

Annual Report

Fiscal Year 2013-2014



OUR MISSION.....A Connecticut where affordable housing, in strong, vibrant and inclusive communities, is accessible to individuals and families across the state and homelessness is a thing of the past.

I. HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

A. FY 2014 Housing Environment

Connecticut's housing market continued on the path to recovery in 2013. According to a recent release from the U.S. Census, Connecticut cities and towns authorized 5,424 new housing units, including single and multi-family homes in 2013, the highest level since 2007. This level of production represents a 16.2 percent increase compared to 4,669 in 2012 and a 3.9 percent increase compared to 5,220 in 2008.

In 2013, Fairfield County had the most permit activity with 2,501 new housing units authorized which accounted for nearly half of the statewide total. Windham County had the fewest with 99. The City of Stamford led all municipalities with 801 units authorized, followed by Danbury with 310, Stratford with 270, Milford with 189 and Norwalk with 187. The combined permits issued for these five communities accounted for nearly one-third of last year's total housing production.

In early spring, the state surveyed demolition activity from each municipality. There was an 80.5 percent response rate with one hundred and thirty-one cities and towns responding to the survey. In 2013, municipalities authorized 1,397 housing units to be demolished. The cities of Hartford and New Britain issued the most demolition permits with 176 and 171. Greenwich and Westport tied at 106 and ranked third. The combined demolition units of Hartford and Fairfield counties accounted for almost three quarters of the total demolition permits issued.

Overall, the nation experienced a 19.4 percent increase in housing permit authorizations, with the New England states having 23.9 percent growth from 2012 to 2013. However, four states [Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky and West Virginia] had a percentage decrease. Connecticut ranked 28th.

The Connecticut real estate market had a stronger showing in home sales and prices with record-low mortgage rates and higher consumer confidence. According to the Warren Group, the number of single family home sales in the state rose 6.5 percent from 24,276 in 2012 to 25,859 in 2013. In addition, the median single family home sales prices grew 7.9 percent from \$240,000 in 2012 to \$259,000 in 2013 as reported by the Warren Group.

According to a National Low Income Housing Coalition report in 2013, the Fair Market Rent (FMR) in Connecticut for a two-bedroom apartment was \$1,208. In order to afford this level of rent and utilities – without paying more than 30 percent of income on housing, a household must earn \$4,025 a month or \$48,304 annually. Assuming a 40-hour work week, 52 weeks per year, this level of income translates into

a housing hourly wage rate of \$23.22. Or, a household needs 2.8 full-time minimum wage earners in order to make the two-bedroom FMR affordable.

Looking back at 2013 data can give us an idea about the year ahead. Solid housing growth (as evidenced by increased housing permits), stronger home sales, increasing home values and improved builder confidence point to even better performance through the end of 2014.

B. Housing Investment Analysis

In FY 2014 OHCD invested \$55,138,520 in Home, Housing Trust Fund, Affordable Housing Program and other state funds into 36 projects around the state and, in doing so, created or preserved 1,579 units of housing, including 1,015 deed restricted affordable housing units.

1. Housing Development Portfolio Analysis

The table below outlines DOH's housing investments. During this fiscal year the total value of DOH's housing development portfolio grew to over \$655 million.

2014 DOH Housing Development Activity			
	State	Federal	Total
FY 2014 Housing Activity	\$50,720,662	\$4,417,858	\$55,138,520
DOH Housing Portfolio Value	\$435,313,122	\$219,857,007	\$655,170,129

Source: DOH

The following table outlines DOH's average rate of participation in its housing development projects. In an era of "doing more with less" DOH has worked hard over the past several years to increase its leverage ratio for housing development projects by partnering with other development and financing organizations.

DOH Housing Development Leveraging				
All Funding Sources	Leverage Ratio	Total Development Cost	Non-DOH Funds	DOH Investment
FY 2014 Leverage Ratio	5.18	\$340,854,685	\$285,716,165	\$55,138,520
Portfolio Leverage Ratio	3.22	\$2,765,004,921	\$2,109,834,793	\$655,170,129

Source: DOH

The following table provides DOH's cost per unit for the affordable housing units created and preserved by DOH's housing development investments.

DOH's Housing Development Per Unit Cost			
All Funding Sources	DOH Investment	Units	DOH Per Unit Cost
FY 2014 Net Units Created	\$25,280,860	363	\$69,644
FY 2014 Units Preserved	\$ 25, 183,625	652	\$38,625
Total Average FY 2014 Cost Per Unit	\$55,138,520	1,033	\$53,377
Total New Units Created	\$472,698,932	6,927	\$77,994
Total Units Preserved	\$182,471,197	6,485	\$28,137
Total Average Portfolio Cost Per Unit	\$655,170,129	13,412	\$48,849

Source: DOH

2. State Funded Housing Production and Preservation Analysis

The Table Below outlines the number of units created and preserved by household type. For the purposes of this section, “elderly units” are defined as units for which occupancy is restricted by age and “family units” are units for which occupancy is not restricted by age.

Household Type Analysis				
	Elderly Units		Family Units	
	FY 2014	Portfolio	FY 2014	Portfolio
Created	44	1,458	318	4,625
Preserved	233	232	419	8,024

Source: DOH

The following table outlines the number of units created and preserved by municipality during FY 2013 and for the entire Housing Development portfolio.

Analysis by Municipality				
	Units Created		Units Preserved	
Municipality	FY 2013-14	Portfolio	FY 13-14	Portfolio
Ansonia		1		9
Area wide		0		28
Avon		11		0
Berlin		99		0
Bloomfield		0		18
Branford		11		0
Bridgeport		534		105
Bristol		0		324
Brookfield	72	72		0
Burlington		24		0
Canaan	10	34		0

Analysis by Municipality				
Municipality	Units Created		Units Preserved	
	FY 2013-14	Portfolio	FY 13-14	Portfolio
Canton		11		0
Cheshire		23		20
Colchester		45		0
Cornwall		10		0
Cromwell		20		0
Danbury		8		290
Darien		0		106
East Hartford		7		180
East Windsor		0		0
Farmington		4		11
Franklin		10		0
Glastonbury		44		0
Greater Hartford		79		0
Greenwich		7		0
Groton		0		7
Guilford		51		0
Hamden		35		87
Hartford	80	1416	164	2787
Hartford Area		0		19
Kent		16		0
Litchfield		10		0
Manchester		109		10
Meriden		5		285
Middletown		95	65	83
Milford		0		467
Naugatuck		0		32
New Britain		70		79
New Canaan		0		41
New Hartford		10		0
New Haven	109	881	89	762
Newington		106		0
New London		56		304
New Milford		40		0
Newtown		6		0
North Haven		20		1
Norwalk		51		90
Norwich		120		169
Old Saybrook		0		0
Plainville		0		0
Plymouth		69		0
Ridgefield		21		132

Analysis by Municipality				
Municipality	Units Created		Units Preserved	
	FY 2013-14	Portfolio	FY 13-14	Portfolio
Seymour		69		152
Sharon		12		0
Shelton		35		0
Simsbury	48	48		0
Somers		60		86
Southington	34	34		0
South Windsor		22		0
Stamford		428		327
Statewide		295		949
Thomaston		36		0
Tolland		5		29
Torrington		0	78	132
Trumbull		54		0
Vernon		23	159	159
Wallingford		0		28
Waterbury	10	109	97	132
West Hartford		14		0
Westport		118		0
Wethersfield		42		0
Willimantic		22		7
Wilton		51		0
Windsor Locks		0		21
Winchester		72		0
TOTAL	363	5,790	652	8,468

Source: DOH

3. Governor Malloy's \$30MM Preservation Initiative

Governor Malloy announced an ambitious 10-year \$300 million initiative to revitalize the State Housing Portfolio. The Department of Housing (DOH), in partnership with the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA), designed a number of programs and activities to distribute the first \$30 million of that initiative. Using known data on the physical condition, financial condition and organizational capacity of properties and owners within the state housing portfolio, DOH and CHFA identified eight (8) owners within that portfolio who could effectively manage the necessary preconstruction and planning activity associated with the preservation of approximately 647 units within the portfolio. The following table provides a list of those owners and the awards.

Preconstruction Awards FY 2014		
Municipality	Owner	Award
New Britain	Security Manor	\$90,000
Glastonbury	Cobbs Mill Crossing	\$70,000
Hartford	Rose Garden Co-Op	\$90,000
Bristol	Zbikowski Park	\$215,000
Enfield	Woodside Park, Ella Grasso Manor, Windsor Court, Enfield Manor/Ext	\$480,000
Norwich	Sunset Park	\$375,000
Naugatuck	Oak Terrace	\$250,000
Rockfall	Sugarloaf Terrace	\$65,000
Subtotal		\$1,635,000

Source: DOH

DOH and CHFA awarded assistance to seven (7) specific properties representing approximately 458 units which had already completed their planning activities, and were best able to use these second year funds. The following table is a list of those properties, the units being preserved, and the award to be provided.

Second Round Preservation Projects and Awards FY 2014				
Municipality	Owner	Property	Units Preserved	Award
Danbury	Housing Authority	Glen Apartments	100	\$5,173,769
Hartford	LP	Historic Townley Street	28	\$1,900,000
New London	LP	Londonberry Gardens	86	\$4,874,299
Portland	Housing Authority	Quarry Heights	70	\$2,520,000
Westport	Housing Authority/LP	Sasco Creek (incl 4%	54	\$8,507,550
Enfield	Housing Authority	Windsor Court	40	\$1,185,489
Enfield	Housing Authority	Woodside Park/Ella	80	\$2,634,686
Subtotal			458	\$26,795,793

Source: DOH

Finally, the Governor's Portfolio included providing technical resources to various programs including the following:

- *Technical assistance to owners concerning resident engagement:* technical assistance was provided to housing authorities and owners of properties subject to provisions of CGS 8-64c to ensure meaningful engagement between residents, owners and housing authorities. Training explained the law, offered case studies of best practices, and explored the importance and impact of effective resident participation. Training is ongoing.

- *Technical assistance to residents concerning resident engagement:* technical assistance was provided to the residents or resident associations of five SSHP Housing Authority properties. A toolkit provided forms and documents utilized by resident groups, along with tips from best practices and how-to materials regarding meeting protocol, establishing resident councils and by-laws, and holding elections. Training is ongoing.
- *Technical assistance to owners:* technical assistance was provided to assist SSHP owners in assembling development teams to prepare to apply for financing in upcoming rounds. Owners received one-on-one guidance on understanding the Capital Plan and creating a redevelopment scope. Deployment occurred in November 2014.
- *Affordable Housing Academy:* In preparation for upcoming funding rounds, ten SSHP owners were selected to participate in a five-month project development training and capacity building course. The Academy was organized by the CT Housing Coalition, and continued through January 2015.

Technical Assistance FY 2014		
Program	Contractor	Award
TA for Redevelopment	Housing Development Team	\$100,000
TA for Redevelopment	TAG Associates	\$100,000
TA for Redevelopment	TDA Consulting	\$100,000
TA for Limited Equity Co-Ops	CT Housing Coalition	\$353,700
Affordable Housing Academy	CT Housing Coalition	\$90,000
TA – Residents re Resident Engagement	PHRN	\$150,000
TA – Owners re Resident Engagement	Conn-NAHRO/HERC	\$90,000
TA – Residents re Resident Engagement	Tovah, Inc.	\$32,380
Subtotal		\$1,016,080

Total State-Sponsored Housing Portfolio		
Total Fiscal Year Investment	Units Served	\$ Invested
Total	1,105	\$29,446,873

4. Housing Development Impact

In FY 2014 DOH was the lead state agency for all matters relating to housing in Connecticut. As part of the agency's overall mission, DOH worked to increase opportunities for Connecticut's citizens to live in safe, quality housing at affordable prices. To fulfill its mission, DOH monitored and analyzed the Connecticut housing environment and developed policies, strategies, programs and services that maximize success in expanding affordable housing opportunities in Connecticut.

It is difficult to capture the socio-economic benefits that flow from the provision of housing or improved housing to those who may not otherwise be able to afford it. These benefits include building a strong community tax base, encouraging safe streets, and empowering neighborhoods and communities to stabilize and flourish.

5. Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program Portfolio

Beginning on July 1, 2013, the newly formed Department of Housing was designated as the principal state agency for the allocation and administration of the federal CDBG program for non-entitlement areas within the state. Non-entitlement areas include those units of general local government that do not receive CDBG funds directly from HUD as part of the entitlement program.

The primary statutory objective of the CDBG program is to develop viable communities by providing housing, a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities for persons of low and moderate income. To achieve these goals, the CDBG regulations outline eligible activities and national objectives that each activity must meet.

DOH established two program priority objectives and nine secondary objectives for the SC/CDBG Program. The program priority objectives are the creation or preservation of affordable housing and the enhancement of employment opportunities for low and moderate-income persons. These program priority objectives have been in place since the state began administering the program in 1982. The nine additional objectives range from housing issues to coordinated strategies for neighborhood revitalization. The following table outlines DOH's Small Cities CDBG program activity during SFY 2014.

CDBG Projects Awarded During FY 2014		
Municipality	Project Description	Investment
Franklin	Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Killingly	Housing Rehabilitation VIII	\$400,000.00
Oxford	Housing Rehabilitation Program	\$400,000.00
North Stonington	Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Windham	Windham Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Seymour	Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
East Haddam	Oak Terrace Senior Housing Rehabilitation	\$791,210.00
Salem	Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Windsor	Housing Rehabilitation Program	\$400,000.00
Griswold	McCluggage Manor Senior Housing Rehabilitation	\$800,000.00
Hampton	Hampton Regional Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Coventry	Multijurisdictional Housing Rehab Program (with Columbia)	\$500,000.00
Bethlehem	Town Wide Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Suffield	Suffield Housing Authority Project	\$800,000.00
Thomaston	Grove Manor Senior Housing Rehabilitation	\$611,445.00
Torrington	Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Derby	Housing Rehabilitation	\$400,000.00
Sprague	Street and Sidewalk First, Second and Third Ave.	\$500,000.00
Newington	Cedar Village Senior Housing Rehabilitation	\$800,000.00
Stafford	Housing Rehabilitation Program	\$400,000.00
Groton	Pequot Village 1	\$800,000.00
Branford	Parkside Villages 1 and 2 Senior Housing	\$448,500.00
Thompson	Gladys Green/Pineview Court Rehabilitation 3	\$800,000.00
Preston	Lincoln Park Elderly Housing Rehabilitation	\$800,000.00
Total		\$12,851,155.00

Source: DOH

The following table offers a summary of the types of activities that were funded during FY 2014.

FY 2014 CDBG Activity Summary		
Activity	Total Funding	Number of Projects
Homeowner Rehabilitation	\$ 5,700,000	14
Public Housing Rehabilitation	\$ 6,651,155	9
Total Housing	\$ 12,351,155	23
Water/Sewer/Street Improvements	\$ 500,000	1
Total Public Facilities	\$ 500,000	1
TOTAL	\$ 12,851,155	24

Source: DOH

For more information on the Small Cities CDBG program please visit the Department of Housing's website at <http://www.ct.gov/doh/cwp/view.asp?a=4513&q=530474>.

6. Supportive Housing

For more than twenty years, various agencies, both public and quasi-public, along with private organizations have joined in a collaborative effort to identify and develop long-term solutions to end chronic and long-term homelessness. The current partners in this effort are the Department of Housing (DOH), the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS), the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the Department of Corrections (DOC), the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA), Court Support Services Division – Judicial (CSSD), the Department of Developmental Services (DDS), DSS, OPM, CHFA, and the Corporation for Supportive Housing. Connecticut is the only state in the nation consistently investing in the development of supportive housing on a statewide basis.

Connecticut has a long history of providing permanent supportive housing to the most vulnerable homeless individuals and families in our State. Resources have been leveraged at the federal, state, local and philanthropic levels to permanently house over 2500 formerly homeless individuals and families. Connecticut currently is implementing a Social Innovation Fund (SIF) grant, funded through CSH, in which we created a data match between our homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and our Medicaid data, to locate and provide permanent supportive housing to the high cost users of Medicaid who are also homeless. Connecticut also created a Frequent User Service Engagement (FUSE) program in which we matched data from the HMIS and our criminal justice system to permanently house individuals that cycle between jails and homeless shelters. Both programs are successful in reducing high cost institutional care. Services are designed to address the individual needs of the residents, and included the help of a case manager, connections to community treatment and employment services, and rehabilitation services that help the client achieve and retain permanent housing.

The State of Connecticut is planning to build on these successes to bring these programs to full scale. Although our State has been generous in appropriating nearly 60 million dollars for capital work, support services and rental assistance for permanent supportive housing, more resources are needed to meet the goal of ending chronic homelessness by 2016 and setting a path to end all homelessness by 2020. Connecticut has been successful over the past twenty years in creating over 50 single site supportive housing properties that have resulted in over 1200 units of permanent supportive housing. . In the past five years, Connecticut has been able to develop an additional 300 units of permanent supportive housing by prioritizing efforts through the LIHTC program, the QAP, and the Competitive Housing Assistance for Multifamily Properties (CHAMP).

II. Housing Support Programs

A. Tax Abatement

The Tax Abatement Program was designed to ensure financial feasibility of privately owned, nonprofit and limited dividend low- and moderate-income housing projects by providing reimbursement for taxes abated by municipalities up to \$450 per unit per year for up to 40 years. Once the 40 year term expires, Master Assistance Agreements will be executed with no term limit enabling the units to remain affordable. The abatement of taxes enables the owner to maintain the rents at an affordable level for the tenants. This program was not open to new applicants in FY 2014.

Tax Abatement Program Awards FY 2014			
Municipality	Project Name(s)	Units	Amount Awarded
Ansonia	Liberty Park	30	\$11,330
Bethel	Augustana Homes	101	\$30,535
Bloomfield (2)	Interfaith Homes, Wintonbury II	130	\$49,098
Bridgeport (6)	Cedar Park, Seaview Gardens/Union Village, Sycamore Place, Unity Heights, Washington Heights, Marionville	368	\$124,635
Danbury	Beaver Street Apartments	70	\$8,393
Granby	Stony Hill Village	49	\$10,911
Hartford (14)	Barbour Kensington, Dart Garden, Immanuel House, Lower Garden, Main/Nelson, Main/Pavilion, Mansfield Edgewood, Plaza Terrace, SANA, Martin L. King, Upper Garden, Sheldon Oak, Clearview, Capitol Towers	1,450	\$418,770
Kent	Templeton Farms	19	\$6,666
Middletown (3)	Newfield Towers, Stoneycrest Towers, Wadsworth Grove	245	\$75,746
New Britain	Interfaith Housing	84	\$31,725
New Haven (4)	Bella Vista I, Bella Vista II, Bella Vista/Phase II, Seabury Housing	1,176	\$85,128
Norwalk (3)	King's Daughters, Leonard Street, St. Paul's	224	\$11,504
Stamford (7)	Bayview Towers, Coleman Towers, Friendship House, Ludlow Town House, Martin Luther King Apts., Pilgrim Towers, St. John's Towers	971	\$361,905
Waterbury (5)	Frost Homestead, Lambda Rho Apts., Prospect Towers, Robin Ridge Apts., Savings Towers	578	\$218,300
TOTAL	5,495	\$1,444,646	

Source: DOH

B. Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT)

The PILOT Program allowed the commissioner to enter into a contract with a municipality and its housing authority to make payments in lieu of taxes to the municipality on land and improvements owned or leased by the housing authority. This program was not open to new applicants in FY 2014.

PILOT Program Awards FY 2014		
Municipality	Units	Amount Awarded
Bristol	174	\$84,164
Danbury	290	\$138,553
East Hartford	80	\$45,404
Enfield	174	\$88,960
Greenwich	245	\$98,760
Hartford	770	\$488,583
Mansfield	36	\$10,149
Meriden	215	\$137,590
Middletown	198	\$133,687
Norwich	286	\$157,438
Seymour	81	\$67,306
Sharon	20	\$4,760
Stamford	590	\$254,421
Stratford	100	\$64,427
Wethersfield	28	\$21,316
Windham	146	\$77,882
TOTAL	3,433	\$1,873,400

C. Congregate Facilities Operating Cost Subsidies

Through the Congregate Facilities Operating Cost Subsidies DOH provided grants to housing authorities and nonprofit corporations that own/operate state-financed congregate rental housing for the elderly. Core services included one main meal a day, housekeeping services and a 24-hour emergency service. The program also provided rental assistance for those tenants so they pay no more than 30% of their income toward rent. Program funding was subject to availability of legislative authorizations.

In FY 2014 DOH assisted 24 congregate facilities with \$7.13MM in assistance.

Congregate Program Awards FY 2014			
Entity	Project Name	Subsidized Units	Amount Awarded
Augustana Homes, Inc.	Augustana Homes	44	\$312,421
Women's Institute Reality of Connecticut, Inc.	Eleanor Congregate Apartments	35	\$561,200
Bristol Housing Authority	Komanetsky Estates	44	\$168,025
Enfield Housing Authority	Mark Twain	82	\$94,428
Glastonbury Housing Authority	Herbert T. Clark	45	\$268,857
Hill House, Inc.	Hill House	37	\$302,962
Mystic River Homes, Inc.	Mystic River Homes	50	\$388,998
Hamden Housing Authority	Mount Carmel	30	\$389,507
Sheldon Oak Central, Inc.	Bacon Congregate	23	\$353,776
Killingly Housing Authority	Maple Court	43	\$218,011
Manchester Housing Authority	Westhill Gardens	37	\$268,970
Lutheran Social Services, Inc.	Luther Manor	45	\$242,331
Naugatuck Housing Authority	Robert E. Hutt	36	\$217,680
Hannah Gray Development Corporation	E.B. Scantlebury	20	\$313,823
Norwalk Housing Authority	Ludlow Commons	44	\$491,020
Under One Roof, Inc.	The Marvin	50	\$444,944
St. Jude Housing Corporation	St. Jude Commons	51	\$251,284
Town of Orange	Silverbrook Estates	45	\$323,854
Pomfret Community Housing Corporation	Seely Brown Village	31	\$282,837
Ridgefield Housing Authority	Prospect Ridge	34	\$190,688
Simsbury Housing Authority	Virginia Connolly	40	\$340,996
Stamford Housing Authority	Margot J. Wormser	40	\$214,200
Trumbull Housing Authority	Stern Village	36	\$171,585
Vernon Housing Authority	F.J. Pitkat	43	\$196,935
TOTAL		985	\$7,131,511

Source: DOH

D. Elderly Rental Assistance Program (ERAP)

The ERAP Program provided rental assistance to low-income elderly persons residing in DECD-assisted rental housing for the elderly. DOH contracted with nonprofit organizations as well as local housing authorities that provide rental subsidies in accordance with an approved contract. The following table outlines the FY 2014 awards.

Elderly Rental Assistance Program Awards FY 2014				
Entity	Units	Tenants on RAP	Disabled/ under 62	Amount Awarded
Ashford Housing Authority	32	22	3	\$29,160
Branford Housing Authority	90	34	21	\$29,760
Brookfield Housing Authority	35	5	1	\$3,228
Colchester Housing Authority	70	48	16	\$75,492
Danbury Housing Authority	100	45	17	\$40,992
Deep River Housing Authority	26	16	3	\$31,656
Enfield Housing Authority	200	116	69	\$123,510
Essex Housing Authority	36	17	5	\$18,120
Guilford Housing Authority	90	31	9	\$22,800
Hamden Housing Authority	190	53	30	\$38,236
Hebron Housing Authority	25	10	1	\$17,891
Housing One Corp	40	29	3	\$96,933
Killingly Housing Authority	120	11	4	\$10,968
Manchester Housing Authority	80	63	52	\$154,179
Mansfield Housing Authority	40	12	7	\$12,132
Marlborough Association for Senior Housing	24	21	1	\$66,335
Monroe Housing Authority	30	19	5	\$32,412
Montville Housing Authority	80	5	1	\$228
TFC Housing Corp	50	46	14	\$141,288
New London Housing Authority	210	149	94	\$243,000
North Branford Housing Authority	60	23	13	\$35,880
Norwich Housing Authority	183	129	79	\$217,656
Shoreline Affordable Housing, Inc.	39	29	1	\$82,932
Oxford Housing Authority	34	17	0	\$19,848
Plymouth Housing Authority	60	1	0	\$504
Portland Housing Authority	70	48	30	\$57,576
Preston Housing Authority	40	19	5	\$19,815
Putnam Housing Authority	40	30	10	\$41,496
Ridgefield Housing Authority	60	47	1	\$97,137
Simsbury Housing Authority	70	22	9	\$18,456
South/Southwest Housing Corporation	36	20	0	\$33,012
Stamford Housing Authority	50	45	18	\$136,248
The Atlantic	28	20	0	\$58,284
Tolland Housing Authority	No eligible tenant	0	0	\$0
Vernon Housing Authority	54	5	3	\$2,736
Wallingford Housing Authority	155	46	18	\$31,428
Wethersfield Housing Authority	112	55	38	\$58,658
Willimantic Housing Authority	90	62	37	\$58,044
Windsor Locks Housing Authority	40	10	2	\$9,720
TOTAL	2,789	1,376	617	\$2,167,750

Source: DOH

1. ERAP Assessment

In accordance with Section 8-119 $\ell\ell$ of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Department of Housing is required to prepare a comprehensive analysis of the current and future needs for rental assistance under the Elderly Rental Assistance Payments program (ERAP). In order to do this, DOH collected detailed information from the current owners of the participating properties through the submission of Tenant Certification and Rent Roll forms. These forms broke down actual tenant contributions toward rent, as well as the subsidy portion to be paid through ERAP. The analysis of these subsidy costs included taking into consideration the effect of anticipated rent increases projected both during the current year and in the coming year, allowing accurate estimates of the impacts of these necessary rent increases on the cost of the program. In addition, the Department considered the availability of project-based rental assistance under the Rental Assistance Payments program (RAP) as part of the Governor’s Preservation Initiative relative to the proposed or anticipated redevelopment activities of many of these properties. The use of these subsidies in some of these properties has led to a change in the availability of funding in the current year and was considered as part of the future needs of the program.

All of this information was used to estimate the annualized needs of the current residents at participating properties, and to estimate the program wide need should all of the eligible properties be brought into the program.

The table below summarizes this analysis, and identifies both the current subsidy levels, as well as those projected funding levels necessary to maintain the current roster of eligible residents, and an estimate of the funding necessary to include all of those eligible elderly and young disabled residents who pay more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities living in these participating facilities.

Elderly Rental Assistance Payments Needs			
Current Year FY 2014-15 Allocation	FY 2015-16 Current Participants Annualized	FY 2015-16 Projected Need – Full Participation	FY 2016-17 Projected Need – Full Participation
\$ 2,162,504	\$ 2,205,755*	\$ 4,411,510	\$ 4,499,740
1,300 residents	1,300 residents	2,600 residents	2,600 residents

Source: DOH

It should be noted that the amount listed under **FY 2014-15 Current Participants Annualized** is greater than is recommended in the Governor's Proposed Budget; \$2,162,504. The estimate provided in the table projects full participation by all eligible participants in all currently participating properties without taking into consideration savings due to tenant turnover during this period. We anticipate, however, that the Governor's proposed request will be sufficient to operate the program effectively due to anticipated savings resulting from tenant turnover during the coming fiscal year.

Current policy of the department has been that subsidy requirements of the existing participants in the program be met before including any additional participants due to tenant turnover. With limited funding, increases in rental cost due to redevelopment activity and increasing costs of operation due to inflation/cost of utilities/etc., it is anticipated that additional unmet need will arise in many of these facilities.

It is anticipated that up to an additional 1,300 residents in non-participating facilities may be in need of rental assistance. This would extrapolate to an additional \$2,205,755 in new ERAP funding being necessary to assist these individuals. This would bring total participation to approximately 2,600 elderly/disabled residents receiving a total of \$4,411,510 in ERAP.

The **FY 2015-16 Projected Need – Full Participation** reflects the **FY 2014-15 Current Participants Annualized** PLUS an estimate of the cost of increasing participation to all of the remaining properties and their potentially eligible residents, without taking tenant turnover into consideration.

The **FY 2016-17 Projected Need – Full Participation** reflects a 1% increase in the cost of operating the program, which reflects an estimated increase due to inflation (+2%) as well as a an estimated savings due to tenant turnover (-1%).

E. Resident Service Coordinator (RSC) Program

The RSC Program (also known as the Elderly Rental Registry and Counselor Program) provided grant funds to sponsors of DOH-assisted rental housing for the elderly to hire a resident services coordinator to perform an evaluation of all tenants and to provide other services related to housing when necessary. FY 2013-2014 DOH awarded the total grant amount of \$1,009,160 to provide for a total of 4820 housing units.

Resident Services Coordinator Program Awards FY 2014					
Entity	Total Units	Amount Awarded	Entity	Total Units	Amount Awarded
Ansonia Housing Authority	40	\$7,506	Naugatuck Housing Authority	194	\$37,106
Ashford Housing Authority	32	\$7,436	TFC Housing Corp	50	\$14,698
Berlin Housing Authority	70	\$15,010	Newington Housing Authority	106	\$22,514
Bethel Housing Authority	80	\$15,544	New London Housing Authority	210	\$33,114
Branford Housing Authority	90	\$22,234	North Branford Housing Authority	60	\$14,824
Canton Housing Authority	40	\$7,506	North Haven Housing Authority	70	\$15,010
Cheshire Housing Authority	48	\$15,010	Norwich Housing Authority	183	\$37,474
Colchester Housing Authority	70	\$14,950	Oxford Housing Authority	34	\$7,462
Coventry Housing Authority	80	\$15,010	Plainfield Housing Authority	40	\$7,506
Danbury Housing Authority	100	\$22,514	Plainville Housing Authority	120	\$19,588
Deep River Housing Authority	26	\$7,364	Preston Housing Authority	40	\$7,538
Derby Housing Authority	106	\$22,514	Putnam Housing Authority	67	\$15,010
East Hampton Housing Authority	70	\$14,950	Ridgefield Housing Authority	60	\$15,028
East Windsor Housing Authority	84	\$22,514	Simsbury Housing Authority	70	\$15,010
Ellington Housing Authority	42	\$14,598	Southington Housing Auth.	180	\$37,524
Enfield Housing Authority	240	\$37,526	South/Southwest Hsng. Corp.	36	\$7,506
Essex Housing Authority	36	\$7,506	South Windsor Housing Authority	70	\$12,126
Farmington Housing Authority	40	\$7,512	Stafford Housing Authority	110	\$22,514
Glastonbury Housing Authority	140	\$29,896	The Atlantic	28	\$7,506
Greenwich Housing Authority	51	\$15,010	Tolland Housing Authority	30	\$7,506
Groton Housing Authority	175	\$37,524	Vernon Housing Authority	54	\$15,010
Guilford Housing Authority	122	\$29,740	Wallingford Housing Auth.	185	\$37,524
Hamden Housing Authority	190	\$23,558	Watertown Housing Authority	120	\$22,514
Hebron Housing Authority	25	\$7,350	Westbrook Housing Authority	32	\$7,436
Killingly Housing Authority	120	\$22,514	West Hartford Housing Authority	40	\$7,506
Manchester Housing Authority	80	\$15,074	Westport Housing Authority	50	\$15,010
Mansfield Housing Authority	40	\$7,538	Willimantic Housing Authority	90	\$22,234
Marlborough Association for Senior Housing, Inc.	24	\$7,506	Winchester Housing Authority	14	\$7,506
Middlefield Housing Authority	30	\$7,416	Windsor Housing Authority	112	\$22,514
Monroe Housing Authority	30	\$7,506	Woodstock Housing Authority	24	\$7,506
SUBTOTAL	2,321	\$487,836	SUBTOTAL	2,479	\$521,324

Source: DOH

F. Assisted Living Demonstration Project

The Assisted Living Demonstration Project provided subsidized assisted living to persons who reside in four specific assisted living demonstration sites. Assisted living was designated for people who want to live in a community setting and who need help with activities of daily living, but who do not need nursing home care. Demonstration participants received assisted living services through an assisted living services agency, which is licensed by the Department of Public Health and is under contract with the housing community.

Assisted Living Demonstration Project Awards FY 2014		
Entity	Qualified Units	Amount Awarded
Herbert T. Clark, Glastonbury	25	\$212,000
Smithfield Gardens, Seymour	56	\$543,000
Luther Ridge	45	\$386,000
The Retreat	100	\$1,155,000
TOTAL	226	\$2,296,000

Source: DOH

G. Housing Assistance and Counseling Program/Assisted Living in Federal Facilities (ALFF)

This program was a joint demonstration program with DSS and OPM that brought assisted living services to residents of four HUD-funded facilities. Residents who were eligible for the basic Connecticut Home Care Program for Elders (CHCPE) received assisted living services through DSS. Those residents who needed services, but could not qualify for the DSS program, received up to \$500 per month from DOH to offset some of the costs of receiving the assisted living services.

Assisted Living in Federal Facilities Awards FY 2014		
Entity	Subsidized Units	Amount Awarded
New Haven Jewish Federation Housing Corp	51	\$312,800
Immanuel Church Housing Corporation	20	\$125,600
TOTAL	71	\$438,400

Source: DOH

H. Section 8 New Construction/ Substantial Rehabilitation

The Section 8 New Construction/Substantial Rehabilitation Program (Section 8 NC/SR) was a federal project-based rental subsidy program administered by DOH under C.G.S. Section 8-37r, Section 8-37u and Section 8-37x, as well as the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

DOH acted as contract administrator for 19 projects throughout Connecticut to ensure HUD-subsidized properties were serving eligible families at the correct level of assistance. DOH also provided asset management functions to ensure the physical and financial health of these HUD properties. DOH's contract administrator fee for FY 2014 was \$344,666.

The following table provides detailed information on DECD's HUD Section 8 projects across the state.

DECD's HUD Section 8 Portfolio			
Town	Project Name	# Elderly	# Family
Berlin	Marjorie Moore	40	0
Bethel	Reynolds Ridge	40	0
Bristol	Mountain Laurel Park	40	0
Canton	Twenty-One	40	0
Cheshire	Beachport	48	0
Coventry	Orchard Hill Estates	40	0
Danbury	Fairfield Mill Ridge	0	25
Danbury	The Godfrey	0	9
Farmington	Forest Court	0	36
Hartford	95 Vine Street	0	30
Hartford	Casa Nueva	0	79
Hartford	Casa Verde Sur	0	39
Hartford	Wolcott Place I	0	18
Killingly	Robinwood	0	42
Middlefield	Sugarloaf Terrace	30	0
Norwich	Hillside Apartments	0	26
Putnam	Bulgar Apartments	27	0
Wallingford	McKenna Court	30	0
Westport	Canal Park	50	0
TOTAL		385	304

III. Summary of Efforts to Promote Fair Housing

The DOH continued to administer the HOME and SC/CDBG programs in a nondiscriminatory manner, in accordance with equal opportunity, affirmative action and fair housing requirements. Recipients of HOME and SC/CDBG funds for housing related activities were required to comply with the following civil rights laws and regulations:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;
- Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended;
- The Americans with Disabilities Act;
- Executive Orders 11063, 11246, and 12892;
- Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended;
- Minority Small Business Enterprises – good faith effort, 24CFR 85.36(e);
- The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended;
- Section 104(b) of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended;
- Section 109 of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended;
- Section 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended;
- Sections 92.202 and 92.252, 24 CFR Part 92; and
- 24 CFR Part 85.36(e).

Recipients complied with program assurances that they will affirmatively further fair housing in all their programs. Recipients complied with the requirements of 24 CFR 91.25(a) (1), 24 CFR 91.325(a) (1), 24 CFR 91.425(a) (1) and 24 CFR 570.487(b). Each recipient was given a Fair Housing Handbook developed by DOH. The handbook contains information on state and federal fair housing laws, housing discrimination complaint procedures, model fair housing policies and guidelines, duty to affirmatively further fair housing, an overview of disability discrimination in housing, trends in fair housing, pertinent legal decisions, the State Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing and a resource directory.

Accordingly, recipients of HOME and SC/CDBG funds, in compliance with their Certification to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing, submitted a Fair Housing Action Plan to DOH for review and approval. The plans were consistent with the DOH's Fair Housing Action Plan Implementation Guidelines. All recipients of housing funds whether state or federal provided the FHAP as a condition for funding.

The promotion and enforcement of equal opportunity and affirmative action laws and regulations in housing, economic development, and employment is a standard requirement of all SC/CDBG applications. During the review process, all applications were evaluated for compliance with Title VI and for Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity, and the ADA. In the evaluation system there was a separate criteria for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity for which points were awarded.

The DOH provides the most recent statewide [Analysis of Impediments \(AI\) to Fair Housing Choice](#) on our website. The following is a review of progress made on the previous year's goals as outlined in the State AI:

Objective 1 – Increasing housing access for protected classes

- DOH provided the Corporation for Independent Living with a total of \$1,000,000 during FY 13-14 from the Affordable Housing (Flex) Fund to finance the “Money Follows the Person Transition Program” for accessibility modifications to dwellings for people exiting long term care institutions and moving back into the community of their choice.
- DOH was on the Board of Directors for the “Money Follows the Person” Medicaid Rebalancing Program and is active on its Housing Committee and others as required.
- DOH was on the Boards of Directors for the Long Term Care Planning Committee, Supportive Housing Preservation Committee; Interagency Council on Supportive Housing and Homelessness; and CCEH Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Task Force.

Objective 2 – Increasing supply of affordable housing.

- DOH awarded \$25,280,860 under the various State and Federal affordable housing projects resulting in the production of 363 new units of affordable housing during FY 13-14.

Objective 3 – Begin systematic data collection on fair housing issues.

- DOH collected data on a quarterly basis from its grantees relative to Section 3 practices, affirmative fair housing action steps and activities.
- DOH implemented a “Performance Report on Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Results” which must be submitted to DOH on an annual basis detailing the percentage of “least likely to apply” (LLA) residing in the project and currently on the project’s waiting list.

Objective 4 – Increase training of state employees in the area of fair housing.

- The Connecticut State Legislature reaffirmed its commitment to civil rights and fair housing by authorizing \$461,952 for the SFY 2013-14 to the CT Fair Housing Center (FHC) to continue its work. As part of its duties the FHC provided training and technical assistance on an on-going basis to state employees from DOH, DSS, CHFA and DMHAS who work on fair housing issues and compliance.
- FHC worked with DOH staff to update the SC/CDBG application, process, and training materials for the SC/CDBG Application Workshop.

Objective 5 – Fair Housing outreach, education, and enforcement activities.

The FHC, with financial assistance from DOH, carried out the following:

- Performed intakes and gave fair housing advice to 153 Connecticut households;
- Investigated 153 complaints of discrimination;

- Requested reasonable accommodations and reasonable modifications for 16 Connecticut residents with disabilities;
- Obtained reasonable accommodations and reasonable modifications for 13 Connecticut households without litigation or court action;
- Performed 25 tests designed to investigate any claims of housing discrimination;
- Provided 1,000 hours of legal assistance to the victims of housing discrimination;
- Opened up more than 300 units of housing to Connecticut residents in the protected classes.
- Provided information on the fair housing laws either orally or in writing to the victims of housing discrimination to ensure that they understand their rights and responsibilities under the fair housing laws educating 250 Connecticut residents;
- Assisted members of the private bar in representing homeowners in foreclosure about the changes to the mortgage modification process and the new resources available to homeowners by providing legal updates to 100 attorneys each month;
- Expanded homeowners' access to legal advice on foreclosure prevention by assisting the Judicial Branch with its foreclosure advice tables in New Haven, Bridgeport, and Stamford, and expanding this service to other courts around the state including Hartford and Waterbury by providing 80 hours of legal advice, training, and outreach support to the Judicial Branch and the volunteer attorneys participating in the program;
- Ensured that the foreclosure legal process responded to the needs of homeowners in foreclosure, especially those homeowners who were not represented by attending meetings of the Foreclosure Bench/Bar Committee and subcommittees;
- Provided more than 1,000 hours of legal advice to homeowners in foreclosure;
- Represented 24 homeowners in foreclosure in an effort to save their home and/or obtain a mortgage modification.
- Accepted calls and offered assistance on how to obtain mortgage modifications to members of the private bar representing homeowners in foreclosure for 6 hours each month;
- Met with housing counselors and their clients to offer legal advice and information about the mortgage modification process and the resources available to assist with mortgage modification for 7 hours each month;
- Taught 25 classes to provide information on the legal foreclosure process to 260 households facing foreclosure;
- Provided legal updates and training on changes in the foreclosure process and in mortgage modification programs to housing counselors by attending 10 meetings with housing counselors reaching more than 100 people;

- Distributed, and reprinted, the Center’s “Representing Yourself in Foreclosure: A Guide for Connecticut Homeowners” to 1,000 Connecticut residents.
- Expanded the number of attorneys providing legal assistance to homeowners whose homes are underwater or in foreclosure by offering training on the mortgage modifications and the assistance available to homeowners to 50 attorneys;
- Attended events sponsored by the Governor, Attorney General, and Department of Banking and provide legal advice to 25 homeowners at each event;
- Recruited and trained attorneys for the Judicial Branch’s Volunteer Attorney Program for homeowners facing foreclosure, and staff the tables with Center attorneys 24 times.

DOH provided the following trainings and guidance to housing providers in Connecticut:

- Provided training to cities and towns on how to affirmatively market the programs funded by the SC/CDBG program to increase the participation of those least likely to apply; and
- Provided training for subsidized housing providers on how to create and implement an affirmative fair housing marketing plan.

The State of Connecticut sponsored the following education and training:

- Provided Section 3 training to staff, cities and towns funded by the SC/CDBG program to increase the participation; and
- DOH conducted the SC/CDBG Application Workshop - Fair Housing/Civil Rights Section, covering changes/updates made to the application for the FFY 2013 allocation funds.

Objective 6 - Monitoring and enforcement of fair housing laws and policies.

The CFHC, with financial assistance from DOH, carried out the following:

- Performed 10 tests to determine if deaf and hard of hearing individuals are being discriminated against in housing;
- Performed 5 home sales tests to determine if households of color with children are steered in a discriminatory way;
- Met with LGBT community members to design a testing protocol for determining if people are being denied housing because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

IV. Consumer Loan Programs

A. Energy Conservation Loan Program (ECL)

1. Program Summary

The ECL and the Multifamily Energy Conservation Loan Program (MEL) provided financing at below market rates to single family and multi-family residential property owners for the purchase and installation of cost-saving energy conservation improvements. The program was administered by the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund, Inc. (CHIF) with funding from DOH. Single family (1-4 units) homeowners borrowed up to \$25,000 and multi-family property owners borrowed up to \$2,000 per unit (a maximum of \$60,000 per building) for a period of 10 years for eligible improvements.

The following are some of the improvements eligible under the ECL/MEL programs:

- Automatic Set-Back Thermostats
- Siding
- Caulking and Weather-Stripping
- Insulation
- Heat Pumps
- Replacement Heating Systems
- Replacement Roofs
- Replacement Windows
- Solar Systems and Passive Solar Additions

2. Application Review Process

Connecticut Housing Investment Fund (CHIF) receives the majority of applications electronically via the online application. A manual application can also be taken over the phone, mailed to CHIF or completed in person. CHIF's address is 121 Tremont Street, Hartford 06105. The web site is: www.CHIF.org.

The following steps outline a how CHIF Program Administrators process ECL applications:

- Application is received and reviewed to make sure application meets requirements. Staff confirms the applicant meets income requirements and confirms property taxes are current.
- If the applicant income qualifies and property taxes are current a credit report is pulled and reviewed and the applicant's debt to income (DTI) ratio is calculated.
- If applicant meets the requirements of steps 1 and 2 above the applicant is pre-approved and is sent affidavits that describe all the required documentation that is needed to issue final

loan approval. If the applicant does not meet the debt to income ratio requirements AND the application is a Health & Safety Issue the application is reviewed for a Program Waiver or Deferred Loan; this is done on a case by case basis.

- Upon receipt of signed affidavits and all supporting requested documentation, the file undergoes final underwriting to verify all supporting documentation and to verify the information provided on the application is correct as well as that the planned improvements meet the program guidelines.
- Final approval and loan closing documents are sent to the applicant.
- After the original signed loan documents have been received by CHIF along with the Loan Agreement recording fee, the loan will be processed for disbursement of funds directly to the borrow.
- Work Completion forms must be submitted to CHIF within 90 days of the loan closing, unless is approved.

3. FY 2014 Activity

ECL Program Activity FY 2014		
Loan Type	Number	Investment
ECL	195	\$1,842,324
MEL	2	\$ 53,383
Deferred	22	\$ 160,558
TOTAL	219	\$2,056,265
Fee Type		
Admin		\$ 126,830
Loan Servicing		\$115,972
Recovered Late Fees		\$13,380
TOTAL		\$256,182
Average Days App to Close		61 days
Average Days App to Fund		73

Source: DOH

B. Shore Up Connecticut

To assist shoreline owners interested in protecting their homes and businesses from future storms, DOH established a fund, envisioned by Governor Malloy, to provide low-interest loans to property owners in coastal municipalities to finance or refinance property elevations and retrofitting for flood protection. Primary and secondary single family homes, 1-4 unit owner-occupied rentals and businesses with fewer

than 100 employees located in flood zones VE or AE in coastal municipalities were eligible for assistance under the Shore Up CT program.

V. Resiliency Programs

A. Community Development Block Grant - Disaster Recovery Program

The State of Connecticut, Department of Housing (DOH) made significant progress in the implementation of the disaster recovery programs outlined in the approved Action Plan. Several efforts were made to implement a program that is in accordance with all federal regulations. Written program guidelines were developed, prepared and posted on the DOH web portal dedicated to Superstorm Sandy Recovery.

The Intake Centers and mobile units have proven a great resource for homeowners impacted by Superstorm Sandy. Since opening these centers there have been over 1,500 appointments. The intake centers located in Groton, East Haven, Milford and Norwalk were closed on March 1, 2014 and the Fairfield intake center closed on April 1, 2014. Although all five intake centers are closed, DOH is committed to ensuring that the disaster recovery needs of the residents impacted by Superstorm Sandy are met and the mobile unit is currently available for persons who are elderly, disabled, or in need of assistance in completing their applications.

Roughly nine hundred and fifty-four (954) applications for assistance were submitted by homeowners for the Owner Occupied program; of which 15 are in progress (the applicant has not hit the submit button), and 936 have been submitted. Out of the 936 applications that have been submitted: 138 are under quality assurance review and 798 have been submitted to DOH for program eligibility determination. To date, DOH staff has reviewed 784 of these applications and there are presently 14 applications under review. Assistance has been prioritized for those families that continue to be displaced from their homes, in addition to the standard priority based on income, with assistance being targeted to lower income families first.

The state allocated \$11,200,000 toward the Owner Occupied Reimbursement program in the second tranche of funds to help homeowners in whole or in part, for out-of-pocket funds spent repairing their property. A total of 420 applicants are seeking reimbursement under this program with requests exceeding over \$30,000,000.

A multi-media campaign targeted residents and small business owners located in the areas most impacted by Superstorm Sandy. The Small Business Express Program has received 14 applications since the

program begun accepting applications on September 27, 2013. Three (3) of which have been approved, one (1) is under financial review, one (1) has been withdrawn by the applicant, one (1) has been denied and nine (9) are presently under application review.

Under the Tranche of funds the State allocated \$4,000,000 for Infrastructure, \$2,029,000 for Planning and \$2,200,000 for Public Facilities. DOH issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) directed to applicants seeking assistance for the repair or replacement of existing infrastructure and public facilities. Additionally, planning funds are available to cover costs associated with improving the resiliency of infrastructure and public facilities. The goal of this NOFA was to provide funding for necessary expenses related to the rehabilitation and replacement of infrastructure and public facilities to restore a suitable living environment in disaster impacted areas. DOH intends to make repairs in a manner that supports energy conservation/efficiency and responsible growth as well as transit oriented development.

VI. Individual and Family Support Programs

A. Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program

Through its Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program, DOH provided emergency shelter services, rapid rehousing programs and multi-family or single room residency programs to individuals and /or families who were homeless.

DOH allocated Federal and State funds for a combined total of \$15,654,174 for the provision of housing assistance and supportive services to homeless people. ESG Program funding was provided in FFY 13 to twenty four (24) non-profit organizations for shelter operations, administration and rapid rehousing. Through competitive procurement rapid rehousing funds were allocated to AIDS, CT (ACT) as a fiduciary agency. Non-profit organizations accessed these funds to rapidly rehouse clients out of homelessness. The ESG total allocated for DOH equaled \$1,560,085.

Types of services that were provided include the following:

- Intake, needs assessment and case management services;
- Educational & vocational services;
- Health/mental health services;
- Shelter and housing assistance;
- Substance abuse counseling;
- Rapid rehousing;
- Transportation/provision of bus tokens;
- Outreach; and Workshops on life skills, budgeting, parenting skills, nutrition, etc.

Other related services provided by certain service providers include health care, consumable supplies, food and meal services, employment assistance, client support and child care.

2013 ESG Allocation Chart				
State Recipient	Rapid Rehousing	Shelter Operations	Admin	Total
Central CT Coast YMCA		\$62,515		\$62,515
Norwalk emergency Shelter-Open Door		\$54,695		\$54,695
Operation Hope		\$23,220	\$1,220	\$24,440
Regional Network of Programs		\$54,698		\$54,698
Shelter for the Homeless		\$97,019		\$97,019
Inspirica		\$52,856		\$52,856
Immaculate Conception		\$26,288		\$26,288
Open Health		\$37,767		\$37,767
South Park Inn		\$72,516	\$3,816	\$76,332
Christian Community Action		\$65,227	\$3,098	\$68,325
Columbus House		\$41,092		\$41,092
New Reach (formerly NHHR)		\$49,883		\$49,883
Area Congreg Together – Spooner House		\$33,708	\$1,774	\$35,482
Beth El Center		\$24,988		\$24,988
Columbus House-Middletown Fam. Shelt.		\$34,157		\$34,157
Community Renewal Team (EH Shelter		\$34,350		\$34,350
Family & Children’s AID – Harm. House		\$38,436		\$38,436
Friendship Service Center		\$33,666		\$33,666
Manchester Area Conference of Churches		\$32,897		\$32,897
New Opportunities – Shelter NOW		\$71,204		\$71,204
St. Vincent DePaul Bristol		\$26,987		\$26,987
St. Vincent DePaul Waterbury		\$78,603	\$4,137	\$82,740
Thames Valley Council Comm Action, Inc.	\$12,150	\$60,531		\$72,681
Tri-Town Shelter Services		\$18,387		\$18,387
Aids Connecticut	\$408,200			\$408,200
TOTAL	\$420,350	\$1,125,690	\$14,045	\$1,560,085

B. Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

The DOH administered Connecticut’s HOPWA formula grant for the Balance of State, which included the following Counties: Litchfield, Middlesex, and New London. DOH worked collaboratively with AIDS Connecticut (ACT) who received a DOH contract to provide technical assistance to all service providers and to perform an annual “Standards” of Care” Review, a coordinated effort between DOH staff

representatives and the staff of ACT. With the partnership of ACT and the local providers, DOH was able to meet its goal of providing quality supportive housing to persons with HIV/AIDS in the State of Connecticut.

DOH allocated a total of \$5,025,811 Federal and State funds for the provision of housing assistance and supportive services to persons with HIV/AIDS and their families.

In FY 2014, the Department received \$282,574 in Federal Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) funds for the program year, which covered the time period from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. This “Balance of State” program served 40 unduplicated persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through agreement between the Connecticut State Department of Social Services and 3 not-for-profit organizations located in the Middlesex and Litchfield and New London counties Connecticut.

DOH and ACT carried out the following activities during the FY 2014:

- DOH awarded contract starting July 1, 2013 through a competitive procurement process for FY 13 - FY 15. The sub-recipients provided scattered-site apartments, STRMU and a range of support services to clients in Litchfield and Middlesex and New London counties during this period;
- During the reporting period, DOH and its project sponsors provided tenant-based rental assistance to 40 households. Forty (40) unduplicated households received supportive services which included the following: case management/client advocacy/access to benefits and services;
- Of the households serviced during this reporting period, 15 households obtained employment;
- The Department provided training and technical assistance for CTHMIS utilization to HOPWA funded agencies, utilizing non-HOPWA funds;
- The Department and project sponsors participated in quarterly HOPWA grantee meetings convened by HUD-local; and
- The Department staff (programmatic and fiscal) participated and completed HOPWA on-Line Financial Management Training.

C. Rental Assistance Program and Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program

1. Connecticut Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program

The Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) was the federal government’s largest program for assisting very low income families to afford decent, safe and sanitary housing in the private market. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) contracted with Public Housing Authorities (PHA) to administer the program. The State Department of Housing (DOH) was one of 40 PHA’s in Connecticut that administered the HCV program and the only PHA that was allowed to administer the program throughout the entire State of Connecticut. The Department of Housing

funds four categories of HCV Housing Choice Voucher Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program, Family Unification Program, Veteran's Affairs Supportive Housing and Project Based Vouchers. The total amount of Section 8 vouchers awarded in FY 14 was 7,382, totaling \$34,330,630.

a) **Housing Choice Voucher Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program**

The Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program provided a portable rental assistance subsidy, which allowed a tenant to move from one rental unit to another provided the unit meets program requirements.

b) **Family Unification Program (FUP)**

The Family Unification Program (FUP) was a partnership between DOH and the Department of Children and Families (DCF) that provided a Housing Choice Voucher from DOH and a comprehensive array of services from DCF to individuals and families involved in the child welfare system.

c) **Veteran's Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH)**

The HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program combined Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) rental assistance for homeless Veterans with case management and clinical services provided by the Department of Veterans.

d) **Project Based Vouchers**

In contrast to a tenant based rental subsidy, in which a tenant can move from one eligible unit to another, the project based voucher program had the rental subsidy connected to a specific unit in a property.

2. Connecticut Rental Assistance Programs (RAP)

The State of Connecticut Department of Housing Rental Assistance Program (RAP) was the primary state-supported program for assisting very-low-income families to afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the private market. Much like the federal Housing Choice Voucher program, RAP provides a portable rental assistance subsidy, which allowed tenants to move from one rental unit to another provided the unit met program requirements. Participants that were issued a housing voucher are responsible for finding a suitable housing unit of the participant's choice where the owner agrees to rent under the program. Participants were able to select their own housing, including apartment, townhouses, and single-family homes. Rental units met minimum standards of quality and safety as defined by the State of Connecticut, which were the Federal Housing Quality

Standards (HQS) as established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Participants paid 40% of their adjusted gross income (or 30% of adjusted gross income if the participant is elderly or disabled) toward the rent and the DOH rental subsidy (RAP) paid the remainder of the contract rent directly to the landlord. Currently over 1900 households utilize RAP certificates throughout the state. The total amount of RAP certificates awarded in FY 14 was 4,820, totaling \$41,665,046.

a) Department of Housing and Department of Children and Families Housing Collaborative

1) Family Reunification Program

The Family Reunification Program (FUP) built off the success of the federally funded FUP program. FUP is a collaboration between the DOH and the Department of Children and Families (DCF) designed to reduce the number of children in foster care by providing affordable housing through a rental subsidy and the necessary support services, including intensive case management and behavioral health services, to vulnerable and homeless families.

b) Department of Housing and Department of Developmental Disabilities Housing Collaborative

1) Department of Developmental Disabilities Supportive Housing

In State Fiscal Year 2014, the Department of Developmental Disabilities (DDS) received 15 RAP certificates for use in covering the rental costs associated with transitioning individuals from 24 hour privately operated group homes to community based living settings. DDS currently supports over 1300 individuals in apartment-type settings throughout the state. Typically DDS has funded rental costs for individuals (in excess of their contributions) through a rental subsidy program managed internally. Starting in 2013 DDS has had the opportunity to utilize the RAP as a new resources alternative to prior practices.

c) Department of Housing and Department of Mental Health Addiction Services Housing Collaborative

1) Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative

The Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative was a collaborative effort between DOH and the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) to foster the development of long-term solutions to the housing and service needs of families and individuals, coping with psychiatric disabilities and/or chemical dependency that are facing homelessness.

2) Department of Mental Health and Addiction Service Rental Assistance Program (DRAP)

The Department of Mental Health and Addiction Service Rental Assistance Program provided 110 rental certificates to assist clients in obtaining supportive housing. Specifically, 60 rental

assistance certificates were allocated to the DMHAS forensics unit to allow individuals in the criminal justice system with a mental health diagnosis and who would be homeless upon release from prison live independently in the community. An additional 50 rental assistance certificates were allocated to the Enhancing Housing Opportunities Program, which allowed tenants living in supportive housing that had achieved stability, to move into housing with less support services.

3) **Housing First**

DOH and DMHAS launched the Housing First Program in 2009 to offer permanent supportive housing through RAP certificates and supportive services. In FY 2014 this program helped 20 individuals with serious mental illness who were being discharged from psychiatric hospitals, or who were homeless and at risk of hospitalization.

4) **Frequent Users' Service Enhancement Program**

The Frequent Users Service Enhancement (FUSE) Program was a 100 unit permanent supportive housing program that identified and assisted individuals who cycled through homeless service and corrections systems in the state's largest urban centers.

d) **Department of Housing and Department of Social Services Housing Collaborative**

1) **Money Follows the Person (MFP)**

Money Follows the Person (MFP) was a Federal Demonstration program funded by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services designed to help states rebalance their long-term care systems by assisting individuals to transition from living in institutional settings to community living. The program provided service funding for elderly and disabled individuals, including those with mental health disorders or developmental disabilities to live independently in the community.

2) **Social Innovation Fund**

The Social Innovation Fund (SIF), a program of the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), combined public and private resources to grow promising community-based solutions that have evidence of results in any of three priority areas: economic opportunity, healthy futures, and youth development.

VII. Affordable Housing Land Use Appeals – Exempt Municipalities/Non-Exempt Municipalities

2014 Affordable Housing Appeals - Exempt Municipalities							
Town	Total Housing Units 2010 Census	Governmentally Assisted	Tenant Rental Assistance	Single Family CHFA /USDA Mortgages	Deed Restricted Units	Totally Assisted Units	Percent Affordable
Ansonia	8,148	371	642	112	9	1,134	13.92%
Bloomfield	9,019	591	149	311	0	1,051	11.65%
Bridgeport	57,012	5870	3779	1036	20	10,705	18.78%
Bristol	27,011	1633	823	1065	0	3,521	13.04%
Brooklyn	3,235	231	12	135	0	378	11.68%
Danbury	31,154	1587	904	344	296	3,131	10.05%
Derby	5,849	275	314	69	0	658	11.25%
East Hartford	21,328	1700	1054	952	0	3,706	17.38%
East Windsor	5,045	559	43	119	14	735	14.57%
Enfield	17,558	1340	211	581	7	2,139	12.18%
Groton	17,978	3589	76	369	10	4,044	22.49%
Hartford	51,822	10,299	7812	1523	0	19,634	37.89%
Killingly	7,592	495	107	488	0	1,090	14.36%
Manchester	25,996	1834	977	923	36	3,770	14.50%
Mansfield	6,017	417	125	117	2	661	10.99%
Meriden	25,892	2027	1033	1065	11	4,136	15.97%
Middletown	21,223	2974	1047	614	25	4,660	21.96%
New Britain	31,226	3421	1602	1192	382	6,597	21.13%
New Haven	54,967	8880	5336	1188	581	15,985	29.08%
New London	11,840	1685	674	487	98	2,944	24.86%
Norwalk	35,415	2334	997	261	599	4,191	11.83%
Norwich	18,659	2109	721	554	0	3,384	18.14%
Plainfield	6,229	377	166	460	0	1,003	16.10%
Putnam	4,299	383	69	208	0	660	15.35%
Stamford	50,573	4862	1732	326	1295	8,215	16.24%
Torrington	16,761	1112	277	639	17	2,045	12.20%
Vernon	13,896	1387	391	374	12	2,164	15.57%
Waterbury	47,991	5171	3074	2327	326	10,898	22.71%
West Haven	22,446	1024	1451	429	0	2,904	12.94%
Winchester	5,613	348	444	187	0	979	17.44%
Windham	9,570	1862	541	575	0	2,978	31.12%

2014 Affordable Housing Appeals List - Non-Exempt Municipalities							
Town	Total Housing Units 2010 Census	Governmentally Assisted	Tenant Rental Assistance	Single Family CHFA /USDA Mortgages	Deed Restricted Units	Totally Assisted Units	Percent Affordable
Andover	1,317	24	1	32	0	57	4.33%
Ashford	1,903	32	2	50	0	84	4.41%
Avon	7,389	244	8	26	0	278	3.76%
Barkhamsted	1,589	0	4	13	0	17	1.07%
Beacon Falls	2,509	0	2	31	0	33	1.32%
Berlin	8,140	556	43	94	6	699	8.59%
Bethany	2,044	0	0	2	1	3	0.15%
Bethel	7,310	252	15	66	64	397	5.43%
Bethlehem	1,575	24	0	1	0	25	1.59%
Bolton	2,015	0	3	23	0	26	1.29%
Bozrah	1,059	0	2	34	0	36	3.40%
Branford	13,972	243	56	179	0	478	3.42%
Bridgewater	881	0	0	2	0	2	0.23%
Brookfield	6,562	35	7	48	70	160	2.44%
Burlington	3,389	27	0	34	0	61	1.80%
Canaan	779	25	3	30	1	59	7.57%
Canterbury	2,043	76	0	79	0	155	7.59%
Canton	4,339	211	17	68	32	328	7.56%
Chaplin	988	0	0	36	0	36	3.64%
Cheshire	10,424	277	12	78	17	384	3.68%
Chester	1,923	23	3	12	0	38	1.98%
Clinton	6,065	84	9	47	0	140	2.31%
Colchester	6,182	364	34	145	0	543	8.78%
Colebrook	722	0	0	10	1	11	1.52%
Columbia	2,308	24	3	63	0	90	3.90%
Cornwall	1,007	18	2	3	0	23	2.28%
Coventry	5,099	103	1	176	20	300	5.88%
Cromwell	6,001	212	13	203	0	428	7.13%
Darien	7,074	136	7	1	95	239	3.38%
Deep River	2,096	26	24	26	0	76	3.63%
Durham	2,694	36	4	14	0	54	2.00%
Eastford	793	0	0	24	0	24	3.03%
East Granby	2,152	72	2	35	0	109	5.07%
East Haddam	4,508	73	1	47	1	122	2.71%
East Hampton	5,485	70	5	98	25	198	3.61%
East Haven	12,533	542	141	307	0	990	7.90%
East Lyme	8,458	396	10	95	19	520	6.15%
Easton	2,715	0	0	0	11	11	0.41%
Ellington	6,665	260	9	106	0	375	5.63%
Essex	3,261	36	5	12	0	53	1.63%

2014 Affordable Housing Appeals List - Non-Exempt Municipalities							
Fairfield	21,648	241	94	34	116	485	2.24%
Farmington	11,106	496	110	123	155	884	7.96%
Franklin	771	27	0	16	0	43	5.58%
Glastonbury	13,656	583	37	124	2	746	5.46%
Goshen	1,664	1	0	9	0	10	0.60%
Granby	4,360	85	1	47	5	138	3.17%
Greenwich	25,631	839	334	2	54	1,229	4.79%
Griswold	5,118	153	67	237	0	457	8.93%
Guilford	9,596	177	7	36	0	220	2.29%
Haddam	3,504	22	0	25	0	47	1.34%
Hamden	25,114	903	545	477	4	1,929	7.68%
Hampton	793	0	2	42	0	44	5.55%
Hartland	856	2	1	8	0	11	1.29%
Harwinton	2,282	22	0	36	0	58	2.54%
Hebron	3,567	58	3	46	0	107	3.00%
Kent	1,665	52	4	4	0	60	3.60%
Killingworth	2,598	0	0	11	5	16	0.62%
Lebanon	3,125	26	5	88	0	119	3.81%
Ledyard	5,987	32	5	204	0	241	4.03%
Lisbon	1,730	2	0	57	0	59	3.41%
Litchfield	3,975	140	5	28	29	202	5.08%
Lyme	1,223	0	0	2	8	10	0.82%
Madison	8,049	90	1	10	29	130	1.62%
Marlborough	2,389	24	2	23	0	49	2.05%
Middlebury	2,892	77	3	15	20	115	3.98%
Middlefield	1,863	30	2	13	1	46	2.47%
Milford	23,074	726	212	220	107	1,265	5.48%
Monroe	6,918	32	3	23	1	59	0.85%
Montville	7,407	81	28	240	0	349	4.71%
Morris	1,314	20	4	1	0	25	1.90%
Naugatuck	13,061	537	368	311	0	1,216	9.31%
New Canaan	7,551	163	9	2	31	205	2.71%
New Fairfield	5,593	0	0	27	13	40	0.72%
New Hartford	2,923	12	5	46	15	78	2.67%
Newington	13,011	537	148	390	36	1,111	8.54%
New Milford	11,731	269	27	147	16	459	3.91%
Newtown	10,061	134	3	29	15	181	1.80%
Norfolk	967	28	2	9	0	39	4.03%
North Branford	5,629	62	10	62	0	134	2.38%
North Canaan	1,587	138	1	8	0	147	9.26%
North Haven	9,491	343	36	76	1	456	4.80%
North Stonington	2,306	0	2	22	0	24	1.04%

2014 Affordable Housing Appeals List - Non-Exempt Municipalities							
Old Lyme	5,021	64	2	9	3	78	1.55%
Old Saybrook	5,602	50	7	19	20	96	1.71%
Orange	5,345	46	6	10	6	68	1.27%
Oxford	4,746	36	3	12	0	51	1.07%
Plainville	8,063	242	21	311	22	596	7.39%
Plymouth	5,109	178	18	224	0	420	8.22%
Pomfret	1,684	32	1	28	0	61	3.62%
Portland	4,077	185	82	64	0	331	8.12%
Preston	2,019	40	5	44	0	89	4.41%
Prospect	3,474	0	4	38	0	42	1.21%
Redding	3,811	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Ridgefield	9,420	179	1	9	48	237	2.52%
Rocky Hill	8,843	235	30	179	0	444	5.02%
Roxbury	1,167	19	0	1	0	20	1.71%
Salem	1,635	1	0	34	0	35	2.14%
Salisbury	2,593	16	2	7	12	37	1.43%
Scotland	680	0	0	13	0	13	1.91%
Seymour	6,968	262	18	97	0	377	5.41%
Sharon	1,775	20	2	4	0	26	1.46%
Shelton	16,146	344	34	87	82	547	3.39%
Sherman	1,831	0	2	3	0	5	0.27%
Simsbury	9,123	241	19	62	0	322	3.53%
Somers	3,479	146	12	31	0	189	5.43%
Southbury	9,091	90	4	18	0	112	1.23%
Southington	17,447	609	67	295	51	1,022	5.86%
South Windsor	10,243	427	49	239	0	715	6.98%
Sprague	1,248	20	13	47	0	80	6.41%
Stafford	5,124	178	13	231	0	422	8.24%
Sterling	1,511	0	6	61	0	67	4.43%
Stonington	9,467	297	15	71	0	383	4.05%
Stratford	21,091	524	381	278	33	1,216	5.77%
Suffield	5,469	212	3	64	15	294	5.38%
Thomaston	3,276	104	4	115	0	223	6.81%
Thompson	4,171	151	25	133	0	309	7.41%
Tolland	5,451	98	2	93	3	196	3.60%
Trumbull	13,157	315	15	36	317	683	5.19%
Union	388	0	0	12	0	12	3.09%
Voluntown	1,127	20	4	38	0	62	5.50%
Wallingford	18,945	481	115	310	35	941	4.97%
Warren	811	0	0	5	0	5	0.62%
Washington	2,124	14	6	7	23	50	2.35%
Waterford	8,634	123	20	239	0	382	4.42%
Watertown	9,096	205	18	145	0	368	4.05%

2014 Affordable Housing Appeals List - Non-Exempt Municipalities							
Westbrook	3,937	140	7	17	24	188	4.78%
West Hartford	26,396	621	832	316	287	2,056	7.79%
Weston	3,674	0	1	0	0	1	0.03%
Westport	10,399	246	45	2	20	313	3.01%
Wethersfield	11,677	615	134	231	0	980	8.39%
Willington	2,637	160	1	46	0	207	7.85%
Wilton	6,475	136	7	7	100	250	3.86%
Windsor	11,767	154	297	401	26	878	7.46%
Windsor Locks	5,429	137	153	187	0	477	8.79%
Wolcott	6,276	313	4	131	0	448	7.14%
Woodbridge	3,478	30	5	6	0	41	1.18%
Woodbury	4,564	59	2	25	0	86	1.88%
Woodstock	3,582	24	3	72	0	99	2.76%
Total	1,487,891	91,251	41,637	29,874	5,893	168,655	11.34%