

2021 CAPER DRAFT

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

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

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

The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for Program Year 2021 (July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022) represents the second CAPER of the State of Mississippi's Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development for Plan Years 2020 – 2024. The report presents the overriding strategies and goals of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development, including selected performance criteria associated with each goal and strategy. The objectives pursued were as follows: Reduce housing blight and blighting influences; Enhance the provision of quality affordable housing; Create, expand and retain more jobs for low- to moderate –income persons; Create, expand and maintain public infrastructure for the benefit of low- to moderate -income persons; Reduce the incidence of homelessness; and Provide housing for HIV/AIDS persons in Mississippi.

The HOME Program- Homeowner Rehabilitation, HOME Rental and CHDO set-a-side activities provided funding for the construction and rehabilitation of single-family homeownership and single & multi-family rental housing units for low-to-very low-income households. Mississippi Home Corporation (MHC) continues to provide safe, decent, affordable housing for families by addressing substandard housing needs through Homeowner Rehabilitation.

The HTF Program funds were allocated for the development of rental housing for extremely low-income families (30% AMI). MHC offered incentives to non-profit and for-profit organizations to apply for HTF funding, assist extremely low-income families and provide affordable rental housing in areas of need and opportunity. MHC assisted clients through HUD's Comprehensive Housing Counseling Program by bringing awareness of credit, budgeting, lending and building wealth.

ESG, HOPWA: This year MHC focused on best practices within program management for effective procedures and efficient outcomes from all HUD funded programs. In addition, MHC focused on removing silos between departments and agencies and improving effectiveness and outreach. MHC is working collaboratively with MDOT, the CoCs, CPS, MDA, MDOC, and other departments to increase services that will impact housing stability and poverty like transportation, employment, homeless youth, and housing. Staff met with these different departments

throughout the year to discuss ways programs can work together.

Additionally, the state supported fair housing education and enforcement for community members.

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

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

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Community Development	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	437500	86966	19.88%			
Community Development	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	0		87500	86966	99.39%
Disability and Access	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	2000	0	0.00%			

Disability and Access	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	300	0	0.00%			
Disability and Access	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	0	0		60	0	0.00%
Disability and Access	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit		476		400	476	119.00%
Disparities in Access to Opportunity	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	55	0	0.00%	11	11	100.00%
Disparities in Access to Opportunity	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	300	0	0.00%	60	0	0.00%
Disparities in Access to Opportunity	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	4250	2940	69.18%	850	0	0.00%
Disproportionate Housing Need	Affordable Housing Owner-occupied Rental	HOME: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	200	0	0.00%			
Disproportionate Housing Need	Affordable Housing Owner-occupied Rental	HOME: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	0	0		40	0	0.00%

Disproportionate Housing Need	Affordable Housing Owner-occupied Rental	HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	200	0	0.00%	40	0	0.00%
Economic Development	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	4100	1566	38.20%	820	1566	190.98%
Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Persons with disabilities	HOME: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	500	0	0.00%			
Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Persons with disabilities	HOME: \$	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	0	0		100	0	0.00%
Publicly Supported Housing	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Persons with Disabilities	HOME: \$	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	1750	0	0.00%	350	0	0.00%

Segregation	Affordable Housing Counseling	HOME: \$ / HTF: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1500	0	0.00%			
Segregation	Affordable Housing Counseling	HOME: \$ / HTF: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	475	0	0.00%	95	0	0.00%

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

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

HOPWA services were targeted to individuals and families with low-income (80% AMI) throughout the state of Mississippi. HOPWA’s goal was to serve 245 households during the reporting year; however, 476 households received services. The notable increase in HOPWA services was noted in STRMU mainly due to: 1) the impact of COVID on housing and income stability, 2) the decrease of HOPWA services in the Jackson area.

ESG services were targeted to individuals and families with extremely low income who are experiencing homelessness for at risk of becoming homeless. ESG's goal was to serve 4252 individuals; instead, ESG served 2940 individuals. The main reason for the decrease of ESG services is the impact of the CARES program that is not listed in this report. The CARES program is working to prevent and end homelessness during the pandemic.

The State designed the CDBG program to address critical economic and community development needs of the citizens of Mississippi. The funds were allocated to both public facilities and economic development activities. The state distributed CDBG funds statewide to eligible units of general local government using a competitive method of distribution process for public facility/infrastructure activities. These activities directly addressed the Plan Objective: Create, Expand and Retain More Jobs for Lower-Income Persons; and the two Strategies: Create or Expand Employment at For-Profit Businesses, and Invest in Eligible Infrastructure that Supports Better Paying Jobs. The expected/actual program year

measures from the table above include activities that have been completed and results in actual beneficiaries.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

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

91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG	HTF
White	32,243	1	92	1,363	6
Black or African American	51,030	53	563	1,429	129
Asian	343	0	2	10	0
American Indian or American Native	827	0	3	33	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	11	0	0	9	0
Total	84,454	54	660	2,844	135
Hispanic	835	0	8	76	0
Not Hispanic	1,677	54	663	2,840	135

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

Narrative

The above table does not account for individuals who identify as multi-racial or "don't know".

For the State's HOME program, the largest primary beneficiaries in the 2020 program year were Black or African Americans across all programs (53 HOME, 563 HOPWA, and 1,429 ESG). The second largest primary beneficiaries for the 2020 program year were White across all programs (1 HOME, 92 HOPWA, and 1,363 ESG). The third largest primary beneficiaries in the 2020 program year were American Indian or American Native across all programs (0 HOME, 3 HOPWA, and 33 ESG). The fourth largest primary beneficiaries in the 2020 program year were Asian across all programs (0 HOME, 2 HOPWA, and 10 ESG). The fifth largest primary beneficiaries for the 2020 program year were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander across all programs (0 HOME, 0 HOPWA, and 9 ESG). The largest primary beneficiaries in the 2020 program year by ethnicity were Not Hispanic across all programs (54 HOME, 663 HOPWA, and 2,840 ESG). The second largest primary beneficiaries in the 2020 program year by ethnicity were Hispanic across all program areas (0 HOME, 8 HOPWA, and 76 ESG).

MHC is actively targeting outreach to Limited English-Speaking populations, and other racial and ethnic families. The largest percentage of families assisted with ESG funds for the 2020 program year were Black or African American, White and the ethnicity category Not Hispanic. The largest percentage of families assisted with HOPWA funds for the program year were Black or African American and the ethnicity category was Not Hispanic. The largest percentage of families assisted with HOME funds for the 2020 program year were Black or African American and the ethnicity category was Not Hispanic. The racial and ethnic status of families assisted with ESG and HOPWA funds can be found in the SAGE attachment for ESG and the HUD-40110-D for HOPWA.

For the State's CDBG program, the largest primary beneficiaries for the 2020 program year were White and Black or African Americans. Reconciliation of all closed funded projects within the program were reviewed that may reflect differently in the federal reporting system.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	public - federal	26,614,222	9,937,919
HOME	public - federal	10,256,790	1,937,421
HOPWA	public - federal	1,671,519	2,357,173
ESG	public - federal	2,369,654	4,227,694
HTF	public - federal	3,000,000	818,582

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

Resources made available are identified as the amount of CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA and Housing Trust Fund Allocations received for 2020 program year. The amount of funds expended, during the 2020 program year for the HOME program included Rental, Rehabilitation, and Reconstruction activities. HTF funds were used for affordable rental housing during the program year. The amount of funds expended, during the 2020 program year for the ESG program included Emergency Shelter, Street Outreach, Homeless Prevention, Rapid Re-Housing and HMIS. The amount of funds expended, during the 2020 program year for the HOPWA Program included STRMU, TBRA, Master Leasing and Supportive Services. The amount of funds awarded and expended during the 2020 program year for ESG and HOPWA covers multiple grants during this period.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Non-Entitlement Entities	100	100	CDBG funds are available to non-entitlement entities
Statewide		100	Funds are not targeted geographically, but are available statewide.

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)- The state provides CDBG funds to units of general local government statewide to non-entitlement jurisdictions on a competitive, or per economic development project basis, and does not provide for geographic targeting.

The State of Mississippi's HOME Program administered by MHC covers the entire State of Mississippi. Funds are not targeted geographically but are available statewide.

HOME Program - Funding for Homeowner Rehabilitation, HOME Rental, and CHDO activities were distributed based on a competitive application process. Local units of government submitted applications for funding and once those applications were received, the applications were reviewed for Threshold Requirements. Applications that passed the Threshold Review were reviewed, scored and ranked. CHDO set-aside funds were provided to eligible non-profit organizations through a certification and proposal process prior to submitting application for funding.

The ESG program is administered Statewide including identified non-entitlement communities. ESG funding is allocated using a competitive process by which applications are reviewed for Threshold Requirements, then reviewed and rated according to specific rating factors and ranked according to the scores attained. Funding is provided based on the ranking and amount of funds available.

HOPWA funding is provided through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. RFPs are reviewed and ranked according to specific rating factors. Funds are awarded based on ranking and available funds.

The National Housing Trust Fund Program covers the entire State of Mississippi. Housing Trust Fund Program (HTF)- HTF funds are awarded on a competitive basis. MHC used a scoring and ranking process to select projects for funding. The application process consists of Threshold Review and Application Scoring. Eligible applicants are Non-profit and For-profit organizations with demonstrated development experience and capacity with creating, rehabilitating, or preserving affordable housing.

Leveraging

Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

ESG: Funds were leveraged from the CHOICE program to house more individuals experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness with serious mental illness. During the reporting year, CHOICE housed 89 individuals who also qualified for ESG assistance. All ESG funded agencies met 100% of their ESG match. Other resources used for ESG Match included private funds, Veteran Affairs funds, and additional funds at the agency level.

HOPWA: Funds were leveraged through University Medical Center and the Ryan White Program to provide more housing, support, and health resources to individuals who qualified for HOPWA services.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)- The state did not directly leverage funds for CDBG. The state requires units of general local government to match CDBG economic development funds with a 10% investment and the benefiting business to invest a dollar for dollar match of CDBG funds. The state requires units of general local government to provide an unspecified match of certain competitive public facility applications according to the approved method of distribution.

The State did not directly leverage funds for HOME and Housing Trust Fund. Mississippi is declared as a fiscally distressed state; therefore, the HOME Program and Housing Trust funds are exempt from the Match Requirement by 100%. HOME/CHDO projects and homebuyer assistance activities are representative of identifying “other” funding. Those funds were sourced by bank loans, other grant opportunities, and owner’s contributions. HTF funds were used for the purpose of gap financing and other funding sources required to ensure projects are financially feasible. This included low income housing tax credit and other private, state and local funds. There were no publicly owned land or property located within the state that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

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

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at begin-ning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
102,090	135,645	110,975	0	126,760

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	1,567,399	0	0	1,567,399	0	0
Number	15	0	0	15	0	0
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	1,567,399	10,000	1,557,399			
Number	15	2	13			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0			
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			

Table 8 - Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

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

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		0		0		
Businesses Displaced		0		0		
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0		0		
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0		0		
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

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

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	450	0
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	665	0
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	400	0
Total	1,515	0

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	350	0
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	115	0
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	65	86
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	125	0
Total	655	86

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

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

The State's progress in rehabbing existing units exceeded the goal by 132%. A number of other activities are on-going and cannot be counted as actual. The state continues to provide affordable housing to extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons.

There are two rental components under HOME: Rental and CHDO. Projects under these programs were awarded but pending loan closing and construction of development units. However, the HOME and HTF

programs implemented incentives to increase special needs units in developments. This will contribute to the number of households to be supported. HOME and HTF awards were reserved for non-profit and for-profit organizations committing to special needs affordable housing units designated for disabled and homeless families/individuals.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

The outcomes will impact future annual actions plans by showing a larger number/percentage of households supported through rental assistance, rehab, acquisition of existing units and production of new units. The HTF Program actual outcome will increase rental assistance, production of new units, and rehabilitation of existing units for rental housing due to the interest shown by non-profit and for-profit applicants. The number of households supported through the HOME Program will increase due to the percentage of funding allocated for Homeowner Rehabilitation and the improvement of the application and funding process. This increase will reflect in the acquisition, production and rehabilitation of existing units state-wide. In addition, extremely low-income household will receive assistance from ESG, HOPWA, HOME and HTF funding.

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

Number of Households Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual	HTF Actual
Extremely Low-income	0	24	86
Low-income	0	7	
Moderate-income	0	4	
Total	0	35	

Table 13 – Number of Households Served

Narrative Information

The HOME actual count reflects the number of households served under the HOME Program activities, Homeowner Rehabilitation & Reconstruction and Rental. HOME Rental does target moderate income for Homeowner Rehab. CDBG focus is on public facilities/infrastructure activities which serve low and moderate-income individuals and economic development activities which provides job opportunities to low and moderate-income individuals, housing is not an eligible activity under the State's CDBG Program.

Applications received were pending due to funding, loan closing and construction contributed to goal not met for households supported through HOME and HTF, households supported through Rental Assistance and acquisition of existing units.

Worse Case Needs: MHC addresses the "worse case needs" for meeting the needs for persons with disabilities, low, very low, and extremely low-income individuals by eliminating shortage of rental housing, increasing homeownership, and reducing individuals from living in substandard housing in the State. The information provided reflects beneficiaries who received HOME assistance in the areas of (Rehabilitation/Reconstruction and Rental Activities). During the program year, the HOME program was inclusive of Rental Housing, CHDO and Homeowner Rehab/Reconstruction activities for low-income families living in substandard housing; eliminate the shortage of housing for people with disability, and provide decent, safe and affordable housing for these low, very low and extremely low-income households by homeownership and rental housing. MHC's allocated the largest percent of HOME funds to HOME Rehabilitation. HOME funds are eligible for Rental & to be used in conjunction with (LIHTC) developments to address the shortage of rental housing for extremely low income and very low-income families. Applications received for HOME were pending approval for funding & loan closing. To prohibit these families from paying more than 30% of their household income, sources of rental assistance is encouraged. Developers received incentive points for designating units in developments for ELI households with disabilities including serious mental illness under MS Olmstead Initiative. This Initiative is designed to provide community-based housing options for person with serious mental illness released from institutional care, persons who have been incarcerated or homeless with serious mental illness diagnosis or occurrence of hospitalization.

HTF primary focus is to address the shortage and eliminate shortage of rental housing for extremely low-income households and assist households from paying more than 30% of their household income for rent. HTF provides for the development or rehab of rental units for targeted populations.

Applicants address the following priorities: 1) Rental housing needs of extremely low (30% of AMI) and very low-income (50% of AMI) households; 2) Target at least 10% of units in each property to address prevention, reduction, and expansion of permanent housing opportunities for persons experiencing homelessness and persons with serious mental illness; 3) located within priority areas defined by the State's Consolidated Plan.

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

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

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

During the year, MHC has worked with the BoS CoC, ODHC, and the Central CoC to fund street outreach programs through ESG, implement a functional Coordinated Entry System, and reach those experiencing homelessness, including unsheltered homelessness. In addition, MHC has taken steps to implement systematic reporting in HMIS that shows the number of individuals served who are sheltered and unsheltered, homeless and the number of individuals who return to homelessness after receiving services.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

In Mississippi, there are not enough emergency shelters to provide shelter to all unsheltered homeless individuals. The greatest impact of the need for shelters is felt in rural Mississippi, the BoS CoC area. To help fill the gap where shelter is needed, the BoS uses ESG funding to provide shelter and hotel/motel vouchers to individuals who have no other resources.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

During the reporting year, MHC has taken some action steps to ensure extremely low-income individuals exiting public funded institutions do not be released into homelessness. Some initiatives MHC is working on include:

- CHOICE program- The CHOICE program provides housing and case management support to individuals exiting psychiatric hospitals with a history of severe mental illness. MHC uses funds allocated from legislation due to the Olmsted act to provide housing support. Individuals assisted by this program often transition to a public housing voucher.
- HOPE program- The HOPE program is a partnership between MHC, CPS, CoC, TVRHA PHA, Youth Villages, MDoT, and others to provide housing support and case management to youth aging out of state care into homelessness. ESG funds will be used to help with deposits and case management.

- Reentry program- State Reentry programs, Department of Corrections, MHC, and CoC are working together to see how ESG funds can be used to prevent homelessness among individuals exiting correctional facilities with no housing options.

The HOPE and the Reentry programs are newly implemented programs that are expected to function similarly to the CHOICE program. There is still a lot of work to be done in testing and implementing the HOPWA and Reentry program.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

MHC works with the local CoCs and provides input on some CoCs Coordinated Entry policies and procedures to ensure that HUD prioritized homeless populations are served without overlooking other homeless populations. In Mississippi, two out of the three CoCs have declared a functional end to Veterans' homelessness and are diligently working towards ending chronic homelessness in their communities. As needed ESG and HOPWA funds were used with CoC and VA SSFV funds to quickly house individuals experiencing homelessness.

ESG and HOPWA services are provided with a case manager and supportive services to help homeless individuals quickly transition from shelter to permanent housing placement. MHC also works with PHAs and other programs to prioritize formerly homeless individuals and homeless youth through TVRHA PHA.

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

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

MHC has worked to educate PHA on the need to target services to the homeless populations. Some actions taken by MHC includes:

- Asking PHAs to add homelessness in their plan.
- Working with the HOPE program to access housing vouchers for homeless youth aging out of state services.

Public Housing Authorities are eligible and encouraged to apply for funding through the National Housing Trust Fund (HTF) Program for either construction, acquisition or rehabilitation of rental units. The HTF Program is designed to serve ELI households and promote the use of rental assistance for affordability. Developers awarded HTF funds are subject to incentives, during the application process. Additional points are awarded, when applicants provide supportive services appropriate for the population being served. Supportive services will assist in addressing the needs of public housing by building wealth and assets among tenants, particularly, special needs population such as, homeless and serious mentally ill.

Local housing authorities are encouraged to work with regional housing authorities to provide rental assistance to address the affordability of rent for low, very low and extremely low-income households targeted by the HTF & HOME Program. HTF and HOME funds are used in conjunction with each other and serve as source of funding in the form of gap financing. This source of funding ensures financial feasibility of developments. Housing Authorities are subject to HUD's regulation of eligibility in seeking funding under these programs. Based on the criteria required by HUD to form partnerships, housing authorities may consider partnering with for-profit or non-profit developers to develop affordable housing. The State of Mississippi is working closely with mental health facilities to address issues related to the MS Olmstead Act. The housing authorities are a vital part of this process. MHC collaborated with public housing authorities in preparing a joint/regional Analysis of Impediment. As a result, the collaboration effort enhanced the ability to identify barriers and needs among housing authorities statewide. MAHRO serves as the lead instrument in coordinating this process with PHAs.

MHC encourages PHAs to apply for funding through the National Housing Trust Fund (HTF) Program for either construction, acquisition or rehabilitation of rental units. The HTF Program is designed to serve ELI households and promote the use of rental assistance for affordability. Developers awarded HTF funds are subject to incentives, during the application process. Additional points are awarded, when applicants provide supportive services appropriate for the population being served. Supportive services may assist in addressing the needs of public housing by building wealth and assets among

tenants, particularly, special needs population such as, homeless and serious mentally ill.

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

The following actions were taken by MHC to encourage public housing residents to become more involve in management and participation in homeownership: MHC engaged participation of Public Housing Authorities through the development of the Annual Action Plan and participation in the MHC's Annual Advisory Meeting. Invitations were extended to representatives of Public Housing Authorities to attend MHC's Annual Advisory Meeting for the purpose of providing input on housing needs for people with disabilities and the overall distribution of grant funds. Suggestions were made to ensure that Federal Program funding assist rental housing and homeownership for people with disabilities, extremely low, very low and low- income households. Public housing authorities created an active resident council to develop rich and meaningful service and delivery plans in order to engage residents/tenants in activities and services. MHC utilized this concept by recruiting MAHRO and PHA's Resident Council to serve as Program and Community Participants in collaboration with MHC to address the impact of homeownership and housing in the State. MHC collaborated with MAHRO for the development of a state-wide analysis of impediment to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing. As a result, public housing residents will become more involved in management and participation in creating homeownership. Notifications were published in the local newspapers of general circulation in each area, as well as The Clarion Ledger, Jackson Advocate, and LA Noticia MS in Jackson, MS. In addition, MHC's HUD Housing Counseling grant program worked with several PHAs on funding homebuyer education activity for households eligible for Homeownership Vouchers.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

MHC cannot identify particular troubled PHAs; however, local housing authorities are encouraged to work with regional housing authorities to provide rental assistance to address the affordability of rent for low, very low and extremely low-income households targeted by the HTF & HOME Program. HTF and HOME funds are used in conjunction with each other and serve as source of funding in the form of gap financing. This source of funding ensures financial feasibility of developments. Based on the criteria required by HUD to form partnerships, housing authorities may consider partnering with for-profit or non-profit developers to develop affordable housing. The State of Mississippi is working closely with mental health facilities to address issues related to the MS Olmstead Act. The housing authorities are a vital part of this process. MHC collaborated with public housing authorities in preparing a joint/regional Analysis of Impediment. As a result, the collaboration effort enhanced the ability to identify barriers, needs and solutions in assisting troubled PHAs statewide. MAHRO serves as the lead instrument in coordinating this process with PHAs.

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

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

The State recognizes many factors that impact the need to remove barriers to affordable housing, most of the barriers stem from things outside the control of the State, such as the cost of land and materials. Nonetheless, the State encouraged the development and promotion of affordable housing through the use of funding through the HOME and HTF Programs. The State continues to utilize tax incentives for homeowners and encourage communities to allow more affordable housing options.

Mississippi used HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and HTF funds to help ameliorate barriers that made it difficult for low, very low, and extremely low individuals to access affordable housing in the following ways:

- The Annual Action Plan allocates HOME funds for homeownership and rental for persons with Disabilities, Individuals with intellectual, developmental, or physical disabilities. HOME and HTF application processes include incentive points for applicants that dedicate a percentage of rental units to serve ELI and low-income individuals with serious mental illness. Units assisted by HTF will target extremely low-income households at 30% of AMI. A portion of ESG funds support activities connecting persons with Serious Mental Illness to housing and services.
- HOME funds for homeowner repair includes incentive points that will reward communities that connect homeowner repair activities with areas undergoing concerted revitalization. MHC also including incentive points for connecting supportive services, such as GED programs, financial counseling, health and wellness, with homeowners who are being assisted by homeowner or housing replacement activity.

The lack of housing dollars, public or private dollars, is currently the major barrier to producing affordable housing to meet documented needs; the lack of sufficient household income for affordable housing results in non-activity by developers, unless federal funds, state dollars, or other incentives are offered; the lack of infrastructure in rural areas is considered a barrier due to the fact that development is controlled primarily by availability of water, sewer, and electricity. Cost becomes a major factor in affordable housing production.

The tax structure for the State allows homeowners to file and receive Homestead Exemption, lowering monthly mortgage payment considerably, taxes are assessed at a rate lower than that of rental or commercial properties. The higher assessment rate on rental properties is normally incorporated into the monthly rental fee. This tax structure directly affects the return on residential investment and serves as a disincentive to the production of affordable rental property.

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

The State of Mississippi continues to serve underserved households by providing financing for the ongoing development of affordable housing as well as financing the rehabilitation of homes for people and families who are low- income, elderly, and persons with disabilities.

The availability of funding is an obstacle that limits the ability of the State to meet all underserved needs. In the CDBG Program within the public facilities activity, the funding is divided between "small government" and "regular government". This allows those with a certain number in population to compete against jurisdictions of the same size. Also, there is a difference in "match requirement" for each of these categories.

HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and HTF funds were used to help ameliorate barriers that make it difficult for low and extremely low individuals to access affordable housing. During the application process, MHC provides incentive points for connecting supportive services to homeowner rehabilitation activities where areas are undergoing concerted revitalization. MHC will set aside a portion of HOME funds to assist in meeting the housing needs for people with disabilities. These funds will be available state-wide to assist in promoting homeownership by providing DPA and closing cost. HOME and HTF Programs provide incentive points for dedication of a portion of rental units for low and extremely low-income individuals at 30% AMI with serious mental illness.

ESG funds supported activities in Continua of Care that connected persons with Serious Mental Illness to housing and services. HOPWA Program addressed obstacles to meet housing needs for HIV/AIDS beneficiaries. TBRA, Permanent Supportive Housing, Transitional/Short-term Housing and Supportive Services were provided.

HOME and HTF funding along with LIHTC addressed obstacles in serving the "underserved", particularly ELI households, homeless, and persons with serious mental illness. MHC engaged participation of Public Housing Authorities and other entities through the development of the Annual Action Plan and participation in the MHC's Annual Advisory meeting. MHC and MDA worked along with Entitlements, PHAs to conduct a joint Analysis of Impediment (AI) for the State.

Services were also provided to the "underserved" through MHC's HUD Housing Counseling network. The network provided counseling and education services to households below 30% of AMI. Counseling agencies worked with PHAs and other social service organizations in providing one-on-one counseling and/or group education classes/workshops. Housing counseling and education services provided by our housing counseling network: Rental counseling, homebuyer counseling/education classes, post-purchase counseling and foreclosure prevention services. Financial literacy includes budgeting and credit counseling, which are elements of the counseling and education services provided.

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

Based on federal program requirements, the following actions are required to reduce lead-based paint hazards: 1) homeowner rehabilitation - remediation will take place as a result of testing performed to

detect the presence and the action taken to reduce or eliminate the hazard through rehabilitation or reconstruction of the owner-occupied units built prior to 1978; 2) substantial rehabilitation of rental units - remediation will take place as a result of testing performed to detect the presence and the action taken to reduce or eliminate the hazard through rehabilitation; 3) ESG and HOPWA activities address lead based paint hazards on units built prior to 1978 and occupied by household members that are under 6 years of age, inspection is required and if present other housing would be located; 4) Homebuyer Assistance activities are subject to addressing lead based paint hazards on units built prior to 1978. In addition, the approach to implement lead hazard evaluation and reduction; Identify and stabilize deteriorated paint.

Through MHC's HUD Housing Counseling network, many agencies provided information on lead-based paint hazards during their housing counseling and education classes. HUD Housing Counseling awarded agencies that provide pre-purchase/homebuying, post-purchase, or rental counseling and education services are required to provide clients information on lead-based paint hazards. MHC also has a partnership with the Green and Healthy Homes Initiative to provide lead-based paint training to our counselors and provide awareness to households throughout the state. The Green and Healthy Homes Initiative provided a training at our Affordable Housing Conference during the period of performance on lead-based paint hazards and provided resources to those in attendance to distribute to households in their service area.

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

By addressing the housing needs of Mississippians who are low-income, the state is working to help reduce the number of poverty-level families. Numerous studies show that housing plays a critical role in providing stability to poor families.

HOPWA Addresses Poverty-Level Households: MHC's HOPWA program will aid in reducing the number of poverty-level households by increasing the availability of affordable housing and providing supportive services (case management, STRMU, TBRA, PHP, FB, and other eligible support) to those living with HIV with low income and their families and by providing HOPWA supportive services. Through HOPWA development, MHC seeks to support rehabilitation and construction projects (if available) that will target affordable units to the HOPWA population. While many HOPWA clients assisted may be at poverty-level, this is not a requirement under 24 CFR §574.3

ESG Addresses Poverty-Level Households: The ESG Program funds activities that provide shelter, housing, and essential services for homeless persons, as well as intervention services for persons threatened with homelessness. Essential services for homeless persons include medical and psychological counseling, employment counseling, substance abuse treatment, transportation, and other services. Through subgrantees, MHC assists households with rent, security and utility deposit assistance, case management, and other supportive services. Focusing on Housing First, but not only, ESG services can include job training and General Education Development ("GED") support to help individuals access and sustain housing and improve employment options and increase their economic

independence and self-sufficiency. While MHC supports the use of ESG funds to help ESG clients lift themselves above the poverty line, it is not a specific initiative for which MHC earmarks ESG funding or that MHC monitors for the ESG Program.

For individuals threatened with homelessness, homelessness prevention funds can be used for short-term subsidies to defray rent and utility arrearages for households receiving late notices, and security deposits.

CDBG provides funding for economic development activities to create jobs made available to at least 51% low and moderate-income persons. This will help reduce the number of poverty-level families by providing economic opportunities and encouraging economic self-sufficiency.

MHC has set forth requirements in the Homeowner Rehabilitation, Home Rental/CHDOs and HTF applications process requiring supportive services are made available to those who benefit from federal funds. The focus is to provide asset and wealth building for these individuals and families. MHC's HUD Housing Counseling grant program worked with PHAs on funding homebuyer education activity for households eligible for Homeownership Vouchers. In addition, MHC's HUD Housing Counseling agencies are available to assist PHA's in preparing residents for homeownership through pre-purchase counseling and homebuyer education. Those participating in the Homeownership Voucher program are required to take an 8-hour homebuyer education class. The homebuyer education class provides information from the beginning to the end of the homebuying process. Also available to residents of PHAs are budgeting/financial counseling, credit counseling and rental counseling. All counseling and education services provided are designed to assist with asset and wealth building.

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

The State of Mississippi does not provide funding for institutional structure activities.

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

The State of Mississippi will continue to provide HOME funding for homebuyer assistance activities through eligible contractors/HUD approved housing counseling agencies, which provides pre-purchase counseling and education services. Housing counseling agencies have established relationships with social service agencies, realtors, lenders and other governmental agencies. The coordination between these agencies enhance the relationships between public and private housing and social service agencies.

In the homeowner rehabilitation category, coordination between the Mississippi Department of Health and local units of government assisted in the enhancement of providing adequate disposal systems as

required by State Law. In all of the housing programs, coordination with social service agencies, housing authorities, other housing agencies, local governmental agencies, state governmental agencies, and federal governmental agencies is vital in completing task for federal programs.

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

The Mississippi Development Authority, Community Services Division (CSD) continues to Affirmatively Furthering Fair housing by sponsoring the HEED Conference annually. CSD required all sub-recipients to adhere to the fair housing requirements by resolution, proclamation during fair housing month in April and conducting a fair housing activity.

The State of Mississippi's actions to overcome impediments to fair housing choice was addressed through educational outreach, public hearings, citizen participation, publications, compliance trainings, program implementation workshops and funding. Public hearings were held virtually statewide due to the COVID-19 pandemic. During these hearings, attendees were informed and provided material pertaining to FHEO requirements and the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule.

An MHC staff member also serves as a board member for HEED. Through MHC's HUD Housing Counseling program, counseling agencies attempted to overcome the effects impediments to fair housing choice by educating buyers through credit counseling and home purchase training; provided training and information on how to establish and keep good credit, particularly for first time homebuyers. Fair housing Information was provided to individuals/families at various stages of the homeownership process, renters and homeowners trying to avoid foreclosure. Additionally, housing counselors provided clients information on their fair housing rights, protected classes, and AFFH.

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

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

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

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

The State of Mississippi's Public Notice for the 2021 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Review (CAPER)/Draft will be published in The Clarion Ledger, Jackson Advocate, La Noticia, Mississippi, and the Sun Herald newspapers as part of the public input process for the development of the performance reports for the previous year. MDA mailed a statewide CSD Instruction and Program Bulletin was mailed statewide to all units of general local government and other interested parties of the availability of the CAPER for public comment. The 2021 CAPER Draft was made available on the Mississippi Home Corporation website at www.mshomecorp.com and the Mississippi Development Authority website at www.mississippi.org. Copies were made available upon request at Mississippi Home Corporation at 735 Riverside Drive, Jackson, Mississippi 39202 during the office hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Public access including the availability to persons with disabilities and non-English speaking persons were available upon request. The CAPER was available for more than the 15-day public comment period beginning Tuesday, September 13, 2022, through Wednesday September 28, 2022.

The Public Notice for the 2021 Caper/Draft was published to obtain comments from the public for a period of at least 15 days from September 13, 2022 – September 28, 2022, for the CDBG Program.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

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

The state continues to use Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding for economic development and community development activities to enhance the growth and development of local communities with a direct benefit for low to moderate income citizens.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?

No

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

CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

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

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

The list of projects that should have been inspected on-site for this program year, based on the schedule 92.504 are attached. The list includes projects that were inspected along with summary of issues and deficiencies detected, during inspections are disclosed in the CAPER. In addition, projects that were not inspected along with reasons and remedies to the situation are addressed and disclosed in the CAPER. Projects due for inspections were completed and inspected according to 92.504 (d). See attachment under Administration of the CAPER.

During the period July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021, the common deficiencies found were smoke detector replacement/batteries, faucet repair, toilet stabilization, and fire extinguisher replacement.

During the Program Year, projects were selected for inspection based on risk analysis, compliance and rescheduling of projects with previous deficiencies. As a result, some projects were not inspected, during the time period of the CAPER's Program Year. MHC will continue with the inspection of these missed projects in a timely manner to: 1) eliminate a gap in the inspection of projects and activities in order to reduce risk associated with projects; 2) continue to track performance; 3) monitor the period of affordability, and; 4) adhere to regulation at 92.04 (d).

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

The State of Mississippi enforces affirmative marketing actions to include methods of informing the public about fair housing laws by presenting information at federal programs workshops, setting up booths and distributing FHEO material. Incorporating the Fair Housing logo on documentation and material distributed, Ensuring the posting of Fair Housing posters in English and Spanish and in areas that are concentrated with Vietnamese speaking persons. Pre-homebuyer counseling is required for applicants seeking homebuyer assistance funding. During the counseling session, affirmatively marketing is addressed. Throughout the year, MHC actively promotes fair housing to ensure citizens awareness of opportunities that exist. Project signs disclosing FHEO logo are required on rental properties. Affirmative Marketing plans are required by all HOME grant recipients to encourage outreach to those persons who are not likely to apply for housing assistance. The outreach to minority and women owned businesses is encouraged in the HOME Homeowner Rehabilitation and Rental activities. This outreach is vital to recipients of the HOME funding because future application rating

factors include the use of minority/women owned businesses on previous awards. During the monitoring process, the State verifies solicitation for services/contractors to minority/women owned businesses and Section 3 requirements. MHC finalizes the collaboration efforts with the State's Public Housing Authorities and Entitlement communities in preparation of a joint/regional Analysis of Impediment. As a result, the collaboration effort enhanced the ability to conduct affirmative outreach, identify barriers and the needs of housing statewide. MHC made effort to adhere to 92.351 (b) by conducting outreach during virtual public hearings held. In addition, outreach was conducted by advertising virtual public hearings on MHC's website and in newspapers state-wide. MHC also conducted outreach among Limited English Proficiency populations to ensure knowledge and federal programs availability.

HUD approved housing counseling agencies are also required to display Fair Housing posters within their lobby and counseling areas. Additionally, MHC included the Fair Housing poster in English within homebuyer's guidebooks, which are distributed throughout the state to those interested in homeownership.

As a requirement for homebuyer assistance funding under the HOME program, applicants must attend an 8-hour homebuyer education course from a HUD approved housing counseling agency. During the homebuyer education course, housing counselors provide information on the homeownership process as well as fair housing rights, protected classes, and AFFH.

Throughout the year MHC's counseling network will address affirmative marketing through homebuyer fairs, resource materials, education classes, and counseling services. An example of fair housing information that is distributed is HUD's Fair Housing – Equal Opportunity for All booklet. These affirmative marketing actions not only promote fair housing but also ensures citizens are aware of the opportunities that exist.

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

Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period: \$102,089.60

Amount received during reporting period: \$135,645.47

Total amount expended during reporting period: \$110,975.12

Amount expended for TBRA: \$0.00

Balance on hand at end of reporting period: \$126,759.95

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

91.320(j)

The State of Mississippi will directly allocate funding to eligible entities to provide down payment/closing cost assistance to eligible disabled and non-disabled households throughout the state. This set-aside provides for long-term affordable housing for low and extremely low-income households. Housing activities under this program demonstrate low default rates and the periods of affordability are satisfied. Applicants will receive in-depth counseling and offered extensive technical assistance before and after loan closings. Eligible entities will promote fair housing and ensure citizens are aware of these opportunities.

During the reporting period, the State received an allocation of \$3,000,000 for providing and maintaining affordable rental housing for extremely low-income households under the National Housing Trust Fund Program (HTF). This program is designed to include the coordination of LIHTC for the development of affordable housing. Incentives are offered for LIHTC Developers to construct and rehab developments for the extremely low-income households, which are inclusive of homeless and serious mental ill populations. In addition, HOME Funds are available for Rental Housing set-aside and Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO) Developments. These activities are also coordinated to work in conjunction with LIHTC developments. The State of Mississippi will continue coordinating HOME and HTF funds with LIHTC.

CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)

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

Table for report on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	119	189
Tenant-based rental assistance	160	185
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	71	0
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	0	0

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Narrative

During the reporting year, MHC had two HOPWA Development projects that will provide 10 units and 14 beds; however, these units were still being completed during the reporting year and not occupied.

During the program year July 1, 2020 - June 30,2021, the actual goal for short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family exceeded the one-year goal by 159% (one-year goal 119 compared to 189 actual).

During the program year July 1, 2020 - June 30,2021, the actual goal for Tenant-based rental assistance exceeded the one-years goal by 116% (one-year goal 160 compared to 185 actual).

During the program year July 1, 2020 - June 30,2021, the actual goal for Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased or operated with HOPWA funds were not exceeded by actual (one-year goal 71 compared to 0 actual).

During the program year July 1, 2020 - June 30,2021, the actual goal for Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds was 0% (one-year goal 0 compared to 0 actual).

During the program year July 1, 2020 - June 30,2021, the actual total goals exceeded the one-year goals by 107%.

CR-56 - HTF 91.520(h)

Describe the extent to which the grantee complied with its approved HTF allocation plan and the requirements of 24 CFR part 93.

Tenure Type	0 – 30% AMI	0% of 30+ to poverty line (when poverty line is higher than 30% AMI)	% of the higher of 30+ AMI or poverty line to 50% AMI	Total Occupied Units	Units Completed, Not Occupied	Total Completed Units
Rental	0	0	85	85	1	86
Homebuyer	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 15 - CR-56 HTF Units in HTF activities completed during the period

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

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name MISSISSIPPI
Organizational DUNS Number 809399686
EIN/TIN Number 646000736
Identify the Field Office JACKSON
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance Gulf Port/Gulf Coast Regional CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix Ms.
First Name Lisa
Middle Name
Last Name Coleman
Suffix 0
Title Sr. Vice President of Federal Grants

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	735 Riverside Dr
Street Address 2	0
City	Jackson
State	MS
ZIP Code	-
Phone Number	601718464757
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	lisa.coleman@mshc.com

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	Ms.r
First Name	Tamara
Last Name	Stewart
Suffix	0
Title	AVP of Federal Grants Management
Phone Number	6017184654
Extension	0
Email Address	tamara.stewart@mshc.com

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date	07/01/2020
Program Year End Date	06/30/2021

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

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: MULTI-COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICE AGENCY
City: Meridian
State: MS
Zip Code: 39301, 6411
DUNS Number:
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: CARE LODGE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SHELTER

City: Meridian

State: MS

Zip Code: 39302, 5331

DUNS Number: 062719963

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: THE CENTER FOR VIOLENCE PREVENTION

City: Pearl

State: MS

Zip Code: 39288, 6279

DUNS Number: 879721124

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: GULF COAST WOMEN'S CENTER FOR NONVIOLENCE

City: Biloxi

State: MS

Zip Code: 39533, 0333

DUNS Number: 154890776

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: S.A.F.E., INC.

City: Tupelo

State: MS

Zip Code: 38804, 3730

DUNS Number: 028025554

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: WWISCAA

City: Greenville

State: MS

Zip Code: 38701, 2656

DUNS Number: 139611180

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Hancock Resource Center

City: Waveland

State: MS

Zip Code: 39576, 2557

DUNS Number: 828060629

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Open Doors Homeless Coalition

City: Gulfport

State: MS

Zip Code: 39503, 6015

DUNS Number: 626776277

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: BACK BAY MISSION

City: Biloxi

State: MS

Zip Code: 39530, 2968

DUNS Number: 137021259

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Voice of Calvary Ministries

City: Jackson

State: MS

Zip Code: 39203, 2604

DUNS Number: 082494691

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Mississippi United to End Homelessness (MUTEH)

City: Jackson

State: MS

Zip Code: 39201, 2000

DUNS Number: 078837999

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Community Counseling Services

City: Columbus

State: MS

Zip Code: 39704, 2590

DUNS Number: 084955053

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: St. Gabriel Mercy Center, Inc.

City: Mound Bayou

State: MS

Zip Code: 38762, 0824

DUNS Number: 083126495

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Salvation Army Gulf Coast
City: Gulfport
State: MS
Zip Code: 39501, 4717
DUNS Number: 125199872
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: AIDS Services Coalition
City: Hattiesburg
State: MS
Zip Code: 39403, 0169
DUNS Number: 147991512
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Guardian Shelter for Battered Families-Natchez c/o Catholic Charities, Inc.
City: Jackson
State: MS
Zip Code: 39202, 3443
DUNS Number: 119747822
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Community Care Network
City: Ocean Springs
State: MS
Zip Code: 39564, 8473
DUNS Number: 189638419
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 0

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	224
Children	169
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	393

Table 16 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	446
Children	157
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	603

Table 17 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	720
Children	389
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	1,109

Table 18 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	743
Children	7
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	750

Table 19 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	2,191
Children	734
Don't Know/Refused/Other	11
Missing Information	1
Total	2,937

Table 20 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	1,182
Female	1,739
Transgender	4
Don't Know/Refused/Other	15
Missing Information	0
Total	2,940

Table 21 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	735
18-24	200
25 and over	1,991
Don't Know/Refused/Other	1
Missing Information	13
Total	2,940

Table 22 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans	173	2	16	17
Victims of Domestic Violence	607	8	43	538
Elderly	162	11	35	28
HIV/AIDS	16	1	2	6
Chronically Homeless	331	0	129	18
Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill	751	18	156	265
Chronic Substance Abuse	496	5	77	270
Other Disability	1,105	91	256	177
Total (Unduplicated if possible)	2,940	0	0	0

Table 23 – Special Population Served

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

10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	81,395
Total Number of bed-nights provided	35,033
Capacity Utilization	43.04%

Table 24 – Shelter Capacity

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

ESG applicants/sub-recipients are required to describe the process used to evaluate through performance measurement as a tool to capture information about program performance to determine how programs and activities are meeting established needs and goals. Assessment information is used to make improvements to the sub-recipient ESG program.

Additionally, the State uses applicant's capability as demonstrated through experience, the ability to provide rapid rehousing and homelessness prevention services to program participants within their service areas.

ESG funds are awarded based on applicant's capacity, experience, ability to match requested funds, their involvement in their local CoC and those who adhere to the strategic goals, priorities and objectives in this allocation plan and with MHC guidelines for how applications are evaluated. ESG funds are used to support the operation and maintenance of emergency shelters, provide rental and utility assistance to the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless. Grantees must use a Coordinated Entry System (CES) to assist persons and referred to the appropriate organization and report outcomes.

In consultation with the CoC's, a by name list was developed and coordinated entry was promoted through training to all projects. This contributed to the results of 43% capacity utilization.

All program participants received case management and/or were referred to other community resources. The Project Outcomes Data can be found in the SAGE HMIS Reporting Repository attached to the CAPER.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	257,896	167,193	238,026
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	17,689	9,053	12,682
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	99,080	89,528	83,266
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	374,665	265,774	333,974

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	512,311	334,567	476,327
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	275,757	158,332	158,551
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	247,904	300,655	176,323
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	1,035,972	793,554	811,201

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Essential Services	71,917	59,213	64,736
Operations	689,201	562,776	584,067
Renovation	0	0	0

Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	761,118	621,989	648,803

Table 27 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Street Outreach	89,946	89,235	93,064
HMIS	159,488	84,106	112,796
Administration	103,085	126,899	83,328

Table 28 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2018	2019	2020
	2,524,274	1,981,557	2,083,166

Table 29 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2018	2019	2020
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	209,331	176,478	76,488
Other Federal Funds	569,656	416,368	380,954
State Government	637,854	434,140	416,553
Local Government	27,010	3,300	13,000

Private Funds	560,843	748,685	745,821
Other	540,793	408,605	511,704
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	2,545,487	2,187,576	2,144,520

Table 30 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2018	2019	2020
	5,069,761	4,169,133	4,227,686

Table 31 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities