

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 City fiscal year (CFY) 2021 examines Baltimore City's efforts in meeting the housing and community development goals set forth in its current Consolidated Plan and in the companion Annual Action Plan (AAP). The Consolidated Plan helps guide and describe community development efforts in Baltimore City and serves as the application request for funding from four federal housing and community development programs. The AAP is the detailed listing of activities that implement strategies proposed in the Consolidated Plan. It is updated and annually submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) while the Consolidated Plan is in force for a five-year period. This CAPER evaluates the first year of the five years covered by the Plan.

The CAPER primarily, and specifically, discusses the use of funds associated with four Federal programs. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG); Home Investment Partnership (HOME); Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS (HOPWA); and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG). However, its scope extends to other Baltimore City activities and initiatives that relate to housing and community development. This report compares the City's actual performance during CFY 2021 - July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2021, - to the performance proposed in the Consolidated and Annual Action Plans.

This CAPER is produced using HUD Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) based eCon Planning Suite. The Suite places tight limits on the number of characters that can be used in response to the HUD established CAPER questions. It is submitted to HUD electronically.

This particular CARER is problematic due to the lack of report data from subrecipients. Due to COVID and staff changes in various city departments, progress in getting the PY 2020 contracts completed was extremely difficult. Thus, many of the subrecipients worked without contracts but have yet to submit their quarterly reports and final draws. Of the funds available during the program year, about half has been drawn through at the time of this report. Clearly this CAPER is an undercount of the accomplishments and the expenditures for PY 2020.

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
Assist HOs & LLs to Maintain Homes/Healthy Home	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / General Fund: \$ / Local - General Fund - Lead: \$627902 / Other Federal - Lead: \$ / Private: \$ / State - Lead: \$ / State - other: \$966000	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	4700	181	3.85%	300	181	60.33%
Blight Elimination & Stabilization	Blight Elimination and Stabilization	CDBG: \$ / General Fund: \$ / Private: \$	Buildings Demolished	Buildings	1800	317	17.61%	360	317	88.06%
Blight Elimination & Stabilization	Blight Elimination and Stabilization	CDBG: \$ / General Fund: \$ / Private: \$	Other	Other	10	0	0.00%			

Code Enforcement	Non-Housing Community Development Code Enforcement	CDBG: \$ / General Fund: \$10460978 / Other Federal Funds: \$1199985 / Private: \$	Housing Code Enforcement/Foreclosed Property Care	Household Housing Unit	15000	115751	771.67%	88000	115751	131.54%
Create/Increase Affordable Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Private: \$ / State - other: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	1800	54	3.00%	237	55	23.21%
Create/Increase Affordable Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Private: \$ / State - other: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	750		%	63	99	157.14%
Emergency Shelter & Serv. to Homeless Persons	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$ / General Fund: \$ / Private: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	25000	2000	8.00%	5000	2000	40.00%
Emergency Shelter & Serv. to Homeless Persons	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$ / General Fund: \$ / Private: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	50000	2376	4.75%	10000	2376	23.76%

Housing for Special Needs Populations	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Competitive At the Door Grant: \$474833 / Competitive Housing and Health: \$468650 / Other Federal Funds: \$ / Private: \$ / State - HIV/AIDS: \$1488965	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	0	432		165	432	261.82%
---------------------------------------	---	--	---	---------------------	---	-----	--	-----	-----	---------

Housing for Special Needs Populations	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Competitive At the Door Grant: \$474833 / Competitive Housing and Health: \$468650 / Other Federal Funds: \$ / Private: \$ / State - HIV/AIDS: \$1488965	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	0	4		10	4	40.00%
---------------------------------------	---	--	--------------------------	------------------------	---	---	--	----	---	--------

Housing for Special Needs Populations	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Competitive At the Door Grant: \$474833 / Competitive Housing and Health: \$468650 / Other Federal Funds: \$ / Private: \$ / State - HIV/AIDS: \$1488965	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	100	0	0.00%	3	0	0.00%
---------------------------------------	---	--	----------------------------	------------------------	-----	---	-------	---	---	-------

Housing for Special Needs Populations	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Competitive At the Door Grant: \$474833 / Competitive Housing and Health: \$468650 / Other Federal Funds: \$ / Private: \$ / State - HIV/AIDS: \$1488965	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	3250	600	18.46%	596	600	100.67%
Implement Fair Housing Practices	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / Other Federal Funds: \$18900 / Private: \$	Other	Other	15	3	20.00%	3	3	100.00%
New Construction of homeownership units	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / Private: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	20		%	2	0	0.00%
Preservation of Existing Affordable Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Private: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	500	99	19.80%	800	99	12.38%

Provide Housing Interventions for People Experienc	Affordable Housing Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$ / Continuum of Care: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Private: \$ / State - Homelessness: \$ / Youth Homeless Demonstration Program: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	1240	440	35.48%	200	440	220.00%
Provide Housing Interventions for People Experienc	Affordable Housing Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$ / Continuum of Care: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Private: \$ / State - Homelessness: \$ / Youth Homeless Demonstration Program: \$	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	1300	185	14.23%	950	185	19.47%

Provide Housing Interventions for People Experienc	Affordable Housing Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$ / Continuum of Care: \$ / LIHTC: \$ / Private: \$ / State - Homelessness: \$ / Youth Homeless Demonstration Program: \$	Housing for Homeless added	Household Housing Unit	100	48	48.00%	24	48	200.00%
Public Facilities & Public Open Space Improvements	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / Private: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	600	12	2.00%			
Public Facilities & Public Open Space Improvements	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / Private: \$	Other	Other	0	0		130	12	9.23%
Rehabilitation of primarily vacant/abandoned struc	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / Private: \$ / State - other: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	0			11	8	72.73%
Rehabilitation of primarily vacant/abandoned struc	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / Private: \$ / State - other: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	70	8	11.43%			

Research, Planning, and Oversight of Formula Funds	Planning, Research and Admin	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$ / Private: \$	Other	Other	61	39	63.93%	61	39	63.93%
Social, Economic & Community Development Services	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / General Fund: \$10151229 / Other Federal Funds: \$1156014 / Private: \$ / State - other: \$5012951	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	205000	48285	23.55%	205000	48205	23.51%
Strengthen Homeownership Markets	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / General Fund: \$578774 / Other Federal Funds: \$73795 / Private - Mortgage Debt: \$60592400 / Private: \$ / State - other: \$529000	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	15000	2514	16.76%	4000	2514	62.85%

Strengthen Homeownership Markets	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / General Fund: \$578774 / Other Federal Funds: \$73795 / Private - Mortgage Debt: \$60592400 / Private: \$ / State - other: \$529000	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	1000	153	15.30%	250	153	61.20%
----------------------------------	--------------------	---	---	---------------------	------	-----	--------	-----	-----	--------

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.

As in past years, the largest share of costs incurred in PY 2020 were administrative, planning, and public information expenses, both of the city and of subrecipients. The second largest share of funds covered expenses for providing affordable, safe owner-occupied housing. These expenses included housing rehab including replacement roofs, rehab admin of homes to be sold to low-mod income households, and incentive funds to cover closing and other costs of low -mod income homebuyers. The third largest expense category in PY 2020 was public services, including housing counseling, youth programs, employment training, and legal services, among others.

The large majority of the HOPWA funds went toward 600 units of tenant based rental assistance, which exceeded the goal of 597 households assisted. We expect that the number of available units will decrease slightly due to a decrease in HOPWA funds made available.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

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

91.520(a)

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

Narrative

Please see table below for complete racial and ethnic counts - table above is missing row for multi racial.

Baltimore City continues to monitor affirmative marketing efforts through the annual certification of the project's tenant demographic information and continues to provide training for both for-profit and non-profit developers. Regulatory information is mailed annually to assist homeowners and property managers in their compliance efforts.

Use of the four Consolidated Plan programs as reported by racial category composition was dominated by African American persons and households. They accounted for 73% of all users followed by Whites at 18%. The other four racial classes identified on Table 2 were reported as assisted by the programs accordingly: Asian, 1.02%; American Indian or American Native, .30%; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, .31%, and multi-racial persons, 7.03%. Hispanic persons/households made up 3.29% of programs users.

By program, Black or African American persons/households accounted for 72% of the total persons/households served by CDBG; 87% of all HOME clients; 91.8% of all HOPWA users and 79.3% of all ES clients. Based on 2020 American Community Survey data (1-Year Estimates, Table BO2001) African American persons accounted for 57.7% of the city's population.

By program, White persons/households accounted for 19% of persons/households served by CDBG, 18% of all HOME clients; 7.8% of all HOPWA users and 15.6% of all ESG clients. Based on 2020 American Community Survey data (1-Year Estimates, Table BO2001) White persons accounted for 26.8% of the city's population.

By program, Asian persons/households accounted for 1.1% of all persons/households served by CDBG; 0% of all HOME clients; 0% of all HOPWA users and .59% of all ESG clients. Based on 2020 American Community Survey data (1-Year Estimates, Table BO2001) Asians accounted for 3.6% of the city's population.

By program, American Indian or American Native persons/households accounted for .23% of persons/households served by CDBG; 0% of all HOME clients; .33% of HOPWA users and 1.3% of all ESG clients. Based on 2020 American Community Survey data (1-Year Estimates, Table BO2001) American

Indian/American Native persons accounted for .39% of the city's population.

By program, Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander persons/households accounted for .30% of persons/ households served by CDBG; 0% of all HOME clients; 0% of HOPWA users and .52% of all ESG clients. Based on 2020 American Community Survey data (1-Year Estimates, Table BO2001) this population accounted for .0003% of the city's population.

By program, multi-racial persons/households accounted for 7.60% of persons/ households served by CDBG; 0% of all HOME clients; 0% of HOPWA users and 2.5% of all ESG clients. Based on 2020 American Community Survey data (1-Year Estimates, Table BO2001) multi-racial persons accounted for 5.5% of the city's population.

By program persons/households identifying as Hispanic accounted for 3.3% of persons/ households served by CDBG, 0% of all HOME clients; 1.1% of all HOPWA users and 3.6% of all ESG clients. Based on 2020 American Community Survey data (1-Year Estimates, Table BO3003) this population accounted for 7.8% of the city's population

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	23,368,400	10,775,971
HOME	public - federal	5,136,612	6,386,321
HOPWA	public - federal	8,305,670	
ESG	public - federal	1,905,804	1,635,804
Continuum of Care	public - federal	21,000,000	21,338,334
General Fund	public - local	9,000,000	9,476,717
LIHTC	public - state	46,380,267	3,729,156
Other	private	164,463,837	87,817,517
Other	public - federal	164,463,837	87,817,517
Other	public - local	164,463,837	87,817,517
Other	public - state	164,463,837	87,817,517

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
City Wide	43	47.51	A wide range of housing, social service and economic development activities were carried out.
East Impact Investment Area	4	4.57	Public service and affordable rental housing activities were conducted in the East Impact Investment
Low Moderate Income Areas	48	45.23	Numerous subrecipient organizations conducted public services, affordable housing and economic devel
Park Heights Impact Investment Area	2	0.74	Public services were the predominant activity in the Park Heights Impact Investment Area
Southwest Impact Investment Area	2	0.15	Pigtown Main Street invested in local businesses and Southwest Partnership conducted rehab admin act

West Impact Investment Area	2	1.8	Druid Heights CDC implemented a number of public service and affordable housing activities.
-----------------------------	---	-----	---

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

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.

HOME PROGRAM

The total costs from all sources of funding (HOME, other loans from federal, state, and local sources, as well as private loans and grants) for the projects eligible for reporting during this period was \$21,585,234. HOME program funds in the amount of \$2,325,000 leveraged \$19,260,234 in other private and public funds and represent 11% of total project costs.

Baltimore City DHCD predicts four HOME projects will be completed and fully leased by the end of the next fiscal year. Construction is complete on 410 Lofts, 22 Light, Greenmount Chase and 1234 McElderry. 410 Lofts, 22 Light and Greenmount Chase are nearly fully leased. Leasing has recently begun on 1234 McElderry. These projects will combine \$87,089,684 of funding with \$5,250,000 of HOME funds, about 6% of the \$92,339,684 total funds.

This year's completed HOME projects are all rehabilitation projects. These projects include the 54 units of Union Avenue Apartments in the historic Hampden in West Baltimore. The other rehabilitation project is the 99 units of senior housing at Parkview at Coldspring in Coldspring Newtown section of West Baltimore.

Union Avenue Apartments' 54 units include 48 project-based Section-8 units. Parkview at Coldspring has 15 disabled units and has targeted units for tenants at 30% AMI.

CDBG Program

The PY 2020 CDBG Funds were matched with \$188,400 in other federal funds, \$9,295,476 in state funds, \$604,173 in city/county funds, \$29,745,276 in private and foundation funds, and \$2653,252 in earned and reserved funds. Note that the private funds include \$25,509,951 in mortgages incurred by recipients of Direct Homebuyer Incentives for first-time homebuyers.

Comparing these figures to those reported in the 2019 CAPER we find that generally the amounts leveraged this year are 59.77% of last year. While all of the amounts are down in 2020 the most obvious reason is the lack of reports from our subrecipient organizations. Many have only recently received their contracts, so their quarterly reports are late. Looking at the First Time Homebuyer leverages (mortgages), which were reported in full, the 2020 amount is 6.43% higher than the 2019 amount.

ESG Program

The 2020 Emergency Solutions Grant funds were matched with \$9,476,717 in local general funds, \$1,659,283 in state funds and,1,605,627 in other Federal funds.

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	11,272,530
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	2,000,000
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	13,272,530
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	0
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	13,272,530

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
8772	10/24/2019	2,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,000,000

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 beginning 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 \$
3,127,873	1,581,326	2,192,524	0	2,516,676

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	58,190,006	0	0	20,631,000	0	37,559,006
Number	4	0	0	1	0	3
Sub-Contracts						
Number	92	0	1	23	17	51
Dollar Amount	43,051,807	0	15,000	9,666,996	11,299,699	22,070,112
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			
Number	0	0	0			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	126	34	92			
Dollar Amount	58,389,806	5,643,696	52,746,110			

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	1,075	440
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	1,850	487
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	627	1,036
Total	3,552	1,963

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	1,647	1,472
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	839	62
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	816	272
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	250	153
Total	3,552	1,959

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

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

A significant lack of returned quarterly reports from subrecipients, due to the COVID 19 pandemic impact, are the root cause of the low actual goal accomplishment rates in this document.

The reported number of households supported through production of new units was significantly less than the projected amount. This difference may be due to incorrect goal tabulation - the number of new units projected in the Annual Action Plan was 239 for rental and owner-occupied combined.

Market factors likely played a part in the low number of home buyer incentives granted vs. the projection of 250. The inventory of for-sale homes was significantly depressed with a high rate of home buyers and quick home sales. 153 low-income renter households became homeowners with modest (\$5,000) CDBG down payment support. The average sales price of homes purchased with CDBG incentives was \$166,732.

The number of households in existing affordable units who were helped by having their units rehabilitated fell short by 544 units, 67% of the goal. Again, a number of subrecipients have not yet provided their quarterly reports, depressing the accomplishment rate reported here.

The number of permanent supportive housing units made available for homeless special needs households lined up with the initial estimates. MOHS also leveraged approximately 800 Section 8 homeless set aside vouchers, pairing them with supportive services, to complement the units provided directly by MOHS.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

Over the course of the previous five years of the prior Consolidated Plan affordable housing production had, with the exception of HOPWA TBRA and critical repairs for low-income owner occupant households, largely met annual action plan goals. The 2022 annual action plan, the second one of the new five-year period, will support the continuation of this trend, particularly making sure resources are in place to meet production of affordable rental units.

HOPWA Modernization in 2016 projected that the Baltimore EMA could lose approximately \$3 million in funding. This would have been catastrophic for persons living with HIV and AIDS in our jurisdictions. HUD’s stop loss gap has expired, and we are still expected to have a decrease in HOPWA funding over the next several years. So far, the decrease has been slight, around 1%. Our goal continues to be to prevent any households from becoming homeless due to the loss of funds.

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
Extremely Low-income	64	89
Low-income	66	46
Moderate-income	71	14
Total	201	149

Table 13 – Number of Households Served

Narrative Information

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

In PY 2020, Baltimore City Continuum of Care (CoC) made significant progress with efforts to engage people experiencing homelessness, especially unsheltered persons. The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic fueled the increase in the number of individuals in need of street outreach services. In order to adequately serve these individuals, the CoC has realigned resources and service models to meet the needs of unsheltered people in the community.

The CoC maintains three homeless outreach teams that are staffed by both the City and two nonprofit service providers, Downtown Partnership of Baltimore, and People Encouraging People. This program year, the City worked to expand robust homeless outreach services available to households experiencing homelessness throughout the entire geographic area of the City ensuring coordinated and persistent outreach, in-reach and engagement efforts through the delivery of services directly to households in crisis. In addition to outreach services, the City partnered with the Franciscan Center to provide meal service to individuals residing in encampments across the City.

Utilizing Coordinated Access, the City of Baltimore will continue to expand housing navigation services to more effectively address the housing needs of unsheltered individuals. The City's Coordinated Access System is designed to assess household experiencing homelessness and match them to appropriate housing interventions based upon their individual needs and history of homelessness. Outreach teams continued to engage homeless households throughout the city; referring them to shelter, vital community resources and reconnecting them with natural supports such as family and friends.

The CoC continued to build partnerships with critical community service providers in order to provide much-needed referrals to mental health and substance abuse services. These partnerships are vital as many households experiencing homelessness are disengaged – and oftentimes distrustful of public systems; making them reluctant to seek services.

As part of this rehousing strategy, the Mayor's Office of Homeless Services developed, maintained, and utilized by-name lists (BNLs) to provide a systemic response to veterans, youth, and chronically homeless individuals experiencing an episode of homelessness. Case conferencing meetings were implemented with all providers serving these special populations to track and monitor housing placements for individuals within the Coordinated Access system.

The City additionally made concentrated efforts to monitor projects for Coordinated Access compliance. Program compliance officers within the Mayor's Office of Homeless Services provided in-depth training

and technical assistance to street outreach providers on assessing need of unsheltered persons via vulnerability and homeless history assessments. Outreach providers also received HMIS data report cards from the Mayor's Office of Homeless Services, detailing providers' compliance in submitting timely and accurate client data.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The City used ESG funds to operate the following homeless shelters and services:

House of Ruth Maryland (HRM): HRM utilized ESG funds to provide rapid rehousing services to individuals and families fleeing domestic violence and experiencing homelessness.

Associated Catholic Charities, Weinberg Housing and Resource Center (ACC WHRC): ACC WHRC utilized ESG funding to operate its low barrier emergency shelter that provides homeless services to over 275 single adult men and women daily. Services included but were not limited to; shelter, convalescent care, showers, laundry, meals, case management and housing location services.

Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition (HEBCAC): HEBCAC utilized ESG funding to operate a ten (10) bed emergency shelter for youth experiencing homelessness ages 18-24 in Baltimore City. Services included but were not limited to; overnight shelter beds, showers, laundry, meals, and connections to case management through HEBCAC's YO Baltimore drop-in center program.

St. Vincent de Paul of Baltimore (SVDP), Front Door Program: SVDP utilized ESG funding to operate a drop-in center for individuals and families experiencing homelessness in Baltimore City. Services included but were not limited to; meal service, housing navigation services, a free clothing closet, showers, and laundry.

Manna House: Manna House utilized ESG funding to operate a drop-in center for individuals experiencing homelessness in Baltimore City. Services included but were not limited to; meal service, housing navigation services, a free clothing closet, showers, and laundry.

Health Care for the Homeless (HCH): HCH utilized ESG funding to operate a convalescent care project based within the WHRC emergency shelter site. Funding was used to provide professional nursing staff for clients requiring intensive outpatient medical care services while at the shelter.

Downtown Partnership of Baltimore (DPOB): DPOB used funding to operate a street outreach program. Funding was used to provide street outreach services to individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness in Baltimore City, including basic needs services (i.e. food, clothing), housing navigation services, transportation to shelter and essential services, and connections to community resources and mainstream benefits.

Taylor Made Transportation: TaylorMade Transportation utilized ESG funding to operate a shelter

transportation project, connecting shelter residents at City-funded shelters to essential medical services and case management.

TIME Organization: TIME used ESG funding to operate the Pinderhughes emergency shelter, serving 125 adult women experiencing homelessness. Funding was used to cover the cost of staffing, meals, and basic shelter operations.

United Way of Central Maryland (UWCM): UWCM used ESG funding to operate a housing relocation case management project for families experiencing housing instability at-risk of eviction. Services included case management support, connection to community resources, housing identification services and family stability planning.

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

This year, MOHS partnered with the Community Action Program centers to provide homelessness prevention services to households at risk of eviction. In addition to assistance with overdue rent, households were also able to apply for utility assistance, case management and follow up services to ensure ongoing housing stability. All City-funded emergency shelters and outreach teams were trained on prevention and diversion strategies and encouraged to utilize these tools to aid households to successfully transition to natural supports such as family and friends where possible.

MOHS continues to work closely with the Mayor's Office of Children and Family Success, the Department of Housing and Community Development, and the Housing Authority of Baltimore City to identify and address gaps in homeless services to ensure that homelessness is rare, brief, and nonrecurring for Baltimore City residents. The Mayor's Office of Homeless Services and its partners assisted households experiencing homelessness and those who are at risk of homelessness by providing outreach to ensure that those who are experiencing homelessness are identified and referred to Coordinated Access for appropriate housing needs.

In partnership with the Mayor's Office of Employment Development (MOED), MOHS began a systems level collaborative effort to advance access to employment and economic development for homeless jobseekers. As part of these efforts, MOHS and MOED partnered to train shelter case managers to fully access and utilize all MOED programmatic offerings for clients in shelter in need of employment or workforce development training.

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

In PY2020, MOHS expanded homeless outreach services to homeless households throughout the city of Baltimore. Services include housing navigation services, assistance with locating affordable housing, referrals to residential substance abuse treatment, transportation assistance, connections to mental health counseling, employment training, preparation and placement, and connections to other vital community services.

During PY 2020, the CoC significantly expanded the number of rapid rehousing units available to individuals experiencing homelessness. The expansion of rapid rehousing paired with alongside the leveraging of Medicaid and private partnerships with local hospitals to increase permanent housing, and targeted centralized landlord recruitment efforts have supported efforts to increase the number of households moving to permanent housing from homelessness and reducing the length of time individuals homeless.

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

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

During program year 2019 the Housing Authority of Baltimore City (HABC) took actions to address both the physical conditions of public housing and socio-economic needs of public housing tenants. It spent some \$33.1M making a wide range of physical improvements to its housing stock including scattered site locations and its family developments. This included window replacement at Gilmore Homes and Latrobe Homes; heating system replacement at Douglas Homes and furnace replacement at Dukeland/Rosemont. It also expanded its Energy Performance Contracting initiative to further reduce utility costs and completed hot water system renovations at seven family developments.

Program services provided to HABC residents during program year 2019 included: Job Placement which matched 201 residents with jobs, slightly exceeding its 200-person goal. Of those placed, 135 were youth, a total much greater than the 20 projected at the beginning of the program year. Twenty-five persons enrolled in the skills training program, significantly fewer than the 60 projected.

The Family Self-Sufficiency Program served 332 families, a number well below the 500 families projected. However, it graduated 49 families from the program, two-thirds greater than the 30 projected. Thirty persons attended homeownership education sessions; the number of attendees projected. Forty-eight households established escrow accounts, exceeding the goal of 35. The financial literacy sessions, projected to serve 100 families, had 55 enrolled during the program year.

The number of residents served through the six Support Service Programs – Service Coordination, Service Referrals, Congregate Housing Services, Early Head Start, Occupancy Training and Youth Services – was greater than projected for all the programs. The Youth Services Program saw 1,530 youth, six times the 250 expected. Occupancy Training served almost twice the 500 participants anticipated. Early Head Start served 63 residents, 6 more than projected and the Congregate Housing Program served 29, 4 more than anticipated.

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

During program year 2019 the revision of Tenant Council bylaws, including those governing the election of Resident Advisory Board members, were enacted and a consultant was hired to advise on actions needed to achieve full and fair RAB and Tenant Council elections in PY 2020.

The Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program (HCVHP) allows a qualified family to convert its housing choice voucher rental assistance payment into mortgage assistance for a fifteen-year period. HABC's goal in PY 2019 was to assist 11 new families in becoming homeowners. The goal was almost met with 8 families purchasing homes through the HCVHP during the program year. At the end of program year 2019 there were 82 households participating in the HCVHP.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

Not applicable. HABC is not a troubled housing authority.

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)

As noted in the Consolidated Plan, Baltimore City does not support public policies that limit the creation of housing for low-income households. Although Baltimore has less than a quarter of the region's population, Baltimore has over three-quarters of the region's subsidized housing as well as the largest reservoir of market rate housing affordable to households with incomes of less than 80% of AMI.

One public policy element identified in the City's Analysis of Impediments is undue restrictions on the number of persons living in group homes. Removing these restrictions will require action on the part of the Baltimore City Council. During PY 2020, the City Council did not remove existing restrictions or impose new ones and at year's end, the law remains unchanged.

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

As was noted in the 2021 – 2025 Consolidated Plan, the City has a large number of households in need of housing assistance and the City would address the needs of some of these households through available Annual Plan resources.

As Table 1 in module CR-5 – Goals and Outcome at the beginning of this document shows, these actions were successfully carried out. HOME funds were used to rehabilitate 154 rental units. CDBG funds were used to provide rehab and repair services to 246 LMI homeowners; create 4 new homes for homebuyers; rehabilitate 6 units for rental households; provide down payment assistance to 153 first-time homebuyers; and assist 170 homeless persons with securing housing. Additionally, ESG funds provided rapid rehousing for 440 homeless individuals and HOPWA funding provided tenant based rental support for 600 households.

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

In PY 2020, the Baltimore DHCD's Lead Hazard Reduction Program was unsuccessful in remediating lead hazards from any Baltimore City homes. The advent of the pandemic and restrictions on working near others prevented any units being remediated. However, staff performed outreach activities which involved 8,815 phone calls clients to offer services and gather documents for program eligibility, and application assistance to build the unit pipeline. Other outreach activities involved 6 virtual presentations, 693 letters to clients and 231 letters to organizations, 164 calls to organizations, research projects to identify clients, curbside pick-up, and drop-off of documents for 28 clients, document collection from 89 clients for case closure, and flyer dropping to 20 organizations. To increase client participation new flyers, postcards, and brochures were created. Staff participated in 11 community

events where 91 people attended. A piece mail was sent out to over 4,414 clients to offer services. Field work involved 40 initial screens, 42 risk assessments, and the completion of 24 work scopes. A total of 425 referrals were obtained and 18 applications were completed. There were 95 cases underwritten and 6 cases were placed under contract. Staff reviewed the relocation process with 3 applicants. In addition, staff attended 10 professional trainings. Moreover, staff reached out to over 90 contractors to spark interest in the new lead solicitation.

The Green and Healthy Homes Initiative's Safe At Home Baltimore project reduced childhood lead poisoning, pervasive residential lead-paint hazards and other home-based environmental health and safety hazards (allergens, mold, mildew, and general safety hazards) in 34 older, low- to moderate-income housing units. These activities included lead abatement in 28 units; temporarily or permanently relocating 7 households from hazardous housing to lead certified safe housing; and providing Healthy Homes intervention 34 households. The Green and Healthy Homes Initiative also provided community education, healthy home visits, post-remediation services and program consultation.

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

Baltimore Community Action Partnership (CAP) administers services and delivery systems that promote self-sufficiency and provide opportunities for low-income households. This program operates five geographically dispersed Community Action Partnership Centers located in the Govans, Park Heights, Cherry Hill, Highlandtown, and Oliver neighborhoods.

In PY 2020 CAP provided case management and a variety of other services to address food and nutrition, financial literacy and housing and energy needs, free tax preparation and asset development services to a total of 29,331 low- and moderate-income persons.

During PY 2020, 6 persons were Section 3 hires on construction projects funded by the HOME program.

The CDBG program funds a number of non-profits to provide job and employment readiness training to low- and moderate-income persons. In PY 2020, Maryland New Directions assisted 49 low- and moderate-income individuals with employment preparation, career counseling, life skills training, computer literacy training, job placement and follow up services to help find and retain jobs; the Caroline Center provided job training/education to 80 low income women to enable them obtain jobs through a 15 week tuition-free program that includes soft skills training and occupational skills training in geriatric nursing and as a pharmacy technician; Druid Heights CDC assisted 40 ex-offenders and Intersection of Change - Strength to Love served 19 ex-offenders with integrating back into society through job training and employment opportunities.

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

In PY 2020 there was significant restructuring of Baltimore City leadership including a change in Mayor and City Council membership and change in executive directors of DHCD and MOHS. There were also

several staff changes at MOHS.

The COVID-19 pandemic continued throughout PY2020, which resulted in considerable changes to the institutional structure governing City operations and the operations of most of the non-profit organizations funded with Consolidated Plan resources. These included a move to remote working by most staff involved in HUD programs; on-line public hearings and meetings; the extensive use of web-based platforms and software for communicating, processing, and storing reports and documents, and developing and processing contracts and financial documents. These changes in structure are expected to carry on through PY2022.

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

Government agencies, for-profit and nonprofit organizations all work to coordinate services for individuals in public and private housing. The Community Action Program (CAP) continues to work with these entities to address community needs. “Pop Up” locations in areas outside of the immediate center neighborhoods are used to increase the visibility and access to programs. In addition, CAP provided energy assistance grants to qualifying households receiving Section 8 vouchers and conducted energy assistance clinics at local senior housing properties. CAP continued its major expansion of eviction prevention programming throughout PY2020 in response to an increase in federal funding for rental assistance. CAP, MOHS and DHCD continued coordination and collaboration in the eviction prevention program design and implementation.

The Mayor’s Office of Homeless Services (MOHS) is the City’s Continuum of Care lead applicant. During this CAPER period, MOHS continued its participation and coordination with public, housing, and social service agencies.

MOHS and its grantees use the Coordinated Access system, with a priority and focus on serving the chronically homeless, to place homeless persons into permanent supportive housing units. Coordinated Access enables clients to apply for multiple programs through a single application, rather than having to apply separately at each location. The Coordinated Access system is designed to ensure that individuals and families at-risk of or experiencing homelessness have an equitable and centralized process for timely access to appropriate resources, in a person-centered approach, which preserves individual choice and dignity.

MOHS administers Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) for the Baltimore Eligible Statistical Metropolitan Area. MOHS also administers several federal, state, and local grants that target homeless and disabled persons and families. Low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS and people experiencing homelessness receive priority for eligibility purposes.

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

This section sets forth the steps taken by the Baltimore City Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the Housing Authority of Baltimore City (HABC) to affirmatively further fair housing during the period July 2020 through June 2021.

In program year 2020, DHCD and HABC and their regional partners in the Fair Housing Group, including the Baltimore Metropolitan Council who coordinated the process, operated under a new Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing study.

Due to character limitations imposed by the eCon Suite program, the listing the 2012 impediments, both for Baltimore City and the region, and the actions taken during PY 2020 to address these impediments, do not fit in the space available. The 2012 summary impediments and actions taken are found in the Appendix. This will be the final CAPER that analyzes the 2012 AI, as the new AI has a new set of regional and jurisdictional impediments and actions to be taken.

A complete analysis of efforts to address fair housing needs is available in the Appendices.

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

CDBG

DHCD through its CDBG Office provides a comprehensive review of subrecipient and local government agency performance related to the use of CDBG funds. The primary objective is to ensure compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local laws, regulations, policies, and procedures and to safeguard against improper use of Federal funds. Program and Financial Compliance Officers are responsible for conducting the necessary monitoring of subrecipients and City agencies awarded CDBG funding. The primary purpose of the monitoring process is to ensure that all subrecipients are maintaining appropriate documentation to support the applicable CDBG national objective(s) and eligibility category(s) outlined in their agreement. Toward this end, monitoring procedures are designed to focus on contract compliance, compliance with local and federal regulations, soundness of internal controls, eligibility of program costs, program income and allied matters. Once the monitoring is completed, an exit interview is conducted with the agency staff to advise them of the outcome of the monitoring. A written report is mailed to the agency detailing the outcome of the monitoring and requesting the agency to address findings if any.

HOME

DHCD provides, through its Office of Project Finance, a comprehensive review of the HOME projects that have benefited from receiving HOME funds. The primary objective of this review is to ensure compliance with applicable federal laws, regulations, policies, and procedures and to safeguard against improper use of federal funds. Monitoring policies and procedures have been developed that address compliance with regulatory obligations, eligibility of HOME funded activities and internal management controls. The goals of monitoring are to identify deficiencies and provide corrective measures to improve reinforce or augment program performance in the management and administration of HOME funds.

ESG

As a recipient of ESG funds, MOHS is required to monitor program sub-recipients to ensure compliance with federal regulations, contractual obligations, and expectations. Historically monitoring has been facilitated on-site and in person however due to the pandemic, monitoring has been conducted remotely or virtually to ensure the safety of all parties.

Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) funded projects are subject to on-going and consistent monitoring throughout the duration of each contracted term. The monitoring facilitation is guided by the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Interim Rule and is conducted by the assigned MOHS Program Compliance Officer.

In addition to ensuring efficient grant and fiscal management, monitoring serves as a tool to proactively measure operational and programmatic standards, challenges, and risks of each funded sub-recipients (Providers) and measure the outcomes of success with clients/program participants served. As Providers are monitored, there is a general review of programmatic outcomes, fiscal compliance, HMIS utilization, and record keeping practices.

All ESG funded sub-recipients are subject to the following:

- One (1) pre-scheduled site visit (notification sent 30 days prior via USPS mail and e-mail delivery)
- Four (4) un-scheduled site visits (One visit per fiscal quarter throughout the duration of each contracted term, no prior notification).

Sub-recipients receive a full analysis and report within thirty (30) days of the completed monitoring site visit. Follow-up conferences are scheduled to discuss and resolve findings.

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 draft CAPER was released for public comment on December 14, 2021. A draft of the PY2020 CAPER was posted on the DHCD website and notice of the availability of the draft was printed in the Baltimore Sun on Monday, December 13, 2021. The notice ran as follows:

The City of Baltimore will release on December 14, 2021 a draft Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the federally funded Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programs. The draft CAPER covers City Fiscal Year 2021 activities – July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021. The report identifies financial resources received through the ESG, HOPWA, HOME and CDBG programs; describes activities funded through these programs; and assesses the City's success in meeting goals contained in the Consolidated Plan covering the July 2020 through

June 2024 time period. Following the public comment period, the CAPER will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on or about December 31, 2021.

Questions and comments concerning the CAPER should be directed to Susan Moriarty at 410-396-1966 or by e-mail at susan.moriarty@baltimorecity.gov Written comments on the draft CAPER will be accepted until 4:30 p.m. December 30, 2021

Notice was also sent to addresses on a mailing list of approximately 600 non-profits, individuals, businesses, and agencies that have expressed interest in the City of Baltimore formula grants.

As in past years, no comments were received on the draft CAPER.

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.

This CAPER covers the first year of the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan's five years. This Consolidated Plan includes greater geographic specificity as to where activities will be undertaken, building off DHCD's *A New Era of Neighborhood Investment: A Framework for Community Development*. Such an approach will more readily allow public resources to be concentrated, thus creating conditions likely to engender private market investment or, where such conditions are already in place, buttress private investment. While DHCD has long supported a build-from-strength approach, the 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan more explicitly identifies strategies and implementing actions that make such an approach manifest.

This CAPER also covers the first year of new City administration. Accordingly, mayoral priorities have been instituted, which are generally in accordance with the Framework for Community Development. These priorities, known as Mayoral Pillars, are:

- Building Public Safety
- Prioritizing Our Youth
- Equitable Neighborhood Development
- Clean & Healthy Communities
- Responsible Stewardship of City Resources

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

Yes

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

Two 108 Program funded industrial site redevelopment projects, known as the Warner Street and Montgomery Park 108 Projects, were awarded Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants in addition to 108 loan funds. Formerly used in conjunction with the 108 program, BEDI grants were designed to assist cities with the redevelopment of abandoned and underused industrial and commercial property by enhancing either the security of the 108 loans or the viability of the projects financed with 108 loans.

The Montgomery Park project received a BEDI award of \$1,000,000 and Warner-Acme \$975,000. For both projects, the BEDI grants serve as a reserve 108 loan repayment source if a payment is not made. Once the 108 loans have been entirely repaid, the BEDI funds will be treated as CDBG program income and become part of the City's CDBG program and be expended for CDBG eligible activities. During PY

2019 the annual principal and interest payments were made, from non-Consolidated Plan resources, for both 108 loans, and the BEDI funds remained in reserve untouched.

CR-50 - HOME 24 CFR 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 24 CFR §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

During the City's fiscal year (July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021), fifty (45) file inspections were conducted either on site or remotely due to COVID-19 safety protocols. 531 separate files were inspected. There were five (5) properties with at least one file cited for non-compliance. Two have passed subsequent re-inspections and there have files submitted for reinspection before the end of the year. Since Baltimore City conducts inspections based on the calendar year not the fiscal year, eight (8) active HOME projects will have been inspected after the fiscal year. Approximately eighty-four (84) individual files will be inspected during that time. Six projects are not due for an inspection in 2021.

Baltimore City DHCD elected to utilize the regulatory waivers and suspensions of the HOME program requirements offered in the April 2020 HUD memorandum Availability of Waivers and Suspensions of the HOME Program Requirements in Response to COVID-19 Pandemic. The April 2020 Memo waived the requirement of on-site inspections of HOME-assisted rental housing through December 2020. The waiver period was extended further in subsequent memos. As a result, HOME staff did not perform any physical inspection during the fiscal year. Baltimore City has since resumed physical inspections of HOME assisted properties.

Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 24 CFR 91.520(e) and 24 CFR 92.351(a)

During the reporting period HOME staff continued to implement the Regulations set forth at 24 CFR 92.351 by referencing the affirmative marketing provisions in all documents and security instruments signed by the Borrowers. The loan document holds the Borrower legally accountable and establishes compliance, which is a condition of receiving HOME funds. Non-compliance triggers default under the terms of the HOME loan. Borrowers participating in a HUD multifamily housing program administered by the Office of Project Finance (OPF) are required to carry out a marketing program to attract prospective tenants of all minority and non-minority groups within the housing market area regardless of race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin. During the onsite compliance monitoring, the compliance staff reviews evidence of compliance with the written agreement.

While implementing Baltimore City's HOME Program, several methods are utilized to ensure that all HOME recipients are aware of and comply with Affirmative Marketing Provisions of the Fair Housing Act. Baltimore City's Affirmative Marketing Policy is further described in the Department's Letter of Intent,

Commitment Letter, and security instruments for all projects receiving HOME funds.

All Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO's) and for-profit property managers of HOME-assisted rental projects are required to display the federal FHEO and drug-free workplace signs in areas visible to the public. In addition to any general marketing activities, each rental housing development must carry out an affirmative marketing program. The affirmative marketing efforts are to include but not be limited to groups that, because of the development's location or other factors, are considered 'least likely' to apply for housing at the development. The affirmative marketing program must also include outreach efforts to all persons with disabilities. In addition, those developments with accessible or adaptable apartments are to include, in their affirmative marketing program, specific outreach efforts to persons with physical disabilities.

Baltimore City continues to monitor affirmative marketing efforts through the annual certification of the project's tenant demographic information and continues to provide training for both for-profit and non-profit developers. Regulatory information is mailed annually to assist owners and property managers in their compliance efforts.

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

The HOME PROGRAM began the fiscal year with \$3,127,873 in program income and collected \$1,581,326 during the fiscal year. During the fiscal year, \$1,500,000 of the balance on hand was committed to the project known as 525 Aisquith Apartments (aka Somerset 2). The project is part of the Choice Neighborhoods Perkins/Somerset/Old Town redevelopment. The project will create ninety-nine (99) affordable units within a larger one hundred twenty-three (123) unit mixed income rental development. The project will include 56 RAD units, 48 LIHTC units.

Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 24 CFR 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 24 CFR 91.320(j)

The Office of Project Finance used Affordable Housing Program Bonds (AHP) to create affordable housing opportunities. A contribution of \$250,000 in Affordable Housing Program Bonds for the development of the Developing Affordable Starter Home Fund (DASH). DASH is creating a revolving construction loan fund (the "DASH Program") to support the acquisition, stabilization, and renovation of homes in the Neighborhood Impact Investment Fund's ("NIIF") Eligible Neighborhoods. This fund is designed to make loans to developers who may be unable to access capital in the traditional, private capital market.

AHP funds were used to create housing opportunities for special populations. Construction completed on SAGE II Monarch View. AHP funds totaling 275,460 funds were issued to Family Recovery Program to renovate 5 homes to rent to families who are ready to move up from the nearby Sage Center and be

reunited with their children who have been in foster care. Construction and leasing were completed during the fiscal year.

The Office of Project Finance has committed HOME funds to LIHTC projects this fiscal year including the Sojourner Place at Preston, 525 Aisquith, and Woodland Gardens II. The projects are located in choice, distressed and commercial markets throughout Baltimore City incorporating parts of neighborhoods that include the Somerset (near the Choice Neighborhood redevelopment of Somerset/Perkins/Oldtown), Waverly in East Baltimore, Park Heights, Hampden in West Baltimore, and multiple projects in Downtown Baltimore.

Construction also began on Park Heights Renaissance Row during the fiscal year. The 84 units of affordable housing units was funded last fiscal year with funds from AHP, LIHTC, CDA and Slots Funds Loan.

Additional HOME information may be found in the Appendices.

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	50	7
Tenant-based rental assistance	596	600
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	10	425
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	10	0

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Narrative

Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility payments:

MOHS continues to fund University of MD's HIV Clinic as well as Family and Children's Services of Maryland (aka Springboard Community Services) under both the HOPWA and State Special Funds (SSF) award allocation. Mortgage assistance is unallowable under SSF. Thus, MOHS continued to fund mortgage assistance under HOPWA with the University of Maryland's Institute of Virology, Baltimore County and Carroll County. Seven (7) HOPWA eligible households were assisted in maintaining housing stability and placement in their homes through short-term rental, mortgage, and utility assistance funds. These numbers were affected by COVID-19 as many organizations continued to operate at reduced scale on account of the COVID-19 pandemic throughout the funding year; limiting the ability to serve clients.

Rental assistance:

A total of 520 rental subsidies were planned for persons living with HIV/AIDS across the Baltimore EMSA for PY 2020. The EMSA exceeded this goal, serving a total of six hundred (600) households. Some jurisdictions in the Baltimore EMSA were able to eliminate their waiting lists and offer permanent

housing assistance to HOPWA eligible households. Five counties in the EMSA have directed most of their funds to provide clients with tenant-based rental subsidies. In most counties, TBRA is administered through the housing agencies, with support services being provided by the local health departments. This is remains consistent with the goals of increasing availability of affordable housing opportunities and housing for the disabled.

CR-58 – Section 3

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

Total Labor Hours	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA	HTF
--------------------------	-------------	-------------	------------	--------------	------------

Table 15 – Total Labor Hours

Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA	HTF
--	-------------	-------------	------------	--------------	------------

Table 16 – Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program

Narrative

During PY 2020, 6 persons were Section 3 hires on construction projects funded by the HOME program.

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 BALTIMORE
Organizational DUNS Number 140231759
UEI
EIN/TIN Number 526000769
Identify the Field Office BALTIMORE
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance Baltimore City CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix Ms
First Name Ninah
Middle Name
Last Name Bell
Suffix
Title Program Compliance Officer MOHS

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1 7 E. Redwood Street - 5th Floor
Street Address 2
City Baltimore
State MD
ZIP Code 21202-
Phone Number 4103967543
Extension
Fax Number
Email Address ninah.bell@baltimorecity.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix Ms
First Name Ninah
Last Name Bell
Suffix
Title Program Compliance Officer MOHS
Phone Number 4103967543
Extension
Email Address ninah.bel@baltimorecity.gov

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: ASSOCIATED CATHOLIC CHARITIES
City: Baltimore
State: MD
Zip Code: 21201, 4421
DUNS Number:
UEI:
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 750000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: BALTIMORE

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21202, 3431

DUNS Number: 140231759

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 3179350

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: HEBCAC

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21213, 3303

DUNS Number: 179992375

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 150000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: House of Ruth

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21218, 1627

DUNS Number: 145383642

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 103806

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: St. Vincent de Paul of Baltimore

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21218, 5292

DUNS Number: 074929530

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 556000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Manna House

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21218, 5320

DUNS Number: 166587006

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 43300

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Health Care for the Homeless

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21202, 4800

DUNS Number: 798562815

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 195000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The T.I.M.E Organization, Inc

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21202, 3243

DUNS Number: 102967341

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 641000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: United Way of Central Maryland

City: Baltimore

State: MD

Zip Code: 21230, 1701

DUNS Number: 077410405

UEI:

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 382767

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	12
Children	20
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	32

Table 16 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	199
Children	245
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	444

Table 17 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	989
Children	7
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	996

Table 18 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	64
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	1
Missing Information	0
Total	65

Table 19 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	1,263
Children	272
Don't Know/Refused/Other	2
Missing Information	0
Total	1,537

Table 20 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	636
Female	887
Transgender	10
Don't Know/Refused/Other	3
Missing Information	1
Total	1,537

Table 21 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	277
18-24	133
25 and over	1,126
Don't Know/Refused/Other	1
Missing Information	0
Total	1,537

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	37	0	3	34
Victims of Domestic Violence	277	0	53	224
Elderly	142	0	7	135
HIV/AIDS	39	0	7	32
Chronically Homeless	414	0	91	323
Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill	563	1	107	456
Chronic Substance Abuse	209	0	20	189
Other Disability	511	0	91	420
Total (Unduplicated if possible)	0	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	110,230
Total Number of bed-nights provided	81,395
Capacity Utilization	73.84%

Table 24 – Shelter Capacity

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

Outreach providers receiving ESG funding (DPOB): Returns to homelessness from permanent housing within 6 months- 0%; Percentage of contacted households that engaged-94%; Successful exit from Street Outreach- 0%.

Emergency Shelters receiving ESG funds (WHRC, HEBCAC, and TIME): Average Length of Stay- 195 days; Percent of persons exiting to permanent housing- 17.2%; Returns to homelessness from permanent housing within 2 years- 9.52%; Increase Earned Income – 5.33%; Increase Non-Earned Cash Income- 9.53%; Increase Total Cash Income- 11.31%; Increase Mainstream Benefits- 10.5%; Utilization rate of units/Beds for homeless or formerly homeless persons- 64%.

Rapid Rehousing (SVDP): Percent of person exiting to permanent housing - 44%; Returns to homelessness from permanent housing within 2 years- 15%; Increase Earned Income- 20%; Increase Non-Earned Cash Income- 10%; Increase Total Cash Income- 26%; Increase Mainstream Benefits- 14%.

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	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	15,824
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	0	0	15,824

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	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	246,643	408,473	483,190
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	246,643	408,473	483,190

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	198,754	395,434	1,586,850
Operations	0	0	0
Renovation	0	0	0

Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	198,754	395,434	1,586,850

Table 27 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Street Outreach	78,613	84,323	125,000
HMIS	0	11,015	0
Administration	0	124,559	125,000

Table 28 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2018	2019	2020
	524,010	1,023,804	2,335,864

Table 29 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2018	2019	2020
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	0	0
State Government	0	0	0
Local Government	3,964,140	3,964,140	1,905,804
Private Funds	0	0	0

Other	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	3,964,140	3,964,140	1,905,804

Table 30 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2018	2019	2020
	4,488,150	4,987,944	4,241,668

Table 31 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities