention of not only homelessness, but also that basic needs can that go along with the preventing homelessness.

Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)

1. Identify actions to address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless individuals and families (including significant subpopulations such as those living on the streets).
2. Assessment of Relationship of ESG Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Evaluate progress made in using ESG funds to address homeless and homeless prevention needs, goals, and specific objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.
 - b. Detail how ESG projects are related to implementation of comprehensive homeless planning strategy, including the number and types of individuals and persons in households served with ESG funds.
3. Matching Resources
 - a. Provide specific sources and amounts of new funding used to meet match as required by 42 USC 11375(a)(1), including cash resources, grants, and staff salaries, as well as in-kind contributions such as the value of a building or lease, donated materials, or volunteer time.
4. State Method of Distribution
 - a. States must describe their method of distribution and how it rated and selected its local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations acting as subrecipients.
5. Activity and Beneficiary Data
 - a. Completion of attached Emergency Shelter Grant Program Performance Chart or other reports showing ESGP expenditures by type of activity. Also describe any problems in collecting, reporting, and evaluating the reliability of this information.
 - b. Homeless Discharge Coordination
 - i. As part of the government developing and implementing a homeless discharge coordination policy, ESG homeless prevention funds may be used to assist very-low income individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless after being released from publicly funded institutions such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or corrections institutions or programs.
 - c. Explain how your government is instituting a homeless discharge coordination policy, and how ESG homeless prevention funds are being used in this effort.

Program Year 4 CAPER ESG response:

1-5. Not applicable. The City of Ames does not receive ESG funding.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Community Development

*Please also refer to the Community Development Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Assess use of CDBG funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the Consolidated Plan, particularly the highest priority activities.

-
- b. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served.
 - c. Indicate the extent to which CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.
 2. Changes in Program Objectives
 - a. Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.
 3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions
 - a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
 - b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
 - c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.
 4. For Funds Not Used for National Objectives
 - a. Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.
 - b. Indicate how did not comply with overall benefit certification.
 5. Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property
 - a. Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.
 - b. Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations who occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.
 - c. Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.
 6. Low/Mod Job Activities – for economic development activities undertaken where jobs were made available but not taken by low- or moderate-income persons
 - a. Describe actions taken by grantee and businesses to ensure first consideration was or will be given to low/mod persons.
 - b. List by job title of all the permanent jobs created/retained and those that were made available to low/mod persons.
 - c. If any of jobs claimed as being available to low/mod persons require special skill, work experience, or education, provide a description of steps being taken or that will be taken to provide such skills, experience, or education.
 7. Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit
 - a. Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of whom are low- and moderate-income.
 8. Program income received
-

-
- a. Detail the amount of program income reported that was returned to each individual revolving fund, e.g., housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other type of revolving fund.
 - b. Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.
 - c. Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.
 - d. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.
9. Prior period adjustments – where reimbursement was made this reporting period for expenditures (made in previous reporting periods) that have been disallowed, provide the following information:
- a. The activity name and number as shown in IDIS;
 - b. The program year(s) in which the expenditure(s) for the disallowed activity(ies) was reported;
 - c. The amount returned to line-of-credit or program account; and
 - d. Total amount to be reimbursed and the time period over which the reimbursement is to be made, if the reimbursement is made with multi-year payments.
10. Loans and other receivables
- a. List the principal balance for each float-funded activity outstanding as of the end of the reporting period and the date(s) by which the funds are expected to be received.
 - b. List the total number of other loans outstanding and the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period.
 - c. List separately the total number of outstanding loans that are deferred or forgivable, the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period, and the terms of the deferral or forgiveness.
 - d. Detail the total number and amount of loans made with CDBG funds that have gone into default and for which the balance was forgiven or written off during the reporting period.
 - e. Provide a List of the parcels of property owned by the grantee or its subrecipients that have been acquired or improved using CDBG funds and that are available for sale as of the end of the reporting period.
11. Lump sum agreements
- a. Provide the name of the financial institution.
 - b. Provide the date the funds were deposited.
 - c. Provide the date the use of funds commenced.
 - d. Provide the percentage of funds disbursed within 180 days of deposit in the institution.
12. Housing Rehabilitation – for each type of rehabilitation program for which projects/units were reported as completed during the program year
- a. Identify the type of program and number of projects/units completed for each program.
 - b. Provide the total CDBG funds involved in the program.
 - c. Detail other public and private funds involved in the project.
13. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies – for grantees that have HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategies
- a. Describe progress against benchmarks for the program year. For grantees with Federally-designated EZs or ECs that received HUD approval for a

neighborhood revitalization strategy, reports that are required as part of the EZ/EC process shall suffice for purposes of reporting progress.

Program Year 4 CAPER Community Development response:

1a. CDBG funds during the 2012-13 reporting period were used to address the following priority goals of the Consolidated Plan:

- PUBLIC SERVICES OBJECTIVE: CDBG funds should be used to promote "one community" by implementing programs that support a continuum of new or expanded housing and services targeted for the homeless, transitional housing clients, and persons with special needs.

For the 2012-13 program year, the City allocated \$80,000 to re-open the Renter Affordability Program that consisted of the Deposit and First Month's Rent Assistance activity. The goal was to assist 10 low- and very low-income households (50% or less of the AMI) with funds Security Deposit and First Month's Rent to help household to gain access decent, affordable, and sustainable housing. At the program year-end, \$8,885 was disbursed, assisting 12 families/households.

-HOUSING ACTIVITIES OBJECTIVES: CDBG funds should be used to strengthen neighborhoods by implementing affordable housing programs and services through acquiring, demolishing, and rehabilitating housing units that support homeowners, homebuyers, and renters to obtain and remain in affordable housing.

The Neighborhood Sustainability Program is the umbrella program that contains the following core program components: Homebuyer Assistance, Operation/Repair of Foreclosure Properties (Acquisition/Reuse), Dangerous Building Program (Slum and Blight program), Single Family Conversion Project, and the Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program.

For the 2013-13 program year, \$599,086, (not including administration) was allocated to cover the implementation of **all or some** of the above five project activities.

a. Under the Homebuyer Assistance Program, \$115,500 was allocated for this activity. Applications for the program were solicited during the year. Nine (9) applied for the program and seven (7) applicants participated in the Homebuyer Educational Seminar to learn more about the home buying process and if they qualify for the down payment and closing cost assistance. Determining eligibility and assisting in a home purchase will likely occur in the in the 2013-14 program year. Approximately \$307 was on spent during the program year for cost associated with the Homebuyer Educational Seminar.

b. Under Operation/ Repair of Foreclosure Properties Program, \$97,500, was allocated for this activity, including a re-allocation of approximately \$35,000 from the Housing Improvement, and Public Improvements budgets. There are five properties that were purchased under the Acquisition/Reuse Program that fall under the Operation/Repair of Foreclosure Program, to be rehabilitated and sold to first-time homebuyers. All five properties were tested for lead paint and radon as part of the work specifications. One of the five in particular was identified to be rehabilitated utilizing funding under this program of approximately \$40,000 along with funding from our 2009 Community Development Block Grant Recovery Program (CDBG-R) of approximately \$30,000. Under the CDBG-R Program, the funds were designated to utilize an existing single-family home by incorporating "go-green" features as part of the rehabilitation of the

property to create an environmentally friendly, healthy, affordable home. The green affordable home would then to be sold to an eligible, low or moderate income, first-time homebuyer, in conjunction with the City's CDBG Homebuyer Assistance Program. The solicitation of bids was completed and the rehabilitation work began in 2012-13, but was not completed by the end of that program year. Approximately \$88,918 was spent in 2012-13, of which \$30,676 was spent on the "go-green rehabilitation property, and the remainder (\$58, 242) was spent on property maintenance on the remaining properties.

c. Under the Neighborhood Home Improvement Program the initial allocation was \$378,896. However, the program was delayed from being implemented due to the City not being able to complete a Programmatic Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in order to streamline and expedite requirements when processing program applicants. The City will continue to work with SHPO to complete an agreement.

d. Under the Dangerous Buildings (Slum and Blight Program) \$45,000 (including administrative cost) was allocated. This program was not implemented in 2012-13 due to staff turnover and staff shortages in the Inspections Division. Funding for the program was re-allocated to the Renter Affordability Program.

e. Under the Single Family Conversion Pilot Program, \$25,000 was allocated. However, due to lack of interest from property owners, the funding for this activity was re-allocated to the Renter Affordability Program.

-PUBLIC FACILITIES OBJECTIVE: CDBG funds should be used to strengthen neighborhoods by implementing programs that will increase or improve public facilities, infrastructure, and services.

The Public Facilities Program is the umbrella program that contains the following core program activities: the Public Facilities Improvement Program and the Neighborhood Public Infrastructure Program.

a) The Facilities Improvement activity was designed to assist non-profit organizations with financial assistance to make repair to their facilities that house and/or provide services to homeless, very-low, and low-income residents. For the 2012-13 program year no fund were allocated for the Public Facilities Program.

b). Under the Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvement Program \$378,896 was initially allocated, of which approximately \$348,609 was spent installing approximately 1,537 linear feet (lf) of curb and gutter, 768.5 lf of new street paving, 327 square yards of driveway approaches, 590 square yards of sidewalk ramps, 589 lf of storm sewer pipe and 168 square feet of truncated domes. The population of LMI households in this census tract is 60.4%.

1b. Through the implementation of the Renter Affordability Program, Deposit and First Month's Rent Assistance during the reporting period, 12 households were assisted as follows:

White: 10; Hispanic: 0
African-American: 2; Hispanic: 0
Female Headed: 10
Elderly: 0

Disabled: 2
Homeless: 2
Section 8 Voucher Program Participants: 3
Those with incomes <30% of AMI: 10
Those with incomes <50% of AMI: 2
Speak English as primary language: 12
Read, write or speak English well: 12

Through the Homebuyer Assistance Program, all seven (7) applicants who attended and completed the Homebuyer Educational Seminar had incomes below 80% of the AMI.

Through the implementation of the Neighborhood Public Infrastructure Improvements Program, 60.4% of the households residing in that HUD designated low income census tract were LMI. The household characteristics types are as follows:

- White-1,016;
- African American-125
- Asian- 102
- American Indian- 2
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander-0
- Other Races-41
- Hispanic or Latino-119
- Non Hispanic or Lation-1,206
- Under 18 years of age-216
- Eighteen years of age and older-1,109
- 65 years of age and over-43

1c. In each of the programs implemented during the reporting period, CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited households in extremely low-, low-, and moderate-income households.

2a. Although there were no substantial changes in the three program goals and objectives, the City was unsuccessful in implementing the Single Family Conversion Program and the Dangerous Buildings activities, therefore they were suspended due to lack of interest from property owners and properties identified as dangerous buildings were either sold or repair by the current property. The City feels that these are both good programs to implement. More feedback from property owners and the Inspections Division will be sought before re-opening these programs. Additionally after numerous of communications and meeting the City still was unsuccessful in updating its programmatic agreement with SHPO. The City will continue to work with SHPO to obtain this necessary agreement.

3a. In implementing the Renter Affordability Program, the Neighborhood Public Improvements Program, the Operation/Repair Foreclosure Program and the Homebuyer Assistance Program and attempted the implementation of the Dangerous Buildings and Single Family Conversion Program, the City pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.

3b. During the reporting period, Youth and Shelter Services, Inc. continued to receive renewal funding through the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) for approximately \$128,330, of which approximately \$33,00 was designated for Story County. Assault Care Extending Shelter and Support (ACCESS) received \$40,000 of

ESG funding. Additionally, during the reporting period the City endorsed Youth and Shelter Services, Inc. Supportive Housing Program (SHP) renewal funding application request is for approximately \$194,918, of which approximately \$58,893 is designated for Story County.

3c. The City of Ames has continued to make every effort within its capacity and abilities during its ninth year as an entitlement community. It has not willfully attempted to hinder any aspects of administering the CDBG funds in accordance with its Consolidated Plan.

4a-b. The programs outlined and implemented during the reporting period have met the National Objectives and have complied with the overall benefit certification.

5a-c. No activities were implemented during the program year that involved Anti-displacement and Relocation for activities that involved acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property.

6a-c. The programs implemented during the reporting period did not include any economic development activities.

7a. For the activities implemented during the 2012-13 program year, all households receiving assistance were determined eligible either through third-party documentations/verifications, agency certifications regarding the populations that they serve, and/or HUD-designated low- and moderate-income census tracts.

8a-d. The Program Income Report (GPR09) indicates that \$4,945.46 was generated and \$4,945.46 expensed during the reporting period. The source of the program income generated was from the following activities: under the Homebuyer Assistance Program from down payment loan repayments in the amount of \$4,718.40, and \$227.06 from a security deposit reimbursement. Below are other accounts of program income:

1. Total program income to revolving funds: 0.00
Single-unit housing rehab.: Revolving fund-\$0.00
Multi-unit housing rehab.: Revolving fund-\$0.00
2. Float-funded activities: N/A
3. Other loan repayments by category:
Payments on economic development loans to the
Economic Development Council (sub-recipient) - \$0.00
4. Income received from sale of property for 2012-13: \$0.00

9a-d. Prior Period Adjustments: N/A

Reimbursement made for disallowed cost:

1. Activity name: N/A
Activity number: N/A
2. PY expenditure was reported: N/A
3. Amount returned to program account: N/A

10a-e. Loans and other receivables:

- a. Float-funded activities outstanding as of end of the reporting period: n/a
- b. Total number of loans outstanding and principal balance owed as of end of reporting period:
 - Single-family Down Payment Assistance revolving fund:
 - loans outstanding - 4
 - principal balance - \$24,700
 - Multi-unit housing rehab. revolving fund:
 - loans outstanding - 0
 - principal balance - \$0.00
 - Economic Development Council:
 - loans outstanding - 0
 - principal balance - \$0.00
- c. Parcels acquired or improved with CDBG funds that have sold and/or are available for sale as of end of reporting period:
 - 1620 Clark Avenue (sold to Habitat in 2010-11; sold by Habitat to a LMI Household in 2011-12)
 - 1621 Clark Avenue (sold to Habitat in 2010-11; rehabilitation completed; sold by Habitat to a LMI Household in 2010-11)
 - 3830 Minnetonka Avenue (re-sold to Habitat in 2010-11; rehabbed; sold by Habitat)
 - 3317 Morningside Street (being rehabbed using both CDBG-R & CDBG funds, to be sold in 13-14)
 - 1109 Roosevelt Avenue (possibly sold to Habitat in 13-14)
 - 306 Wellons Drive (will be rehabbed in 13-14)
 - 1222 Curtiss Avenue (will be rehabbed in 13-14)
 - 1126 Burnett Avenue (possibly to sold habitat in 13-14)
- d. Number and amount of loans in default and for which the balance was forgiven or written off during the reporting period: N/A
- e. Lump sum drawdown agreement: n/a

11a-d. The programs implemented during the reporting period did not include any lump sum agreements.

12a-c. The programs implemented during the reporting period did not include any housing rehabilitation activities under the Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program, however, both CDBG & CDBG-R funds were used to rehabilitate the Morningside Property to be sold to a LMI household in 13-14.

13a. The programs implemented during the reporting period did not include any Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies.

Antipoverty Strategy

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to reduce the number of persons living below the poverty level.

Program Year 4 CAPER Antipoverty Strategy response:

The ASSET group continues to be the largest funder of local Human Service agencies that allows the agencies to provide not only basic need services, but services that include counseling in the area of financial literacy, job interviewing skills, housing, transportation, medical and other services that can be attributed to reducing the number of persons living below the poverty level. Federal and State grants received by some of the Human Service and Shelter agencies also contain components to assist households with financial literacy skills.

Additionally, a new job opportunity initiative, called Project Iowa, in 2013 opened an office in Ames. The purpose of Project IOWA, Inc., (Iowa Opportunities for Workforce Advancement) is to develop a long-term, community-generated and sustained initiative to train unemployed and underemployed central Iowans with skills necessary to advance to career track, high wage jobs with full benefits. Project IOWA uses a holistic approach in training and up-skilling participants by braiding together what employers are seeking and addressing the needs of employees.

The outcome of Project IOWA is to improve workforce development efforts and impact systematic change in central Iowa through the following elements: (1) Deep, organic connection to the community of low wage workers through AMOS (a mid-Iowa organizing strategy organization) member congregations and community relationships; (2) Up-front job commitments for participants from select area employers in need of a skilled workforce; (3) Extensive wrap-around service and counseling assistance for all participants through training and employment

Governor Branstad has made a \$100,000 commitment to Project IOWA from the State of Iowa for the 2012-13 budget year. Other funders include Central Iowa Works, The Annie Casey Foundation and individual donations. To date AMOS has secured over \$200,000 in private funding to launch this economic development initiative.

Several employers in Ames have made commitments to participate in the program. More information is available at projectiowa.org.

NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

Non-homeless Special Needs

*Please also refer to the Non-homeless Special Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Identify actions taken to address special needs of persons that are not homeless but require supportive housing, (including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families).

Program Year 4 CAPER Non-homeless Special Needs response:

ASSET continues to be the largest funder for agencies implementing programs for special needs, homeless, non-homeless populations in the community. Also the Iowa Finance Authority funds and distributes supportive housing funds for persons with HIV/AIDS through a vary of agencies throughout the state. See Appendix III for a map of the areas of distribution.

Specific HOPWA Objectives

*Please also refer to the HOPWA Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Overall Assessment of Relationship of HOPWA Funds to Goals and Objectives
Grantees should demonstrate through the CAPER and related IDIS reports the progress they are making at accomplishing identified goals and objectives with HOPWA funding. Grantees should demonstrate:
 - a. That progress is being made toward meeting the HOPWA goal for providing affordable housing using HOPWA funds and other resources for persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through a comprehensive community plan;
 - b. That community-wide HIV/AIDS housing strategies are meeting HUD's national goal of increasing the availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing for low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS;
 - c. That community partnerships between State and local governments and community-based non-profits are creating models and innovative strategies to serve the housing and related supportive service needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families;
 - d. That through community-wide strategies Federal, State, local, and other resources are matched with HOPWA funding to create comprehensive housing strategies;
 - e. That community strategies produce and support actual units of housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS; and finally,
 - f. That community strategies identify and supply related supportive services in conjunction with housing to ensure the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families are met.

2. This should be accomplished by providing an executive summary (1-5 pages) that includes:
 - a. Grantee Narrative
 - i. Grantee and Community Overview
 - (1) A brief description of your organization, the area of service, the name of each project sponsor and a broad overview of the range/type of housing activities and related services
 - (2) How grant management oversight of project sponsor activities is conducted and how project sponsors are selected
 - (3) A description of the local jurisdiction, its need, and the estimated number of persons living with HIV/AIDS
 - (4) A brief description of the planning and public consultations involved in the use of HOPWA funds including reference to any appropriate planning document or advisory body
 - (5) What other resources were used in conjunction with HOPWA funded activities, including cash resources and in-kind contributions, such as the value of services or materials provided by volunteers or by other individuals or organizations

-
- (6) Collaborative efforts with related programs including coordination and planning with clients, advocates, Ryan White CARE Act planning bodies, AIDS Drug Assistance Programs, homeless assistance programs, or other efforts that assist persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.
 - ii. Project Accomplishment Overview
 - (1) A brief summary of all housing activities broken down by three types: emergency or short-term rent, mortgage or utility payments to prevent homelessness; rental assistance; facility based housing, including development cost, operating cost for those facilities and community residences
 - (2) The number of units of housing which have been created through acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction since 1993 with any HOPWA funds
 - (3) A brief description of any unique supportive service or other service delivery models or efforts
 - (4) Any other accomplishments recognized in your community due to the use of HOPWA funds, including any projects in developmental stages that are not operational.
 - iii. Barriers or Trends Overview
 - (1) Describe any barriers encountered, actions in response to barriers, and recommendations for program improvement
 - (2) Trends you expect your community to face in meeting the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, and
 - (3) Any other information you feel may be important as you look at providing services to persons with HIV/AIDS in the next 5-10 years
 - b. Accomplishment Data
 - i. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 1 of Actual Performance in the provision of housing (Table II-1 to be submitted with CAPER).
 - ii. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 2 of Comparison to Planned Housing Actions (Table II-2 to be submitted with CAPER).

Program Year 4 CAPER Specific HOPWA Objectives response:

1-2. Not applicable. The City of Ames does not receive HOPWA funding.

OTHER NARRATIVE

Include any CAPER information that was not covered by narratives in any other section.

Program Year 4 CAPER Other Narrative response: