



**Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs  
HOME-ARP Allocation Plan**

**Third ~~Fourth~~ Amendment for Resubmission to HUD, ~~April~~ September 2025**

In 2021, TDHCA was allocated \$132,969,147 of funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) under Section 3205 of the American Rescue Plan Act, which HUD has called the HOME-ARP Program. A first amendment was approved by HUD in April 2023, which added more details around the NCO and NCS activities.

In 2023, HUD reduced TDHCA's HOME-ARP Allocation by \$3,808,153 due to a federal allocation error.

In 2024, HUD reallocated \$4,317,058 to TDHCA from other places in Texas.

In 2025, HOME-ARP made an adjustment to the eligibility criteria for one of its activities, and HOME-ARP received HUD notification of an additional reduction of an additional \$3,477.

The following document is the Department's Plan, as amended, for these funds which will be submitted to HUD for approval.

Items in the Plan in *italics* are instructions from HUD for a given section or item.

**Participating Jurisdiction:** Texas Dept. of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA)  
**Date:** May 2022, as amended in April 2023, ~~and further amended in October 2024,~~ April 2025, and September 2025

## I. CONSULTATION PROCESS AND INPUT

### Consultation

*Before developing its plan, a PJ must consult with the CoC(s) serving the jurisdiction’s geographic area, homeless and domestic violence service providers, veterans’ groups, public housing agencies (PHAs), public agencies that address the needs of the qualifying populations, and public or private organizations that address fair housing, civil rights, and the needs of persons with disabilities, at a minimum. State PJs are not required to consult with every PHA or CoC within the state’s boundaries; however, local PJs must consult with all PHAs (including statewide or regional PHAs) and CoCs serving the jurisdiction.*

### **Summarize the consultation process:**

TDHCA held 9 consultations to garner initial input on the state’s planning of HOME-ARP funds. The consultations were held from October 7 to October 22, 2021. In all consultations information on the program was shared with those attending and often many questions were asked and answered. In the interest of brevity, the consultation feedback summaries following the table below do not include questions posed or answers provided, but focus on summarizing input and comments made.

### **List the organizations consulted, and summarize the feedback received from these entities.**

Agency/Org Consulted	Type of Agency/Org	Method of Consultation	Feedback
Mobile Loaves and Fishes – Community First Village	Nonprofit Homeless Provider	Video Conference (October 7)	See summary below
Haven for Hope	Nonprofit Homeless Provider	Video Conference (October 7)	See summary below
Multiple (see Appendix A)	Continuums of Care and Domestic Violence Providers	Video Conference (October 13)	See summary below
Foundation Communities and New Hope Housing	Nonprofit Perm. Supp. Housing Developers	Video Conference (October 15)	See summary below
Multiple (see Appendix A)	Public Housing Authorities	Webinar (October 15)	See summary below

Agency/Org Consulted	Type of Agency/Org	Method of Consultation	Feedback
Multiple (see Appendix A)	TX Interagency Council for Homelessness	TICH Meeting also hosted as consultation (October 19)	See summary below
Multiple (see Appendix A)	Fair Housing and Disability Advocates	Webinar (October 20)	See summary below
Multiple (see Appendix A)	Veterans Services Providers	Webinar (October 22)	See summary below
Multiple (see Appendix A)	Homelessness Services Providers	Webinar (October 22)	See summary below

### Consultation with Mobile Loaves and Fishes

Mobile Loaves and Fishes (MLF) operates Community First! Village, a master planned community that provides affordable, permanent housing and a supportive community for men and women coming out of chronic homelessness in Austin.

- MLF shared that they are expanding their village of RV/park homes and micro-homes; they estimate that 80% of the population will fall into the definition of chronically homeless. They estimate it will take approximately \$150 million of capital investment; some of those funds have been committed already by Travis County. MLF indicated that most of their referrals come from CoCs or other referring agencies but not all come through Coordinated Entry (CE).
- MLF has a successful model in place in which households pay a flat monthly rent for a specific unit type, and that amount is often more than 30% of their income. They indicated they would likely not find these funds attractive for their plans if households were limited to paying only 30% of their income.
- Uses of the Funds: MLF supported a focus on capital investment with the funds. They would like to see that capital investment is used for both tiny home models and associated congregate facilities (kitchens, baths). It was discussed that varied types of units have varying levels of kitchen or bathroom facilities (with robust shared facilities) such that HOME-ARP may be able to be used for some unit types but perhaps not others. It was also discussed that TDHCA would need to confirm with HUD that such models would be allowable. MLF also supported some funds for capacity building as they ramp up operations.
- Populations/Preferences: MLF indicated they would like to see the most vulnerable populations assisted with these funds; they suggested that a preference should be allowed for the chronically homeless and that funds not just go to the households that could be seen as more sympathetic, such as families with children and veterans.
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): MLF did not want to be limited to only taking those

households that score the highest in the CE assessment. They tend to assist persons with a variety of vulnerability levels and do not prefer that all housed with HOME-ARP be referred only through CE.

#### Consultation with Haven for Hope

Haven for Hope (HFH) is a San Antonio nonprofit operating as a “one stop” campus for people who are experiencing homelessness, bringing together service providers in a single location.

- HFH shared that doing NCS as an activity is a challenge without operating expenses being provided to help support it, but did note that they would be interested if in fact operating funds could be assured. They indicated that HFH most needed flexible spending to use on housing for households that don't qualify for CE, particularly for older persons with disabilities, who are awaiting a voucher or other benefits, something that could be an extension of rapid rehousing.
- HFH discussed the unique role some of their shelter staff play as they are both operational staff, but also trained in client-facing assistance roles such as case work and other services identified in 24 CFR §578.53. These Life Safety Officers also have access to HMIS and HFH would hope to classify these staff as case management and service provision, although they are also serving in an operational role.
- HFH discussed that the reason for not being more interested in NCS with hotel conversions as an activity is that the maintenance and upkeep is extreme, they feel it is preferable to just do new construction. They also feel that hotel conversions are better for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), and that while there is a need for PSH, only a fraction of their clients go to PSH.
- HFH provided that past criminal eviction history hurts clients seeking units and suggested that any HOME-ARP funds used for rental housing should require a lower standard for entry into the housing.
- When discussing the possible idea of serving the role of a sponsor who could access a block of units through a master lease, they felt that while this would be attractive to have a guarantee, it was not ideal because it adds undue risk for the nonprofit and also does not allow the person being housed to establish a direct lease relationship with the landlord, which they find important.
- Services needed include housing specialists, intake, housing navigation and bridge psychiatric services that can provide a quick diagnosis and access to medications on an outpatient basis in close coordination with the local Mental Health Authority. HFH specifically noted that funds for these needs would not be fully addressed through the ERA2 Housing Stability Services funds, of which there is approximately \$84 million being released for competition through TDHCA in the fall of 2021. They thought some of the HOME-ARP funds should be used for this purpose also to address the long term effects of the pandemic.
- Uses of the Funds: As noted in the bullets above, HFH felt for them the best use of funds would be for TBRA and supportive services with long contract terms, such as at least a 3 year contract for TBRA to serve as a bridge to households accessing a permanent

voucher.

- Populations/Preferences: HFH felt that high priority groups included older persons currently homeless or at risk of homeless, often with disabilities, who don't qualify for CE and those awaiting vouchers or benefits. Shelters are not the most appropriate place for these persons. They have about 30 people who need a nursing home in terms of the level of care required but don't qualify for Medicaid. They also felt that families are the biggest unmet need because many are newly homeless or doubled up so don't rank as high need on CE.
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): HFH did not support being restricted to only allowing CE and feels it is very important for these housing funds to be able to assist those not in CE, or not ranking highly in CE.

#### Consultation with Continuums of Care (CoCs) and Domestic Violence (DV) Providers

Representatives from the San Antonio/Bexar County CoC; Dallas City and County, Irving CoC; Fort Worth, Arlington/Tarrant County CoC; the El Paso City and County CoC; the Houston, Pasadena, Conroe/Harris, Fort Bend, Montgomery Counties CoC; the Balance of State CoC represented by the Texas Homeless Network (THN); and the Texas Council on Family Violence were in attendance.

- Significant focus has been on rapid rehousing and bridging folks to permanent housing (Houston, El Paso, Dallas) and some noted an interest in more rental assistance to support these efforts (Houston), or to support gaps in services (Houston, El Paso). Houston discussed going from homelessness to housed and not needing to use shelter facilities.
- However, other CoCs felt they had sufficient funds for the vouchers/rental assistance and services, and felt the highest need was in actual production of units (PSH) as there are challenges in finding units for voucher holders (Tarrant, Dallas, San Antonio). Some noted interest in allowing small acquisition/rehabilitation developments that they thought could be brought online more quickly and others were specific that the PSH should include units for large families and deeply affordable units (below 30%). There was discussion of use of HOME-ARP to bring units up to Uniform Physical Condition Standards.
- There was support for funds to support capacity building for homeless services providers, especially in rural areas of the state.
- Several CoCs felt that a priority/scoring preference should include that the applicant is connected to housing authority resources and other subsidies (Houston, Dallas) although the BoS noted that this would be more challenging since they have less access to other funds. There was also discussions in how to use HOME-ARP to address racial disparities.
- Commenters felt there needed to be ways to incentivize the developers to give second chances for poor rental and credit/criminal history and these funds should not allow anything more restrictive than the local housing authority. Others felt the housing authority's barriers were too high.
- There was possible interest in NCS if it could be 'flexed' for use as PSH and interest in

NCS for the domestic violence (DV) population.

- They wanted to be able to consider those At-Risk as a broader definition than that provided by HUD, also noting that often DV cases do not classify as At-Risk but need housing to leave their abuser.
- There was fairly unanimous support that having at least coordinated with the CoC should be an application requirement.

Uses of the Funds: Because the needs of the CoCs varied there was interest in keeping the funds flexible. The most common request for the uses of HOME-ARP was development of supportive housing and NCS. There was greatest interest in NCS and development of units from the Balance of State (BoS) CoC. There were also requests to use the funds for TBRA and services and capacity building, though requests for these activities were not as common as for capital funds.

- Populations/Preferences: There was support for allowing subrecipients to establish preferences, but not limiting the funds at the state policy level to only certain populations. Preferences suggested included: persons experiencing literal homelessness, persons with disabilities, persons fleeing Domestic Violence, unsheltered homeless, and those with a history of homelessness.
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): CoCs from larger areas preferred CE be used and felt it ensured there is coordination and alignment. Alternatively for DV and the BoS they did not want to see the program limited to only CE.

#### Consultation with Developers of Permanent Supportive Rental Housing

Foundation Communities and New Hope Housing are two of the primary PSH developers in the state. The summary below also include comments received in writing from a PSH consultant, True Casa Consulting, who could not attend the session.

- Providers felt that the 70% of rental units that are required to serve qualified households would have to be underwritten as zero income so felt the biggest challenges related to operating. While they realized and appreciated that HOME-ARP allows for capitalized operating expenses they felt it would need to be for the whole affordability period. Additionally, they voiced concern for the residents of those units at the end of the 15-year HUD affordability period; as soon as the HUD operating subsidy and LURA restriction ends, for the properties to support operations on the units they would have to increase the rents on those households from 30% of their income to either market rate or the rent level of any other affordability term (likely housing tax credits).
- Two of the commenters also noted that their models of housing did not generally support having market rate units at the property to subsidize the other units (due to lack of interest by market rate tenants).
- Commenters raised concern and felt strongly that to do such transactions requires significant experience not just with supportive housing development, but also in serving the specific populations, and they felt there should be a standard or requirement relating to experience.
- Regarding leasing criteria they noted that their fair housing counsel advises that they not have different leasing criteria for some units, so whatever criteria they would have

for HOME-ARP would need to be the same as all the units and therefore acceptable to the other funders as well. They did not want to see the state dictate what the leasing criteria should be. One commenter did suggest that barriers for criminal history should be reduced.

- Regarding sizes of the developments, commenters felt that smaller size properties for PSH are not able to achieve sufficient economies of scale with the ideal size being 120-150 units. They note that because of local processes, smaller deals do not necessarily get done any faster, and that a small deal would almost certainly need a more robust subsidy.
- While not specifying that funds should be used for services, one commenter did note that gaps in services include behavioral health, transportation, health and dental, peer support, case management and housing subsidies.
- It was noted that clients should not have burdensome documentation requirements.
- Uses of the Funds: Commenters supported use of the funds for rental housing development. They provided input that the program would need to have no debt requirements. They supported the possibility of the funds being grants, or allowing the funds to be passed through to a sponsor entity to limit the tax event for the property. The one activity they proposed other than rental and capitalized operating, was to possibly allow for capitalized services as they will have to guarantee to the investor sufficient funds for service provision (capitalized service reserves).
- Populations/Preferences: Because these types of developments often have to layer financing from different funders, each with their own priorities and preferences, they felt it would be important for the funds to not limit preferences at the state level, but allows preferences at the property level. Preferences contemplated for the plan would include older adults with one or more ADL needs, adults with disabilities, chronically homeless, unstably housed and at-risk of homelessness and low income (at 200% or below federal poverty level).
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): They would find a preference for CE acceptable, or having it as an option, but not as a requirement as they want to see a range of tenants gaining access to their properties, not only chronically homeless.

#### Consultation with Public Housing Authorities

Outreach for this consultation was targeted to public housing authorities; more than 62 registered to attend the virtual session, and 34 actually logged on to the session. The summary below includes several comments received in writing from PHAs who could not attend the session.

- Across the PHAs on the call, there was support for capital development for more rental units in good condition. There was support for these funds to be used to ‘buy down’ 60% HTC units to 30% units or to add soft financing, as well as off-site costs. There was interest in layering with RAD conversions, allowing sponsorship structures, and for giving an award preference for those rehabilitating large properties to make them deeply affordable. Others asked if there could be point preferences for larger developments, and if HOME-ARP could be used for infrastructure to the development. For rental

development there was interest in making sure that PHAs could use these funds in conjunction with issuing 'Faircloth' vouchers on a private development or other public housing and that it was important to make funds available for rural areas.

- There was support voiced for the funds to be used as rental assistance like HOME TBRA and TDHCA's COVID TBRA Program, for services such as security deposit assistances, furnishings and appliances, youth employment programs, job searches, assistance accessing benefits, financial literacy, parenting skills and scholarships for trade schools.
- There was not support for adding any state-required leasing criteria, or making them more lenient, but rather that it be flexible so it could be layered with other funding sources. One commenter suggested allowing alternate means for lowering barriers such as the tenant attending rehab classes, or being flexible on references.
- Uses of the Funds: As noted above the primary interest was for rental development, as well as more limited support for TBRA and services.
- Populations/Preferences: Support no preferences, or if any, persons experiencing homelessness and Domestic Violence households. There was interest in prioritizing any households below 80% AMI since those are often quick to become unstable.
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): There was not support for CE to be a requirement; in some areas CE is not readily available, and such a requirement would harm properties and those in need.

#### Consultation with Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless (TICH)

The TICH is a statutorily created council supported by TDHCA with public and private membership. The TICH meets quarterly and at its quarterly meeting in October 2021, a presentation was made on the HOME-ARP funds, and the opportunity for input was extended. While questions were asked, no specific comments were received in regards to planning of the funds.

#### Consultation with Fair Housing and Disability Advocates

Outreach for this consultation was targeted to fair housing and disability providers and advocates. More than 185 registered to attend the virtual session, and 91 actually logged on to the session. The summary below includes several comments received in writing from disability or fair housing advocates who could not attend the session or followed up with more information in writing.

- Most of the attendees that spoke indicated a significant need for more permanent supportive rental housing, most speaking of the need specifically for those with those with Intellectual or Development Disabilities (IDD) and Mental Health disorders (MH) to be stably housed in the community. Attendees emphasized the importance of services. There was support that such housing needs to be in high opportunity areas so that it was close to transportation, jobs, stores, services, and medical supports. Several commenters mentioned the needs of adult children with IDD/MH who the parents are no longer able to care for them. It was noted that any funds used for PSH should have robust targets for accessibility and visitability and a higher percentage of units built as fully accessible for physical disabilities than is required in the Housing Tax Credit (HTC)

program. Commenters noted that housing should be for low income housing (not workforce housing). They noted that it was important that capitalized operating subsidies be provided. There was also interest that the funds be able to be used for recovery housing.

- Alternatively, one commenter noted that because the need is pressing and urgent now, that some of the funds should go to ‘right now’ solutions such as rental assistance for persons with disabilities.
- Several comments also supported use of the funds for NCS and a focus on best practices that would allow NCS to transition to other uses.
- One comment supported use for TBRA and several supported use for services specifically service coordinators, resident coordinators, and landlord incentives.
- One commenter felt the funds should allow shared housing (roommate arrangements) and noted successes with that model in Connecticut; there was discussion around risk, leases, and the fact that currently this has not been used in affordable housing or with voucher holders.
- This group voiced frustration at landlord’s unwillingness to accept voucher holders, the challenges in landlords not accepting those with criminal/credit history, and unreasonable minimum income requirements. One commenter felt the funds should be used for providing the payments needed to meet minimum income requirements.
- They suggested that the NOFA have an award preference for those with lowest barrier policies for those with justice involvement.
- Uses of the Funds: Most support for PSH and limited support for NCS, TBRA, and services.
- Populations/Preferences: There was interest for the provider to be able to identify preferences, but that the state should not do so which would limit flexibility. Wide support among the group for preferences for those with dual diagnoses (Mental Health Disorder (MH) and Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities (IDD)) and for seniors with disabilities, as they are seeing increases in IDD and MH folks that senior centers and Medicaid are not able to assist. Also interest in young adults aging out of foster care and veterans. There was also interest in allowing properties to grant a preference on their fully accessible units for those with a physical disability, in having a preference for those getting discharged for rehabilitation centers, psychiatric hospitals or released from incarceration to prevent them from exiting into homelessness. It was requested that these funds should definitely be allowed for seniors, particularly since 811 Program does not allow older than age 62.
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): There was some support of using CE but not as a mandatory requirement. Several speakers gave examples of where CE is not effective and would greatly limit the ability to assist including those in state hospitals for more than 90 days are no longer considered homeless upon exit under CE, many who need housing who don’t get ranked highly enough in CE. Alternatively one commenter did think CE should be required and that CE assessments address racial inequities.

#### Consultation with Veterans Services Providers

(Outreach for this consultation was targeted to the Texas Veterans Commission and

veteran's services providers; 21 persons registered to attend the virtual session, and 12 actually logged on to the session.)

- This session focused significantly on answering questions including eligible uses of the funds, allowable service activities, and length of assistance. One commenter was interested in uses of the funds that were not eligible.
- It was noted that the funds should not require veterans to have a DD 214 or require that the veteran must be honorably discharged. There was discussion of different military discharge statuses. There was interest in assisting vets re-entering the community from incarceration.
- It was suggested that priority in awards be given to those willing to take those perceived as higher risk tenants.
- Uses of the Funds: Interest in capital investment for rental and NCS and in making sure funds are available rurally.
- Populations/Preferences: Veterans.
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): They wanted to be sure funds are not limited to those in CE as many in need will get overlooked.

#### Consultation with Homelessness Service Providers

Outreach for this consultation was targeted to providers of homeless services; more than 158 registered to attend the virtual session, and 117 actually logged on to the session. The summary below includes several comments received in writing from providers who could not attend the session or who followed up with more detail after the session.

- There was strong interest to use funds for one time capital investments for PSH and NCS. There was input that NCS is especially helpful for families, those fleeing domestic violence and those with MH or Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) where congregate care can be detrimental to treatment. Most speakers felt there are sufficient resources for rental assistance, and there are those in need with vouchers in hand who can't find units; there is particularly need for the deepest income units. There was emphasis that the rental housing needed to come with operating reserves and allow for sponsorship structures. Commenters encouraged the construction funds be flexible so recipients can try to fund smaller properties or respond flexibly to families in crisis. Several attendees emphasized the importance of funds being made available for rural areas and that they not have to compete against urban areas.
- Several commenters noted that it would be important to not just fund capital investment, but to focus on long term supports including operations, homelessness prevention, case management, employment services, and landlord incentives (with thoughtful consideration relating to fair housing issues).
- One commenter supported sober living beds/transitional beds and some Single Room Occupancy (SRO) design.
- Because of the urgent need now, there was also interest from several providers for TBRA since other rental funds are starting to end. They also note that accessing rental assistance should not first require having an eviction status which is what is often required from other funding sources.

- One commenter supported the funds for nonprofit development and black-led organizations.
- One commenter suggested that awarding of projects should be prioritized for long term (20-30 year) shelter assistance.
- Uses of the Funds: While varied, there was strong support for PSH and NCS, with less significant support for TBRA, services, and nonprofit operations and capacity building.
- Populations/Preferences: Chronically homeless, disabled, and homeless youth (18-24 years old).
- Use of Coordinated Entry (CE): Most attendees felt strongly that CE should not be a requirement. However two commenters did think CE should be required. Because CE prioritizes persons with the highest scores, those with the greatest needs are getting assisted, but many who could be rapidly assisted are not captured in CE and have lower scores, including those activity working with case workers and in school.

## II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS AND INPUT

*PJs must provide for and encourage citizen participation in the development of the HOME-ARP allocation plan. Before submission of the plan, PJs must provide residents with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on the proposed HOME-ARP allocation plan of **no less than 15 calendar days**. The PJ must follow its adopted requirements for “reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment” for plan amendments in its current citizen participation plan. In addition, PJs must hold **at least one public hearing** during the development of the HOME-ARP allocation plan and prior to submission.*

*For the purposes of HOME-ARP, PJs are required to make the following information available to the public:*

- *The amount of HOME-ARP the PJ will receive,*
- *The range of activities the PJ may undertake.*

***Describe the public participation process, including information about and the dates of the public comment period and public hearing(s) held during the development of the plan:***

Upon approval of a draft Plan by the TDHCA Board, the draft plan was released for a 17 day public comment period from January 14, 2022 to January 31, 2022. TDHCA adhered to its citizen participation plan. Two hearings were held during the comment period.

### Virtual Hearing

Friday, January 21, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. Austin Local Time. There were 51 individuals registered to attend, and 38 attendees. Seven persons commented.

### In-Person Hearing

Thursday, January 27, 2022 at 2:00 pm in Austin, Texas. There were no in-person attendees.

After the Plan was presented to the Board for approval to submit to HUD on March 10, 2022, staff determined that several additional revisions were needed, based in part on further guidance from HUD. While not vastly different from the version approved by the Board initially, the Plan was returned to the Board on April 14, 2022 for its approval. Notice of the Plan being re-presented to the Board was made prior to the meeting, and the public was given the opportunity to again comment on the Plan at the meeting of Board.

For the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan First Amendment, the Draft Amended Allocation Plan showing the amended text was approved at the April 13, 2023 Board meeting to release for public comment. The public comment period was April 17, 2023 to May 2, 2023. The draft amendment was posted on TDHCA's website for viewing. Notification of the public comment period was sent via email list and published in the April 28, 2023 edition of the *Texas Register*.

For the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan Second Amendment, the Draft Amended Allocation Plan showing the amended text was presented at the October 10, 2024 Board meeting prior to release for public comment. The public comment period was October 14, 2024 to October 28, 2024. The draft amendment was posted on TDHCA's website for viewing. Notification of the public comment period was sent via email list and published in the October 25, 2024 edition of the *Texas Register*.

For the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan Third Amendment, the Draft Amended Allocation Plan showing the amended text was posted online on April 7, 2025, and presented at the April 10, 2025, Board meeting. Because the requested change is not material, no additional public comment period was required.

For the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan Fourth Amendment, the Allocation Plan showing the additional reduction was submitted to HUD in September 2025. Because the change amount was less than 1%, it was not presented to the Board and no additional public comment period was required.

### ***Describe any efforts to broaden public participation:***

TDHCA held both an in-person hearing in Austin and a virtual hearing to accept comment. Notice of the hearings was published in the Texas Register and sent via TDHCA's subscription email lists to the homeless-focused topics and the multifamily topics, which reached approximately 9,700 subscribers. The notice included how individuals could request a language interpreter, auxiliary aids or services for the hearings. The information on how to request an interpreter was also included in Spanish. Comments were also accepted via mail or email. Finally, the plan was posted online for ease of access during the public comment

period.

*A PJ must consider any comments or views of residents received in writing, or orally at a public hearing, when preparing the HOME-ARP allocation plan.*

***Summarize the comments and recommendations received through the public participation process:***

Fifteen persons commented on the HOME-ARP draft plan. The comments and staff changes to the plan have been summarized below, along with staff responses.

For the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan First Amendment, no comments were received.

For the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan Second Amendment, no comments were received.

**1. Comment: Clarify if HOME-ARP can be used with National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) in the same development**

Summary: Jennifer Hicks (*TrueCasa Consulting, Austin*) requested clarification on whether NHTF can be layered on the same development.

Staff response: While NHTF was not named specifically in the draft HOME-ARP Plan, NHTF was included in the umbrella category of “other federal funds” able to be layered with HOME-ARP. However, this question prompted several critical discussions among HOME-ARP and Multifamily staff. There may be developments previously awarded NHTF that face increased costs, putting the developments in jeopardy of not being able to be completed. If not completed, the Department may lose access to these NHTF funds. Prioritizing the use of the HOME-ARP funds to these developments allows the NHTF funds to remain in Texas, and also will expedite early delivery of some of the HOME-ARP units more quickly than will be the case for new applications. Therefore, staff revised the Plan to designate that up to \$10 million of HOME-ARP funds may be directly awarded, without competition, to certain NHTF active applications or awardees. These developments will be required to submit an abbreviated application upon approval of the Plan from HUD, but will not be required to compete for funds under the HOME-ARP Rental Development Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). Specifically, the following provisions are now included in the HOME-ARP Plan:

“Applications for HOME-ARP that are for developments with an active application for, or that were awarded, NHTF from the Department may be submitted directly and awarded non-competitively if the applicant:

- applied for NHTF in 2020 or 2021 and the application was not terminated by staff or voluntarily withdrawn by the applicant;
- can demonstrate cost increases that necessitate the need for additional investment;
- has not started construction or has previously received a 24 CFR Part 58

- review if construction has started;
- the deferred developer fee does not decrease and developer fee does not increase; and
- returns HOME-ARP application materials to the Department within the timeframe provided by the Department and before the application due date of NOFAs for HOME-ARP rental housing.

Up to \$10 million in HOME-ARP funds will be available for NHTF awardees that meet the criteria in this section. If the Department receives less than \$10 million in applications by the time of the rental development NOFA application due date, the remaining funding will be used to increase the amount available for rental development awards. If the applications received for this limited pool exceed the total available, the applications will be processed based on their submission date. In the event that more than \$10 million is requested per application received on the same date, the Development with the lowest HOME-ARP capital cost per unit will be awarded.

In addition, applications layered with NHTF will also be accepted during the application cycle for HOME-ARP rental development. However, there may be programmatic limitations on having HOME-ARP and NHTF in the same unit.”

## **2. Comments: Support and clarification of TDHCA HOME-ARP availability in Participating Jurisdictions**

Summary: Two comments were received regarding the ability to use HOME-ARP in Participating Jurisdictions (e.g., areas of Texas that receive HOME-ARP funds directly from HUD).

One comment was from James Wooldridge (*Habitat for Humanity, Fort Hood*) who asked for clarification on availability within Participating Jurisdictions. The second comment was from Judy Telge (*Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living, Corpus Christi*) who encouraged use of HOME-ARP in Participating Jurisdictions.

Staff response: The HOME-ARP draft Plan stated that funds will be made available statewide. Staff has added a clarification that applicants must demonstrate the unmet need among qualifying populations for the type of housing proposed in their geographical area through a market assessment or other source of data for greater conformance to HUD’s requirements. The Department will conduct outreach to encourage applications from both urban and rural areas to be submitted. Distribution may be affected by State laws or limitations, such as Tex. Gov’t Code §2306.111(c), if at such time existing state waivers expire.

## **3. Comment: Increase the maximum amount of HOME-ARP rental development awards to \$15 million**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) asked to increase the maximum amount of assistance for rental housing development from \$10 million to \$15 million. She stated a larger cap of \$15 million would be needed to be able to scale the rental housing program, which also can include operating subsidies.

Staff response: Staff agrees with the comment, and has increased the maximum award amount for rental housing from \$10 million to \$15 million, although this amount may be further limited in the NOFA.

In addition, staff has increased the maximum award amount for the NCS activity to the maximum amount released in the NOFA. This will encourage applicants to request their actual need; large-scale shelter innovations may allow for more impactful changes in access to shelter.

**4. Comment: Apply the per project maximum request to the capital request only for rental development**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) suggested applying the per project maximum request to the capital request, not including any additional operating reserve request.

Staff response: The Plan had not been specific on whether the per application cap did or did not include the operating reserves. Clarification was needed, however the clarification made to the Plan was not what was requested, but rather that the maximum per project award includes operating reserves. HUD CPD Notice 21-10 allows for capitalized operating costs to be used in conjunction with acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of affordable rental housing. Operating costs are not a separate activity and, as such, will be included in the entire application amount. Further, with the limited funds available, the Department wants to stretch the dollars to assist more developments if possible.

**5. Comment: Allow HOME-ARP capital dollars to be loaned through a deferred forgivable loan at 0% interest**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested that HOME-ARP loans be structured as a deferred, forgivable loan at 0% interest, as the HOME-ARP units will not be able to support debt service.

Staff response: Staff anticipates offering a range of loan types in the NOFAs with different options that developments can choose from to suit their financial structure. One of those loan products will be a deferred forgivable loan at 0% interest. Clarification on the types of loans available is included in the Plan, and the specifics on the loan terms will depend on the financial structure of the application and contract terms described in further program guidance.

**6. Comment: Allow HOME-ARP units to float**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested that HOME-ARP units be allowed to float, unless otherwise restricted by additional funding sources on the development.

Staff response: Generally, TDHCA supports floating units unless prohibited by other federal sources. However, because a unit's nature as being fixed or floating affects the underwriting of the development, the NOFA will outline whether units must be fixed or floating.

#### **7. Comments: HOME-ARP rental housing should assist special needs populations**

Summary: Four commenters included their perspective on serving persons experiencing homelessness, and listed specific populations that would benefit from HOME-ARP rental housing.

Dr. Flora Brewer (*Paulos Foundation, PF Residential and Paulos Properties, Fort Worth*) and R. Steve Christian (*New Leaf Community Services, Fort Worth*) commented that funds should be programmed into creating housing especially for persons with long periods of homelessness, disabilities, chronic illness, behavioral health disorders, and those who are elderly.

Deirdre P. Browne (*MHMR Tarrant County Behavioral Health Services*) commented that HOME-ARP's rental housing should serve persons with long histories of homelessness, disabilities, chronic illness, and behavioral health disorders.

Judy Telge (*Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living, Corpus Christi*) commented that HOME-ARP should not be restricted to persons with disabilities who have senior status. She stated that there is need for affordable housing for younger individuals with disabilities.

Staff response: The populations listed by the commenters are within or could be a subset within populations listed already in the HOME-ARP Plan under preferences for rental housing. It should also be noted that the draft Plan included "Persons with Disabilities" with no mention of age as a possible limiting factor. While the persons listed by commenters above were not added separately to the HOME-ARP Plan, the Plan has been revised to further describe the needs and gaps of the qualified populations, and adds three additional possible preference populations: persons who are experiencing homelessness, persons who were formerly homeless and temporarily housed, and persons prioritized through Coordinated Entry for non-congregate shelter and rental housing.

Furthermore, the wording and types of the preferences between the NCS and Rental Housing activities were made more uniform and revised in response to HUD's guidance. While several edits were made, most preferences remained, but using different wording to conform to terms used by HUD. For example, "Persons Fleeing Domestic Violence" was removed because it is included in the "Persons with Violence Against Woman Act (VAWA) Protections and Human Trafficking" preference. Likewise,

“Youth Aging out of the Foster Care System” was removed because this population is included in the “Persons Exiting Institutions or Systems of Care/Reentry” preference. The Plan also clarified that Veterans and Families with Children preferences could be established if these populations were also experiencing homelessness or at-risk of homelessness. The only preference population deleted was Public Housing Residents, which was deleted due to a statutory prohibition between the two funding sources in this regard.

In addition, staff added clarification regarding the use of the Coordinated Entry system. If a property is intending to use only Coordinated Entry and not a project-specific waitlist, the Coordinated Entry system must meet the requirements in HUD CPD notice 21-10, which requires sufficient referrals to the project and that all qualifying populations have an opportunity to participate within the project’s geographic region. This may mean the addition of certain qualifying populations and ensuring the Coordinated Entry includes the primary market area of the rental development, as defined in 11.303(d)(8). Coordinated Entry may also be used with other referral methods, if the Owner establishes prioritization criteria between the Coordinated Entry and other referral methods and maintain any waitlists in chronological order. If the requirements of 21-10 are not met, then a project-specific waitlist must also be used by the development. The project-specific waitlist must take persons in chronological order, with priority given to those with preferences stated in the written agreement between the developer and the Department. In addition, if up to 30% of the HOME-ARP units are reserved for low-income household who are not qualifying populations, a project-specific waitlist must be used for these units.

**8. Plan clarification:** Unused non-profit capacity building and non-profit operating cost assistance will be offered as non-congregate shelter or rental housing development activity funds, and the application process for the non-profit capacity building and operating funds may be independent of the other activities.

Clarification: The Plan was updated to provide a clarification on the flow of funds under the non-profit capacity building and operating cost assistance line items. While the NP Operating and NP Capacity Building are shown as one line item in the table for the purpose of receiving requests for either category, the Department will commit these activities to each project separately in IDIS as needed. The NP Operating and NP Capacity Building Assistance applications may be included as part of the NOFAs for NCS and Rental Housing development, or as separate NOFAs released in advance to assist nonprofits to strengthen capacity and planning prior to applying under the NCS or Rental Housing NOFAs. If awards for NP Operating and NP Capacity Building for NCS or Rental Housing do not fully utilize those funds, those unused funds may be shifted into NCS or Rental Housing for those activities.

In addition, because staff is establishing the application process of the non-profit

capacity building and operating funds to be more independent of the NCS or Rental Housing activities, a minimum and maximum amount was established. An award may be offered for the greater of up to 50% of an organization's operating budget or \$50,000, or as further described in the NOFA.

***Summarize any comments or recommendations not accepted and state the reasons why:***

**9. Comments: Varied comments relating to the proportional amount of funds being allocated for rental housing and non-congregate shelter.**

Summary: There was one comment to support the current allocation in the draft plan, and eleven comments to move funds from non-congregate shelter to rental housing development. G. Roderick Henry (*Temple Chamber of Commerce*) wrote in support of the current allocation proposed in the draft, with the evenly allocated program funds of approximately \$56 million in both non-congregate shelter and rental housing development. He describes possible risks in congregate shelters and the possible struggle to maintain employment while at a congregate shelter. He makes a connection between shelters as a steppingstone toward permanent affordable housing. A letter of support with a similar comment was also submitted by State Representative Brad Buckley, Texas House District 54, outside of the official public comment period.

Alternatively, there were eleven comments to move funds from non-congregate shelter to rental housing development. The comments varied in the amounts to move from one category to the other.

There were five comments that supported moving an unspecified amount of funding from non-congregate shelter to rental housing development. These comments were from (1) Lauren King, (*Tarrant County Homeless Coalition*); (2) Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*); (3) Jyme Gordy (*Presbyterian Night Shelter, Fort Worth*); (4) Toby Owen (*Presbyterian Night Shelter, Fort Worth*); and (5) Madeline Reedy (*CitySquare, Dallas*).

There were three comments that supported moving a moderate amount of funds from non-congregate shelter to rental housing development. Comments were received from (1) Ken Cates (*Habitat for Humanity, Fort Hood*), (2) Tara Perez (*City of Fort Worth*), and (3) Debbi Rabalais (*Presbyterian Night Shelter, Fort Worth*). Ken Cates commented that rental housing development should be budgeted at approximately \$60 million and non-congregate shelter would be approximately \$52 million. He stated that there is an opportunity for partners to combine non-congregate shelter and affordable housing options. Tara Perez and Debbi Rabalais both requested that approximately \$87 million be programmed into rental housing development and \$25 million be programmed into non-congregate shelter. Tara Perez gave an example of a hotel conversion to Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in Fort Worth that no longer needs to be supported by emergency shelter operating funds. The project created a reduction in homelessness metrics for the City of Fort Worth. Both Debbi Rabalais and Toby Owen of the Presbyterian Night Shelter also included the example of the hotel conversion in Fort Worth, commenting that the Presbyterian Night Shelter provides supportive services for

persons in the newly-converted development. They encouraged a similar program in other HOME-ARP rental developments.

There were three comments that supported moving approximately \$56 million from the non-congregate shelter funds to rental housing development. This change would result in the non-congregate shelter activity budget being essentially zero. These comments were from: (1) Dr. Flora Brewer (*Paulos Foundation, PF Residential and Paulos Properties, Fort Worth*); (2) R. Steve Christian (*New Leaf Community Services, Fort Worth*); (3) Deirdre P. Browne (*MHMR Tarrant County Behavioral Health Services*). Dr. Flora Brewer and R. Steve Christian both told of their experience working to end homelessness, and were convinced that funding should be invested in housing. Deirdre P. Browne noted that rental housing and specialized wrap-around services are key to eliminating homelessness and returns to homelessness.

Staff response: While staff agrees that more permanent housing is necessary to alleviate homelessness, emergency shelter is also necessary in certain situations. The draft HOME-ARP Plan has a provision that if applications received in either non-congregate shelter or rental housing do not fully use the allocation, the funds may be shifted between the two categories. Considering this provision, staff recommends retaining the allocation levels between rental housing and non-congregate shelter as proposed in the draft. Therefore, no changes were made to the Plan as a result of the comment.

Staff agrees that successful rental housing developments may include partnerships between developers and non-profits that provide services. Staff also anticipates that there will be partnerships between non-congregate shelter providers and rental housing developments as well.

**10. Comment: HOME-ARP should be used for tenant-based rental assistance and supportive services**

Summary: Judy Telge (*Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living, Corpus Christi*) supported the draft Plan's programming of funds into non-congregate shelter and rental housing development, and also requested for funding to be programmed into tenant based rental assistance (TBRA) and supportive services such as case management. She advocate for TBRA and supportive services to bridge gaps until the shelters or developments are constructed.

Staff response: While staff recognizes a range of support and housing options are needed, the overwhelming support for HOME-ARP through the consultations and public comments have been for non-congregate shelter and rental housing development. In addition, TDHCA offers other program sources for rental assistance and supportive services. The draft Plan also has a provision that if sufficient applications are not received for non-congregate shelter or rental housing, funds may be reprogrammed into supportive services or TBRA. No changes were made to the Plan as a result of this comment.

**11. Comments: Allow HOME-ARP to be used with project-based vouchers, tenant-based vouchers, and other types of rental subsidies.**

Summary: Jennifer Hicks (*TrueCasa Consulting, Austin*) asked for clarification regarding use of HOME-ARP with project-based vouchers or tenant based vouchers and gave several examples (found in Attachment C). She also asked for clarification of the rental amount for a qualified population with a tenant-based voucher.

Staff response: Both project-based vouchers and tenant-based rental assistance may be allowed in HOME-ARP projects, dependent on the overall financial structure and funding sources. A tenant who is in a qualified population would pay 30% of his/her income for rent; if that project also had a project-based subsidy or the tenant had a tenant-based rental subsidy, the payment for the tenant would still be 30% of his/her income, but the development could charge the rent permissible under the applicable rental assistance program (i.e., the tenant rental contribution plus the rental subsidy allowable under that rental assistance program). However, TDHCA will only underwrite to the project-based subsidy because that is the only subsidy that stays with the project. Other types of rental subsidies may potentially be allowed, depending on the source of funds and requirement. In addition, the use of project-based vouchers or rental subsidies may affect access to capitalized operating costs, underwriting (if known at the time of application), layering with HOME annual or NHTF, whether units are fixed versus floating, and mandatory services. Further program guidance on layering with types of rental assistance will be provided. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of this comment.

**12. Comment: Allow HOME-ARP to have a tax exemption**

Summary: Jennifer Hicks (*TrueCasa Consulting, Austin*) asked to pair HOME-ARP with 100% tax exemption for developments that are focused on the hardest to serve populations (she gave an example of persons experiencing chronic homelessness).

Staff response: HOME-ARP does not have the authority to grant tax exemptions, nor does the Department want to limit applicants to only those that can attain such an exemption. Developers should pursue these exemptions from the appraisal district in which the property is located as needed. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of this comment.

**13. Comments: Further guidance or clarification is needed on how to assist the qualified populations in units with operating cost assistance after the federal affordability period and operating cost assistance ends**

Summary: Two commenters requested further guidance on how the development/owner would assist the qualified populations when the federal affordability period ends and the operating cost assistance ends. The qualified populations will be paying 30% of their income toward rent in units that may be supported by capitalized operating costs. Capitalized operating costs are sized to last until the end of the federal affordability period, which is 15

years. The state affordability period is a minimum of 30 years.

Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) suggested the use of HOME-ARP capitalized operating assistance to fund a reserve for after the federal affordability period ends at year 15, so that qualified populations could experience gradual rent increases up to post-HOME-ARP affordability standards. She also suggested finding an alternative funding source to pay for a portion of the higher rents until the qualified populations could pay the full rents under the state affordability period.

Jennifer Hicks (*TrueCasa Consulting, Austin*) asked for clarification if the owner would need to seek out other sources to cover the operating costs if the tenant is not able to pay more than 30% of his/her income for rent after year 15.

Staff response: HOME-ARP affordability period for rental development is 15 years. At the end of that period the tenants will be required to pay rents at the rent level established in the LURA for years 16 to the end of the state affordability period, because Tex. Gov't. Code 2306.185(a)(c) requires that most properties have affordability for at least 30 years. Accordingly, most properties will have to show viability through underwriting for the full state affordability period of at least 30 years at the time of application for HOME-ARP funding. The financial feasibility of HOME-ARP will likely require use of many different models and types of assistance, especially after the federal affordability period ends. In addition, the HUD notice 21-10 does not list rental assistance nor creation of a reserve for rental assistance as eligible costs for operating assistance. The operating assistance reserve is sized for costs throughout the 15-year federal affordability period. Using the capitalized operating costs to fund a reserve beyond the federal affordability period would not be in line with the size of the reserve (with the possible exception of payments into the replacement reserve for major systems, which is specifically listed in the HUD Notice 21-10 as eligible). The State must use the definition of operating costs in the HUD CPD Notice when calculating the size of the assistance. No changes were made to the Plan as a result of these comments.

#### **14. Comments: Maintain full HUD-allowed flexibility for the capitalized operating assistance**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) had several comments regarding the flexibility of the capitalized operating assistance.

One comment was to allow underwriting to determine the maximum per-project cap of the capitalized operating assistance, instead of creating a per-project maximum.

A second comment was to allow the operating cost assistance to fund the prorated share of HOME-ARP units' contribution to the capital replacement reserve.

Staff response: HUD notice 21-10 has no proposed maximum project capitalized operating cost. In addition, the HUD notices states that the operating cost assistance

may fund the replacement reserve. However, HOME-ARP funds cannot be used to both capitalize a reserve for replacement and provide payments to the reserve for replacement from a capitalized operating reserve. The draft Plan does not create limits on the capitalized operating reserve beyond the regulations in HUD notice 21-10, other than the total limit for a development which includes both the development and operating reserves jointly. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of these comments.

**15. Comment: Allow the capitalized operating fund to be drawn based on projected deficits yearly**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested to draw on the operating reserve in advance of each calendar year based on projected deficits. She suggested establishing a process to allow for funds overdrawn or underdrawn to be reconciled at the end of the year, with an option to reconcile earlier if actual rents of the year are lower than projected and impact the development's short-term liquidity. This will help ensure sufficient cash on hand to cover monthly expenses throughout the year.

Staff response: HUD CPD Notice 21-10 requires TDHCA to review each requested distribution from the operating reserve, including supporting documentation. In addition, TDHCA must review the size of the operating reserve account annually to determine the account is appropriately sized. More details on the draw frequency and the process for periodic review of the reserve and its deficits will be issued with additional program guidance. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of this comment.

**16. Comment: Allow the capitalized operating fund to cover a reasonable vacancy rate**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested that operating reserves cover the fixed operating costs incurred even during HOME-ARP unit vacancy periods during initial lease-up and at unit turnover. She requested TDHCA apply a reasonable vacancy rate in sizing the reserve considering the market, the potential for lengthier unit re-leasing timelines depending on the target population, and source of applicant referrals.

Staff response: HUD-Notice 21-10 states that operating cost assistance is for HOME-ARP-assisted units restricted for occupancy by qualifying populations, which would account for up to 70% of the HOME-ARP units. The HUD notice does not specify whether the qualified population units need to be currently occupied in order to receive the operating cost assistance. In addition, HOME-ARP offers an optional initial operating reserve (not to exceed 12 months) for the low-income households, which would account for up to 30% of the HOME-ARP units in the development. The Department is seeking clarification from HUD on whether the capitalized operating costs can be used for vacant units either during lease-up for the first 12 months or when temporarily vacant. It should be noted that a vacancy rate is already applied during the underwriting process to ensure the Development is viable. Further guidance will be released once clarification is received from HUD and processes are established at the Department. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of this comment.

**17. Comment: Allow for underwriting to take into account capitalized operating costs.**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested for a waiver category for TDHCA underwriting infeasibility conclusions for projects that have HOME-ARP operating reserve funds, to the extent any projected deficit is mitigated by these reserve funds.

Staff response: HUD Notice 21-10 requires that capitalized operating cost assistance reserve be included in the underwriting. The capitalized operating costs assistance should mitigate certain projected deficits. No waiver to underwriting criteria would be necessary. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of this comment.

**18. Comment: Allow acquisition costs incurred prior to commitment to be an eligible cost**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested that, to the extent allowable under HUD rules, allowance of acquisition costs incurred prior to commitment be considered an eligible cost in the calculation of the maximum eligible HOME-ARP capital request.

Staff response: The draft Plan does not set any additional limitations on acquisition other than federal regulations. Note that the HOME-ARP Draft Plan specifically states that National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) requirements apply to these funds, which is also included in HUD Notice 21-10. NEPA may affect the eligibility of acquisition costs, which is a choice limiting action and not allowed in most cases prior to commitment. Furthermore, 24 CFR §92.206(g) contains some limitations on costs incurred before the application for HOME-ARP funds is accepted. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of this comment.

**19. Comment: Allow for HOME-ARP funding to be awarded to a sponsor entity and passed through to an awardee of Housing Tax Credits.**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested allowing the HOME-ARP funding to be awarded to the sponsor entity and “passed through” to the tax credit ownership entity. In this way the sponsor can apply a maturity date and interest rate (if required by investor) to avoid the forgivable loan being treated as taxable income.

Staff response: Awarding HOME-ARP funds to a sponsor to then enter into an agreement with a project owner is prohibited per HOMEfires Volume 16, Number 1. For HOME funds (including HOME-ARP), the agreement and provision of funds must be between the State and the owner. No changes to the Plan were made as a result of this comment.

**20. Comment: Require Applicants for rental housing to have meaningful involvement from a nonprofit**

Summary: Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) requested that applicants must demonstrate true, meaningful involvement from a nonprofit with deep experience serving the

target population. She asked for a priority for nonprofit sponsorship, as developments intended to be served by this program are unlikely to generate a profit and will likely require additional fundraising to offset the cost of services.

Staff response: The Plan as drafted was designed intentionally to allow both supportive housing and general rental housing developments to apply for HOME-ARP. As such, meaningful involvement with a nonprofit that provides services may not be needed in all cases. No changes to the Plan have been made as a result of this comment.

**21. Comment: Scattered site general housing and supportive housing models should both be used with HOME-ARP, without priority of one over the other**

Summary: Jennifer Hicks (*TrueCasa Consulting, Austin*) stated that both scattered site general housing developments and supportive housing with wrap-around services are both needed for persons experiencing homelessness. One model should not be prioritized over the other.

Staff response: Staff agrees and the draft HOME-ARP Plan does not prioritize one type of development over another. No changes were made to the Plan as a result of this comment.

**22. Comments: Clarify proportionality of HOME-ARP units and allow for Applicants to designate more units**

Summary: Two comments were received regarding the minimum number of HOME-ARP units required.

One comment from Jennifer Hicks (*TrueCasa Consulting, Austin*) requested clarification on the number of HOME-ARP units required based on the proportional investment of HOME-ARP funds.

One comment from *Sabrina Butler (Foundation Communities, Austin)* suggested allowing developers to commit more units to HOME-ARP than the required minimum. By allowing a higher level of commitment, more units can reach the deeper affordability of the HOME-ARP program and qualify for the operating reserve subsidy.

Staff summary: Applicants may be permitted to commit more HOME-ARP units than the minimum amount specified by applying cost allocation per CPD Notice 16-15. It is anticipated that HOME-ARP units designated for qualifying populations will be eligible for capitalized operating reserves; however, the additional investment of HOME-ARP funds will necessitate a revised cost allocation calculation and could trigger additional requirements such as Davis-Bacon or a longer affordability period.

**23. Comments: Waive specific sections of Texas Administrative Code**

Summary: Two commenters included requests for waivers of existing Texas Administrative Code (TAC).

One comment from Sabrina Butler (*Foundation Communities, Austin*) asks for a waiver of the HOME max per-unit subsidy for HOME-ARP per 10 TAC §13.7(b)-(c).

One comment from Jennifer Hicks (*TrueCasa Consulting, Austin*) requested that TDHCA waive the criminal history criteria in the Supportive Housing definitions in the Qualified Allocation Plan (10 TAC §11.1(a)(122)(B)(v)). She stated that if a goal is to use the Coordinated Entry list, the screening criteria under the Supportive Housing definition may pose barriers.

Staff response: The draft HOME-ARP Plan does not specify any rules will be waived, however staff does plan to list any sections of the rules that will be waived in program guidance or the NOFA in order to allow the program to reflect the flexibility of the HUD Notice 21-10. No changes were made to the Plan as a result of this comment.

### **III. NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND GAPS ANALYSIS**

*PJs must evaluate the size and demographic composition of qualifying populations within its boundaries and assess the unmet needs of those populations. In addition, a PJ must identify any gaps within its current shelter and housing inventory as well as the service delivery system. A PJ should use current data, including point in time count, housing inventory count, or other data available through CoCs, and consultations with service providers to quantify the individuals and families in the qualifying populations and their need for additional housing, shelter, or services. The PJ may use the optional tables provided below and/or attach additional data tables to this template.*

**Homeless Needs Inventory and Gap Analysis Table - 1**

Homeless													
	Current Inventory					Homeless Population				Gap Analysis*			
	Family		Adults Only		Vets	Family HH (at least 1 child)	Adult HH (w/o child)	Vets	Victims of DV	Family		Adults Only	
	# of Beds	# of Units	# of Beds	# of Units	# of Beds					# of Beds	# of Units	# of Beds	# of Units
Emergency Shelter	5,385	1,463	8,285	N/A	972								
Transitional Housing	2,190	618	1,916	N/A	1,916								
Permanent Supportive Housing	4,847	1,695	9,950	N/A	5,633								
Other Permanent Housing						N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Sheltered Homeless						5,783	8,234	1,117	2,242				
Unsheltered Homeless						506	12,686	831	744				
<b>Current Gap</b>										n/a	506	n/a	12,686

**Data Sources:** 1. 2020 Point in Time Count (PIT); 2. 2020 Continuum of Care Housing Inventory Count (HIC)

\*There may not be a direct correlation between the types of housing offered in this chart and the number of people experiencing homelessness, as not every person experiencing homelessness would need or want to use emergency shelter, transitional housing, or permanent supportive housing.

The CoC’s HIC shows the current inventory of beds, though the occupancy status of those beds is unknown. The CoC’s PIT shows the current number of persons or households experiencing sheltered or unsheltered homelessness in 2020. When analyzing the data, the gap in shelter could be the number of unsheltered households, since persons in those households do not have beds or units. Because household size was not reflected in this chart, the gap of the number of beds is not reflected. In addition, many persons experiencing homelessness could move to other permanent housing, without the need of emergency shelter, transitional housing or permanent supportive housing, so the gap in units for the shelter/housing types in this chart may not be as high as the number of unsheltered households.

In August 2024, TDHCA received reallocated funds from HUD that had been originally designated for Odessa, Bryan, and Pasadena, with the understanding that the reallocated funds would have a preference in those areas. Odessa and Pasadena are located within two CoCs, so the PIT data is not specific to those areas and difficult to analyze specifically for those areas. TDHCA has identified several emergency shelters in all three areas, demonstrating a locally-identified need for emergency shelter. A number of shelters may be congregate shelters that would also benefit by being rehabilitated into non-congregate shelters. In addition, these areas also have fair market rent by county for 1-bedroom units that increased by 30% or more between 2021 and 2025; and HUD-published one-bedroom fair market rents by county for FY2025 of \$1,000 or more. These factors support that there are rapidly increasing costs of living, which could necessitate the need for additional emergency shelter.

**Housing Needs Inventory and Gap Analysis Table - 2**

<b>Non-Homeless</b>			
	<b>Current Inventory</b>	<b>Level of Need</b>	<b>Gap Analysis*</b>
	<b># of Units</b>	<b># of Households</b>	<b># of Households</b>
Total Rental Units	3,686,845		
Rental Units Affordable to HH at 30% AMI (At-Risk of Homelessness)	340,420		161,460
Rental Units Affordable to HH at 50% AMI (Other Populations)	546,190		-278,125
0%-30% AMI Renter HH w/ 1 or more severe housing problems (At-Risk of Homelessness)		501,880	
30%-50% AMI Renter HH w/ 1 or more severe housing problems (Other Populations)		268,065	
<b>Current Gaps</b>			<b>-116,665</b>

**Data Sources:** 1. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS); 2. 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)

\*There may not be a direct correlation between the affordable rental units and the households with a housing problem at that income level; this chart does not reflect the housing mismatch, which shows the difference between the households


that can afford the rental units and the households living in the rental units.

There are more affordable units for households with incomes between 0-50% AMI than households in this income range with one or more severe housing problems. However, there is a housing mismatch since there are far fewer units affordable to households at 0-30% AMI with a housing problem than households in this range. If all the households at 0-30% AMI with a housing problem were in the units listed in the first column, 161,460 households would be paying more than 30% of their income on rent. Though the relationship between the columns on the chart is not a direct correlation, the comparison appears to support the need for affordable housing for households that have incomes under 30% AMI.

**Rental Housing Mismatch Table – 3**

<b>Rental Housing Mismatch</b>	<b>Renters earning 0-30% AMI</b>	<b>Renters earning &gt;30-50% AMI</b>	<b>Renters earning &gt;50-80%</b>	<b>Renters earning &gt;80-100%</b>	<b>Renters earning &gt;100%</b>	<b>Total</b>
Rental affordable to households making 0-30% AMI	155,585	61,075	47,650	21,135	54,975	340,420
Rental affordable to households making >30-50% AMI	167,530	134,250	119,555	44,755	80,100	546,190
Rental affordable to households making >50-80% AMI	301,075	315,540	439,685	219,140	495,335	1,770,775
Rental affordable to households making >80%+ AMI	81,435	66,655	124,645	95,715	550,090	918,540
<b>Total</b>	<b>705,625</b>	<b>577,520</b>	<b>731,535</b>	<b>380,745</b>	<b>1,180,500</b>	

**Data Source: 2014-2018 CHAS Data**



**1. Describe the size and demographic composition of qualifying populations within the PJ’s boundaries:**

**Homeless**

For HOME ARP, two of the qualifying populations are persons/households experiencing homelessness, and households who have previously been qualified as “homeless” as defined in 24 CFR §91.5 who are housed due to temporary or emergency assistance and need additional housing assistance or supportive services to avoid a return to homelessness. According to HUD’s 2020 Point-in-Time count for Texas, there were approximately 22,544 Homeless Households comprised of 27,229 Homeless Persons. This is an increase of 5% from 2019 of Homeless Persons in the State of Texas.

In 2020, 58% of the counted homeless population in Texas identified as White, 37% identified as Black or African American, 0.75% identified as Asian, 1.3% identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.32% identified as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and 3% identified as being of multiple races.

Individuals who are identified as chronically homeless make up 14.8% of the State’s homeless

population. Through consultation with stakeholders around the State of Texas it was noted that this segment of the population is often the hardest to reach and hardest to assist. It was also noted through consultation that often the chronically homeless are the most visible segment of the homeless population as they often make up a large portion of unsheltered homeless individuals.

In addition, there were 1,948 homeless Veterans making up 7.2% of the State’s homeless population and 1,408 unaccompanied youth making up 5.2% of the homeless population.

The table below shows each Continuum of Care (CoC) in the State of Texas and the number of homeless individuals in the areas covered by each respective CoC based on data from the HUD 2020 Point-in-Time count.

**Table 4 – Population of Homeless Individuals by CoC**

<b>Metropolitan Area</b>	<b>Continuum of Care</b>	<b>Number of Homeless Individuals</b>	<b>Percent of all Homeless Individuals in the State</b>
Amarillo	Amarillo CoC	600	2.2%
Austin	Austin/Travis County	2,506	9.2%
Bryan/College Station	Bryan, College Station/Brazos Valley CoC	109	0.4%
Dallas	Dallas City & County, Irving CoC	4,471	16.4%
El Paso	El Paso City & County CoC	843	3.1%
Fort Worth	Fort Worth, Arlington/Tarrant County CoC	2,126	7.8%
Houston	Houston, Pasadena, Conroe/Harris, Fort Bend, Montgomery Counties CoC	3,974	14.6%
San Antonio	San Antonio/Bexar County CoC	2,932	10.8%
Waco	Waco/McLennan County	234	0.9%
Wichita Falls	Wichita Falls/Wise, Palo Pinto, Wichita, Archer Counties CoC	236	.09%
All other areas of Texas	Texas Balance of State CoC	9,198	33.7%
<b>Total Homeless Individuals in the State</b>		<b>27,229</b>	<b>100%</b>

As can be seen in Table 4 just under 60% of the State's homeless population (58.8%) is located in the five largest Metropolitan areas, Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston and San Antonio. This is expected due to the large concentration of general population in these areas, close proximity to public services, such as transportation, hospitals/clinics, other social services as well as a greater lack of affordable housing and increased cost of housing in these areas.

### **At-risk of Homelessness**

Per 24 CFR §91.5, an individual or family is considered at-risk of homelessness if their income is below 30% area median family income, do not have sufficient resources or support networks, and have experienced housing instability. Below is an analysis of 0-30% AMI renters.

Individuals or families with extremely low incomes (30% or below area median income) are often service sector workers, including those who earn minimum wage. Individuals or families at risk of homelessness are also often straining the willingness of their social networks to provide housing supports over an extended period, such as living with family or friends over an extended period.

There are 705,625 Renter Households in the State of Texas earning between 0 and 30% of Area Median Income (AMI) according to 2014-2018 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data. This is roughly 20% of all Texas Renter Households. Of those 705,625, roughly 501,880 Households also have one or more of the four severe housing problems identified by HUD which are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room (overcrowding), and 4. Cost burden over 50%. This means that 71% of 0-30% AMI renters are living with one of these serious housing problems that impact their daily lives in addition to being low income. 28% of renters with one or more of the severe housing problems identify as White, 24% identify as Black/African American and 42% identify as Hispanic.

### **Other Families Requiring Services or Housing Assistance to Prevent Homelessness**

One qualifying population for HOME-ARP is defined as households who have previously qualified as homeless, are currently housed due to temporary or emergency assistance, and who need additional housing assistance or supportive services to avoid a return to homelessness. Broadly, assistance to persons experiencing homelessness may be time limited depending on the program requirements and the availability of funds.

Specific to the homeless program resources in Texas, the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Coronavirus Aid, Recovery, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds infused approximately 10 times more funds than the annual amount of ESG funds and have an initial expenditure deadline of September 30, 2022. TDHCA's ESG CARES program received approximately \$97 million, and other participating jurisdictions for ESG CARES in Texas received approximately \$148 million directly from HUD available in 2020.

One of the four activities of ESG/ESG CARES is rapid re-housing assistance, which is for services or housing assistance for persons experiencing homelessness and often associated with entry

into housing. TDHCA's ESG CARES program served 5,821 unduplicated persons through rapid re-housing as of this writing. TDHCA anticipates that other persons who experienced homelessness received rapid re-housing through ESG CARES received by local jurisdictions. In cases where ESG CARES funding ends, there may be need for further supports or assistance that may be provided by several sources, including services through TDHCA's Housing Stability Services (funded through Treasury's Emergency Rental Relief), Emergency Housing Vouchers (authorized by ARPA), or HOME-ARP.

Another large funding source for persons exiting homelessness is Continuum of Care (CoC) rental assistance, which is funded by HUD directly to service providers. In 2020, HUD awarded over \$33 million to rapid re-housing projects. While CoCs provide point in time counts and housing inventory counts annually, the data on persons exiting homelessness through rapid re-housing was not able to be found because CoC reports focus on beds, not persons or households exiting homelessness. The population that exited homelessness through CoC rapid re-housing is not currently known.

The demographics for households who have previously qualified as homeless is estimated to be extremely similar to the homeless population demographics, since the formerly homeless demographic had been a part of the homeless demographic in the past.

#### **At Greatest Risk of Housing Instability**

Two qualified populations (QPs) eligible for HOME-ARP program are those at greatest risk of housing instability: (1) households making 0-30% of AMI that are also severely cost burdened (paying 50% or more of their income in rent); and (2) households who would qualify as at-risk of homelessness per 24 CFR §91.5, except their incomes are up to 50% AMI instead of below 30% AMI.

There are 417,345 or roughly 60% of all 0-30% AMI renters paying more than 50% of their income in rent. According to 2014-2018 CHAS data 48% of all 0-50% AMI renter households in the state are paying more than 50% of their income in rent.

There are an additional 577,520 Renter Households in the State of Texas earning between 30 and 50% of AMI according to 2014-2018 CHAS data. This is roughly 16% of all renter households. 46% or roughly 268,065 households have one or more of the four severe housing problems noted above. For renters at 30-50% AMI with one or more of the severe housing problems, 33% identify as White, 20% identify as Black/African America and 42% identify as Hispanic.

According to the data, there are currently 340,420 units of rental housing affordable to households making 0 to 30% AMI in the State of Texas and an additional 546,190 units of rental housing affordable to households making 30-50% AMI.

To understand the number of households in the state that may be in need of assistance to prevent becoming homeless or to help with housing instability, the population served by the Texas Rent Relief (TRR) Program serves as a representative sample of these populations that may currently need assistance throughout Texas. The TRR Program served 309,850 households between February 2021 and May 2022. Of these households, 254,328 (82.08%) were at or below 50% AMI, with 179,926 (58.07%) of total households under 30% AMI. There were 155,129 (50.06%) households assisted that identified as Black or African American and 74,943 (24.18%) identifying as Hispanic or Latino. This data is one measurement of need for programs that create more affordable housing and other safety nets to keep households from entering into homelessness for households within incomes at or below 50% AMI. It should be noted that far more households applied than those described above as assisted, further supporting the demand.

**Individual or family fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or human trafficking**

It is recognized that domestic violence is one of the main factors of homelessness or being at-risk of homelessness for families. Texas Council on Family Violence provided consultation on the State of Texas 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan noting, “90% of survivors accessing family violence services experienced homelessness as a result of fleeing an abusive relationship at least once”.

According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey 2010-2012 State Report, in the State of Texas 27% of Hispanic Women, 37% of Non-Hispanic Black women, and 44% of Non-Hispanic White Women experienced Sexual Violence.

Domestic violence contributes to homelessness. When a person decides to leave an abusive relationship, they often have nowhere to go. This is particularly true of women with few resources. Lack of affordable housing and long waiting lists for assisted housing mean that many women and their children are forced to choose between abuse at home and life on the streets. Approximately 63% of homeless women have experienced domestic violence by an intimate partner in their adult lives according to the National Network to End Domestic Violence. Statistics released in the 2020 Domestic Violence Counts Report by National Network to End Domestic Violence show that Texas emergency shelters or transitional housing provided by local domestic violence programs served 5,950 victims of domestic violence in one day. 3,712 adult and child victims of domestic violence found refuge in emergency shelters, transitional housing, or other housing provided by local domestic violence programs. On this day, 948 Texas survivor’s request for services went unmet, 341 of which were for housing and emergency shelter.

For program year 2020, September 1, 2020 – August 31, 2021, TDHCA’s Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Subrecipients across the state of Texas served 25,666 households that identified as having a history with domestic violence or fleeing domestic violence. These households were assisted through emergency shelter, rapid rehousing, and other ESG-related services.

## **Veterans**

Veterans may qualify for HOME-ARP if they meet one of the qualifying population criteria. According to the 2019 5-year American Community Survey, there are approximately 1.4 million Veterans in Texas, which is about 5.1% of the total population. Veterans are overrepresented in homeless statistics compared to their share of the state population. According to the 2021 PIT count in Texas, there were 950 veterans in emergency shelter or transitional housing, which makes up 6.7% of the homeless population. There will likely be overlap between Veterans and the Qualifying Populations in HOME-ARP.

The State of Texas is not suggesting expanding the program eligibility beyond the populations noted above and those at greatest risk of housing instability (under 30% AMI and severely cost burdened), as provided by HUD.

### ***2. Describe the unmet housing and service needs of qualifying populations, including but not limited to:***

- ***Sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations;***
- ***Those currently housed populations at risk of homelessness;***
- ***Other families requiring services or housing assistance or to prevent homelessness; and,***
- ***Those at greatest risk of housing instability or in unstable housing situations:***

Through analysis of the data presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3 above we can identify the unmet housing needs of the HOME-ARP qualifying populations.

As identified in Table 1 there are 12,686 unsheltered homeless adults without children and 506 unsheltered homeless families in the State of Texas at a point in time in January. This appears to indicate that there is a gap in housing options of at least 13,192 beds. This could be emergency shelter beds, transitional housing beds, permanent supportive housing beds, beds in private rental units, or beds in private rental units supported by rental assistance. Likewise, there are 8,234 sheltered adults without children and 5,783 sheltered families with children, which could indicate a gap in housing options for transitional housing beds, permanent supportive housing beds, beds in private rental units, or beds in private rental units supported by rental assistance in order to move the households out of emergency shelter into housing.

The need for more affordable units can be seen in the data in tables 2 and 3 above as well as in the Housing Mismatch Chart. As noted above there are 705,625 renter households in the state earning between 0-30% of the Area Median Income, of those 0-30% AMI renter households only 155,585 or 22% are living in a unit that is affordable to households making 0-30% AMI. In the state, according to 2015-2019 CHAS data there are only 340,402 units affordable to households making 0-30% AMI, this is only enough units to house 48% of all households in the state with incomes between 0-30% AMI. 54% of housing stock that is

affordable to households at 0-30% AMI is being occupied by households making between 30-100%+ of AMI, this is due to naturally occurring affordable housing that is not restricted by income being rented by households that can afford a more expensive unit. It is also due to the location of naturally occurring affordable housing, which is primarily found in areas with a lower cost of living. In Texas this equates to locations that are not near the largest metro areas in the state. Higher numbers of low-income households can be found in urban areas due to relative proximity to service jobs. This lack of affordable housing in metro areas leads to a majority of households in the 0-30% AMI range (78%) renting units that are not affordable to them with many in the state (43%) renting units that are considered affordable to households in the 50-80% AMI range, as seen in the housing mismatch chart above. This overall leads to a need of 520,790 units that are available to only renters making 0-30% of AMI.

As noted above 43% of the 0-30% AMI households are renting units affordable to households making 30-50% AMI, these lower income renters are occupying 30% of the housing stock intended for 30-50% AMI renters. This helps contribute to 66% of 30-50% AMI households renting housing that is not affordable to them. 28% of all rental housing affordable to 50%+ AMI households is occupied by households earning 0-50% of AMI. If all units affordable to 30-50% AMI households were occupied by households in the same income bracket only an additional 31,330 units would be needed for 30-50% AMI renter households.

One of the largest unmet needs of renter households in the state is the lack of efficiency or one-bedroom housing units. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, 26% of households in the state are non-family one-person households. Meaning for these persons to be housed efficiently and affordable they would only need access to efficiency and one-bedroom units. Currently, there are 1,206,627 efficiency and one-bedroom units being occupied, if all of those units were being occupied by a single person only 47% of one-person households would be living in a unit suitable to their needs. We know this is not the case and that multiple person households reside in efficiency and one-bedroom units, leading to a majority of one-person households to rent units that are larger and more expensive.

The types of rental housing, tenant-based rental assistance, shelter and service needs for each QP are listed below.

### **(1) Needs: Sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations**

- Rental Housing
  - Consultations for HOME-ARP indicated a significant need for more rental housing. There was support that such housing needs to be in high opportunity areas so that it was close to transportation, jobs, stores, services, and medical supports. Several commenters mentioned the needs of adult children with IDD/MH who the parents are no longer able to care for them. It was noted that any funds used for PSH should have robust targets for accessibility and visitability and a higher percentage of units built as fully accessible for physical disabilities than is required in the Housing Tax Credit (HTC) program. Commenters

noted that funding should be for low-income housing (not workforce housing).

- Tenant Based Rental Assistance
  - TBRA could be used by homeless populations, though there would still be the challenge of finding a landlord willing to take the government assistance program, a challenge that was discussed during the consultations. In addition, persons experiencing homelessness may have greater history of housing instability, which could cause them to be high-risk tenants. The need for landlord incentives may also be needed with TBRA.
- Non-Congregate Shelter
  - HFH stated a need for new construction of NCS since hotel conversions' maintenance and upkeep is extreme. They feel it is preferable to just do new construction. NCS is not designed to be a permanent solution, given the absence of leases and occupancy agreements. However, the availability of NCS may assist persons experiencing homelessness avoid literal homelessness, and provide a safe space while building resources to secure permanent housing.
- Service Needs
  - Several commenters from the consultation with Fair Housing and Disability Advocates supported use for services specifically service coordinators, resident coordinators, and landlord incentives. Several commenters for the consultation with Homelessness Service Providers noted that it would be important to not just fund capital investment, but to focus on long-term supports including operations, homelessness prevention, case management, employment services, and landlord incentives (with thoughtful consideration relating to fair housing issues).

## **(2) Needs: Currently housed populations at risk of homelessness**

- Rental Housing
  - Persons at-risk of homelessness demonstrate housing instability, such as living in the home of another because of economic hardship, or living in a hotel/motel paid by the household. This population also has extremely low incomes at 30% AMI and lack of resources and supports. Availability of affordable rental housing so that they will pay no more than 30% of their income toward rent may assist in decreasing housing instability for this population.
- Tenant Based Rental Assistance
  - HFH felt the best use of funds would be for TBRA and supportive services with long contract terms, such as at least a 3-year contract for TBRA to serve as a bridge to households accessing a permanent voucher. There was also support voiced from the PHAs for the funds to

be used as rental assistance like HOME TBRA and TDHCA's COVID TBRA Program, for services such as security deposit assistances, furnishings and appliances, youth employment programs, job searches, assistance accessing benefits, financial literacy, parenting skills and scholarships for trade schools. One commenter noted that because the need is pressing and urgent now, that some of the funds should go to 'right now' solutions such as rental assistance for persons with disabilities.

- Non-Congregate Shelter
  - Several comments from the consultation with Fair Housing and Disability Advocates supported use of the funds for NCS and a focus on best practices that would allow NCS to transition to other uses, such as CoC housing or permanent affordable housing.
- Service Need
  - Services needs listed in the consultations included, but are not limited to, case management, child care, education services, employment assistance, job training, outpatient health services, legal services, life skills training, mental health services, and transportation.

### **(3) Needs: Other families requiring services or housing assistance to prevent homelessness**

- Rental Housing
  - Persons who were formerly homeless but temporarily housed with assistance may benefit from an option of rental housing that is deeply affordable as a permanent solution. If ongoing assistance to prevent homelessness continues to be needed, permanent rental housing that is affordable may offer a more sustainable option without having to continually apply for and coordinate assistance.
- Tenant Based Rental Assistance
  - There was interest from several providers for TBRA since other rental funds are starting to end. They also note that accessing rental assistance should not first require having an eviction status which is what is often required from other funding sources.
- Non-Congregate Shelter
  - In the event that the temporary assistance ends and a household re-enters homelessness, NCS may be a safe shelter to stay to prevent literal homelessness in a place not meant for human habitation.
- Service Need
  - Persons who were formerly homeless and temporarily housed may need service coordination if one type of assistance is ending and another is beginning.

### **(4) Needs: Those at greatest risk of housing instability or in unstable housing situations**

- Rental Housing
  - Elevated levels of funding received over the previous 18 months have been focused on homelessness-prevention activities to ensure that households that have lost a job, seen a decrease in hours, lost a home, or are sick with no pay do not fall into homelessness. As can be seen from the analysis of shelter and housing inventory, more affordable rental housing is needed to help house persons with severe cost burden and provide more affordability to those at-risk of homelessness even with incomes up to 50% AMI.
- Tenant Based Rental Assistance
  - HFH indicated the most need for flexible spending to use on housing for households that don't score highly on CE, particularly for older persons with disabilities who are awaiting a voucher or other benefits, something that could be an extension of rapid rehousing.
- Non-Congregate Shelter
  - For those at-greatest risk of housing instability, NCS would be used if the housing instability resulted in homelessness.
- Service Need
  - Extremely low income severely cost burdened households or households at-risk of homelessness with incomes up to 50% AMI may need services to increase household income or the assist in reducing frequent moves or overcrowding.

**(5) Needs: Fleeing, or Attempting to Flee, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, Stalking, or Human Trafficking**

- Rental Housing
  - There was a significant focus during the Consultation with CoCs and DV Providers concerning rental housing, specifically on rapid rehousing and bridging folks to permanent housing (Houston, El Paso, Dallas CoCs). Some CoCs noted an interest in more rental assistance to support these efforts (Houston), or to support gaps in services (Houston, El Paso). Houston CoC discussed going from homelessness to housed and not needing to use shelter facilities. There was emphasis that the rental housing needed to come with operating reserves and allow for sponsorship structures.
- Tenant Based Rental Assistance
  - Because the needs of the CoCs and DV providers varied, there was interest in keeping the funds flexible. Most speakers felt there are sufficient resources for rental assistance, and there are those in need with vouchers in hand who can't find units; there is particularly need for the deepest-subsidized units.
- Non-Congregate Shelter

- There was strong interest to use funds for one-time capital investments for PSH and NCS. There was input that NCS is especially helpful for families, those fleeing domestic violence and those with MH or Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) where congregate care can be detrimental to treatment.
- Service Needs
  - Lastly, a service need for survivors of domestic violence may be specific case management and support focused on safety.

**3. *Identify and consider the current resources available to assist qualifying populations, including congregate and non-congregate shelter units, supportive services, TBRA, and affordable and permanent supportive rental housing:***

Currently in the State of Texas, there is an unprecedented level of funding for Homeless related services and rental assistance. The State of Texas alone received \$97,792,616 in Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) funding from the Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act, in addition to the roughly \$8 to 9 million annual appropriation received by the state. These amounts do not include funding provided to local Participating Jurisdictions directly from HUD. The state also received roughly \$2 billion as part of both the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021 and the American Rescue Plan Act to provide Emergency Rental Assistance and Housing Stability Services (HSS), which the state is currently providing through its Texas Rent Relief and Housing Stability Services Program.

This increased amount of ESG and HSS funding provides local subrecipients crucial funds to help keep individuals and families housed through rapid rehousing and rental assistance for individuals and families who would have become homeless without the assistance and street outreach which has assisted local providers in reaching more unsheltered homeless during the pandemic. Currently, the State of Texas does not primarily use its annual allocation of ESG funds for shelter rehabilitation purposes, but does allocate funds to Emergency Shelter activities that help subrecipients operate shelters and continue to provide emergency shelter services to homeless individuals and families.

In addition to ESG funds the state also receives an annual allocation of HOME funds of which the state dedicates on average between \$6 and 8 million for Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA), which is used to help low income individuals with rent and security deposits. During the pandemic additional funds from the state's annual allocation were added to support TBRA activities to assist households that were affected by the pandemic.

The primary method used by the state to fund Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is through the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program. This has helped fund 877 units of PSH in the State of Texas in the last two program cycles 2020 and 2021, and 2,385 units since 2012.

These elevated levels of funding received over the previous 18 months have been focused on prevention related activities to ensure that households that are have lost a job, seen a decrease in hours, lost a home, or are sick with no pay do not fall into homelessness. As can be seen from the analysis of shelter and housing inventory, more units are needed to help house more of the homeless and provide more affordability to those at-risk of homelessness.

**4. *Identify any gaps within the current shelter and housing inventory as well as the service delivery system:***

**Existing gaps in the current shelter inventory**

The Homeless Needs Inventory and Gap Analysis Table 1 shows a possible gap in the shelter and housing inventory of 506 households with children and 12,686 households consisting of adults without children. These households were reported as unsheltered in the PIT count reported by the CoCs in 2020. Through consultation with CoCs and DV providers, it was noted that some of the state’s more rural communities may have a greater need for non-congregate shelter to help get people off the street and provide services so they may transition to affordable units in their community.

**Existing gaps in the current housing inventory**

The Housing Needs Inventory and Gap Analysis Table 2 shows there are far fewer affordable units for households with incomes under 30% AMI than there are households at that income level with a housing problem. In addition, the Rental Housing Mismatch Table 3 shows the greatest need is for units affordable to renters earning between 0-50% AMI. The data shows that 550,040 renters earning 0-30% AMI, and 382,195 renters earning >30-50% AMI are in units that result in cost burden.

A common theme through all consultations was the need for more affordable units. In each consultation, the greatest need was for rental units for persons experiencing homelessness, primarily for deeply affordable Supportive Housing units. The term Supportive Housing is defined in 10 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §11.1(d)(126) which, among many specific criteria, is housing “intended for and targeting occupancy for households in need of specialized and specific non-medical services in order to maintain housing or transition into independent living...” The need for more Supportive Housing is of course not the need for every community, but is available for a larger populations than those eligible for PSH, and could include all QPs.

In addition, CoCs and DV providers felt they had sufficient funds for the vouchers/rental assistance and services, and the highest need was in actual production of units as there are challenges in finding units for voucher holders (Tarrant, Dallas, San Antonio CoCs). Some noted interest in allowing small acquisition/rehabilitation developments that they thought could be brought online more quickly and others were specific that the PSH should include units for large families and deeply affordable units (affordable to households making below 30% AMI).

**Existing gaps in the current service delivery system**

During the consultations for HOME-ARP there were a few mentions of gaps in services, but the gaps primarily had to do with lack of funds, and not one particular service type. Needed services included housing specialists, intake, housing navigation and bridge psychiatric services that can provide a quick diagnosis and access to medications on an outpatient basis in close coordination with the local Mental Health Authority. One commenter added that gaps in services were needed in behavioral health, transportation, health and dental, peer support, case management and housing subsidies.

During the consultations, there were several inquiries into the Housing Stability Services Program, which was anticipated to release a NOFA for approximately \$105 million in legal services, outreach services, shelter services, community services, and services. HFH specifically noted that funds for these needs would not be fully addressed through the ERA2 Housing Stability Services funds. They thought some of the HOME-ARP funds should be used for this purpose also to address the long term effects of the pandemic. There was support for capacity building for homeless services providers, especially in rural areas of the state.

**5. Identify the characteristics of housing associated with instability and an increased risk of homelessness if the PJ will include such conditions in its definition of “other populations” as established in the HOME-ARP Notice:**

The State of Texas is not suggesting expanding the program eligibility beyond the populations noted above and those at greatest risk of housing instability (under 30% AMI and severely cost burdened) as provided by HUD in CPD Notice 21-10.

**6. Identify priority needs for qualifying populations:**

Based on the consultations, priority needs include:

- Deeply affordable quality housing (particularly for those with 0-30% MFI);
- Accessible units;
- Housing subsidies so that no more than 30% of income goes to housing (not housing cost burdened);
- Reduced barriers to entry to rental housing;
- Mental health and behavioral health services;
- Transportation services;
- Health and dental care; and
- Case management (geriatric case management, crisis case management, housing stability case management, financial case management, coordinating basic needs).

The priority needs above may apply to each qualified population, as the issues can affect households who are unstably housed. One additional priority need and further detail on the priority needs per qualified population is also included below.

**(1) Homeless, as defined in 24 CFR 91.5**

- Priority Needs:
  - One priority need not listed above is emergency shelter, which is not applicable to all QPs, but is especially applicable to persons experiencing homelessness while determining if transitional or permanent housing is available.
  - All priority needs listed above also apply to persons experiencing homelessness.
  - While already included in the priority needs listed above, the need for reduced barriers to rental housing may apply especially to the homeless population, as persons exiting incarceration have a higher rate of homelessness than the general population. According to a report released in 2018, the National Low Income Housing Coalition found that formerly incarcerated persons are almost ten times more likely to experience homelessness (<https://nlihc.org/resource/formerly-incarcerated-people-are-nearly-10-times-more-likely-be-homeless>). Tenant leasing criteria with shorter look-back

periods or that allows for mitigating factors for persons with criminal backgrounds may benefit this population. Per the definition of Supportive Housing in 10 TAC §11.1(d)(126)(i)(b)(II), “Mitigation [of criminal screening criteria] may include personal statements/certifications, documented drug/alcohol treatment, participation in case management, letters of recommendation from mental health professionals, employers, case managers, or others with personal knowledge of the tenant.”

**(2) At-risk of homelessness (McKinney Act definition at 24 CFR 91.5)**

- Priority Needs:
  - All priority needs listed above.
  - While already included above, housing subsidies so that the household pays no more than 30% of their income on rent may be especially relevant to this population since this population has an extremely low-income and has demonstrated housing instability.

**(3) Fleeing, or Attempting to Flee, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, Stalking, or Human Trafficking**

- Priority Needs
  - All priority needs listed above.
  - While already included above, case management may be especially relevant to this population due to safety planning requirements for this population.

**(4) Other Populations where assistance would:**

**(a) Prevent the family’s homelessness;**

- Priority Needs:
  - All priority needs listed above.
  - While already included above, case management may be especially relevant to coordinate services and resources as one funding stream ends and another begins, or in order to create a situation in which the household will no longer need assistance when assistance ends.

**(b) serve those with the Greatest Risk of Housing Instability (if applicable)**

- Priority Needs:
  - All priority needs listed above.
  - While already included above, deeply affordable housing may be especially relevant to households who are extremely low income and severely cost burdened or households at-risk of homelessness with incomes up 50% AMI since these populations demonstrated housing instability.

***7. Explain how the level of need and gaps in its shelter and housing inventory and service delivery systems based on the data presented in the plan were determined:***

The level of need and gaps in housing inventory and service delivery systems were determined through careful review and analysis of Census and CHAS data. In addition,

qualitative information was provided at all the consultations noted in this plan that assisted in determining the focus of the State of Texas’s HOME-ARP funds.

#### **IV. HOME-ARP ACTIVITIES**

**1. Describe the method for soliciting applications for funding and/or selecting developers, service providers, subrecipients and/or contractors and whether the PJ will administer eligible activities directly:**

TDHCA will primarily solicit applications through several NOFAs seeking developers or subrecipients. At this time, TDHCA does not plan to administer activities directly, but would do so if directed by its Board of Directors.

##### Rental Housing and Supportive Housing

HOME-ARP Rental Housing and Supportive Housing (RHSH) funds will be made available as follows and as further described in a NOFA:

- Funds will be made available competitively statewide. The allocations may include a set-aside, allocation, or priority for rural applications. Consistent with the guiding HUD Notice, Applicants must demonstrate the unmet need among qualifying populations for the type of housing proposed in their geographical area through a market assessment or other source of data. The Department will conduct outreach to encourage that applications from both urban and rural areas be submitted. Distribution may be affected by State laws or limitations, such as Tex. Gov’t Code §2306.111(c), which requires that 95% of the HOME-ARP funds be used in non-participating jurisdictions, if existing state waivers of this section expire.
- Applications may be for Supportive Housing or for HOME-ARP Units within Multifamily Developments, including Developments with any Target Population, as defined in 10 TAC §11.1. If Applicants apply for Rental Housing, the NOFA may include additional points for the inclusion of services.
- Applications may be able to be layered with other local, state, or federal funds, including but not limited to HTC (both 9% and 4% credits). Per 24 CFR §92.206(g), there are some limitations on costs incurred before the application for HOME-ARP funds is accepted. National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) requirements are applicable for these funds.
- Direct Awards of HOME-ARP for National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) Developments. To expedite delivery of some of the HOME-ARP units into rental developments more quickly than will be the case for new applications, and to preserve existing Department investments in NHTF-funded developments that may otherwise be at risk of not being completed, up to \$10 million of HOME-ARP funds may be directly awarded, without competition, to certain Department awardees of NHTF. These developments will be required to submit an abbreviated application upon approval of the Plan from HUD, but will not be required to compete for funds under the HOME-ARP Rental Development Notice of Funding

#### Availability (NOFA).

Applications for HOME-ARP that are for developments with an active application for, or that were awarded, NHTF from the Department may be submitted directly and awarded non-competitively if the applicant:

- applied for NHTF in 2020 or 2021 and the application was not terminated by staff or voluntarily withdrawn by the applicant;
- can demonstrate cost increases that necessitate the need for additional investment;
- has not started construction or has previously received a 24 CFR Part 58 review if construction has started;
- the deferred developer fee does not decrease and developer fee does not increase; and
- returns HOME-ARP application materials to the Department within the timeframe provided by the Department and before the application due date of NOFAs for HOME-ARP rental housing.

Up to \$10 million in HOME-ARP funds will be available for NHTF awardees that meet the criteria in this section. If the Department receives less than \$10 million in applications by the time of the rental development NOFA application due date, the remaining funding will be used to increase the amount available for rental development awards. If the applications received for this limited pool exceed the total available, the applications will be processed based on their submission date. In the event that more than \$10 million is requested per application received on the same date, the Development with the lowest HOME-ARP capital cost per unit will be awarded.

In addition, applications layered with NHTF will also be accepted during the application cycle for HOME-ARP rental development. However, there may be programmatic limitations on having HOME-ARP and NHTF in the same unit.

- Units serving Qualified Populations are only able to charge a household 30% of the tenant's income.
  - Applications may request and be awarded capitalized operating reserves. Amounts for operating reserves will be established by TDHCA and if approved, the costs may be capitalized at the time of closing or with the first draw. While the operating reserve per unit is not established based on the amount of rent 'lost' by only charging the household 30% of their income, it is estimated that roughly 80% or more of the expenses that would have been covered by those rents are eligible costs to be included in the capitalized operating reserves. Operating reserves for a unit will be for administrative expenses, property management fees, insurance, utilities, property taxes, maintenance of a unit, and other expenses described in HUD CPD Notice 21-10. Operating costs cannot cover debt service for the HOME-ARP units.
  - Applications must follow TDHCA's existing rules and policies for rental housing and/or Supportive Housing, unless otherwise described in the NOFA.
  - At the end of the HOME-ARP affordability period and depletion of the capitalized operating reserves, units will not be required to only charge 30% of tenant's

- income, but will still have a state-required affordability period.
- Up to 30% of the HOME-ARP units may be for low-income households that are not Qualified Populations, as allowed by the HUD CPD Notice 21-10.
  - HOME-ARP units may float or be fixed in the Developments per 24 CFR §92.252(j). However, the NOFA will outline whether units must be fixed or floating.
  - TDHCA may adopt the utility allowance schedule for Developments in which awarded Applicants are using the PHA utility allowances, unless prohibited by other fund sources or any of the other allowable utility methods under TDHCA rules. TDHCA's maximum allowances for utilities and services will be updated annually. Awarded Applicants may choose to use the PHA utility allowance after notification to or approval of TDHCA during the compliance period.
  - Minimum Request Amount: \$500,000
  - Maximum Request Amount: \$15 million, up to 100% of the HOME-ARP eligible costs, and is inclusive of capitalized operating costs. However, the total maximum request may be further limited in the NOFA.
  - Eligible award amounts will be capped at the proportional share of HOME eligible costs for the HOME-ARP units.
  - Must designate at least the lesser of 50% of units or 10 units for HOME-ARP assistance.
  - Funds may be loaned at amortizing, cash-flow, or deferred terms, and may be interest bearing or at 0% or other interest rate in order to meet underwriting requirements. Loan terms will depend on financial structure of the projects and contract terms.

#### Non-Congregate Shelter

- The initial funding for NCS was released in July 2024 as an Invitation to Apply as described below. The total Invitation to Apply was \$56,511,887, with a maximum request of \$50,000,000 for an NCS development. The below allocation plan amendment is divided into an "Initial funding for NCS" regarding the Invitation to Apply released in July 2024, and "reallocated/remaining funding for NCS" which pertains to the amount in the Invitation to Apply not requested from the organization sent the Invitation to Apply in July, and any funds reallocated from HUD or moved to NCS from other budget categories.
- **Initial funding for NCS** -- HOME-ARP NCS funds will be reserved for nonprofit capacity building/nonprofit operating cost awardees who submit the following information within sixteen months of the initial Board award, which may be extended for up to six months by the Executive Director for good cause and as further outlined in Part II of the Invitation to Apply:
  - Site information including, but not limited to, status of site control, location, ingress/egress and easements, replatting or vacating requirement, title commitment or policy, proximity to regularly-scheduled public transportation or planned public transportation routes.
  - Development narrative including, but not limited to, target population, referral methods and preferences, and supportive services.

- Architectural drawings per 10 TAC §11.204(9) including specifications, building type configurations, accessibility requirements, common amenities, unit sizes, and parking requirements.
- Offsite costs and site work cost breakdown, and development cost schedule.
- Operating pro forma for the length of the compliance period.  
Annual operating expenses and demonstration that there is sufficient operating funds to support any NCS activity.
- Schedule of sources showing all funding in the NCS Development with loan terms, and supporting documentation.
- Organizational charts showing ownership structure and a listing of the Development team members.
- Third party reports to include Part 50 or 58 environmental clearance, as required.
- **Reallocated/Remaining funding for NCS** – The requirements for the reallocated funds for NCS will be the same as the Initial funding for NCS with the following exception:
  - The application must be submitted within nine months of the initial Board award of NCO, which may be extended for up to three months by the Executive Director for good cause and as further outlined in Part II of the Invitation to Apply.
- **Initial funding for NCS** --Minimum Request Amounts: \$5,000,000
- **Reallocated/Remaining funding for NCS** – Minimum Request Amounts: \$2,000,000
- **Both Initial funding for NCS and Reallocated/Remaining funding for NCS Maximum Request Amount:** Up to 100% of the NCS funds allocated in this Allocation Plan and not to exceed 100% of the HOME-ARP eligible costs as further identified in HUD’s Notice and state laws and rules. If demand for NCS outweigh the demand for nonprofit capacity building and operating cost assistance, TDHCA may reprogram the nonprofit capacity building and operating cost assistance into NCS. However, the total maximum request may be further limited in the Invitation to Apply.
- **Both Initial funding for NCS and Reallocated/Remaining funding for NCS Unit Commitment:** Must designate at least the lesser of 50% of units or 10 units for HOME-ARP assistance.
- **Both Initial funding for NCS and Reallocated/Remaining funding for NCS Terms:** Funds may be provided in the form of amortizing, cash flow or deferred term loans, and may be interest bearing or at 0% or other interest rate in order to meet underwriting requirements if the shelter converts to permanent housing. Loan terms will depend on financial structure of the projects and contract terms.

Nonprofit Capacity and Operations Assistance

References to the “Initial Funding for NCO” below is related to NCO funds released in 2022 and 2023. The “reallocated funding for NCO” pertains to the funds reallocated from HUD or moved to NCS from other budget categories to be released in after the second amendment is approved. Nonprofit capacity and operations assistance will be made available as follows and as further described in NOFA(s) or for supporting organizations that plan to undertake NCS

Development as selected according to characteristics below:

- **Initial funding for NCO Release of Funds** -- Nonprofit capacity building and operations (NCO) assistance will be selected based on need of the area in Texas, or available for competition combined in NOFAs with RSHS. If nonprofit capacity building or operations assistance is awarded prior to a RSHS, the application process will direct awards only to those organization for which it is reasonable to expect that the applicant organization will be provided RSHS funds within 24 months of award.
- **Reallocated funding for NCO Release of Funds** – Nonprofit capacity building and operations (NCO) assistance will be selected based on need of the area in Texas, or may be made available for competition combined in NOFAs or an Invitation to Apply for NCS. If nonprofit capacity building or operations assistance is awarded prior to an NCS, the application process will direct awards only to those organization for which it is reasonable to expect that the applicant organization will be provided NCS funds within 24 months of award.
- **Initial funding of NCO Need** -- For NCO supporting organizations that plan to undergo NCS Development, funds will be distributed to areas that show need of a NCS according to the following characteristics:
  - Unsheltered homeless populations that are 400 persons or above as of the 2022 point in time count, published by HUD;
  - Fair market rent by county for 1-bedroom units that increased 20% or more between 2019 and 2023; and
  - HUD-published one-bedroom fair market rents by county for FY2023 of \$930 or more, which is the top 15% of rents in the state.
- **Reallocated funding for NCO Need** – Funds will be available to areas that show need for an NCS according to the following characteristics:
  - Fair market rent by county for 1-bedroom units that increased 30% or more between 2021 and 2025; and
  - HUD-published one-bedroom fair market rents by county for FY2025 of \$902 or more, which is the top 20% of rents in the state.
- **Initial funding of NCO Organizational Requirements** – For NCO supporting organizations that plan to undergo NCS Development, funds will be awarded to one or more 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4) nonprofits that have the following characteristics in areas per the above that are also:
  - Subject to a Previous Participation Review by the Department per 10 TAC §1.302, and recommended for an award or an award with Conditions by the Executive Award Review and Advisory Committee;
  - Be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) by the time of Contract, but no later than 90 days after award which may be extended by the Executive Director up to six months for good cause;
  - Have a current annual operating budget of at least \$500,000 and Single Audit or Audit Certification Form submitted to the Department in a satisfactory format in accordance with [10 TAC §1.403](#);
  - Agree to follow 2 CFR Part 200 regarding Uniform Administrative

- Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements (including procurement) as a Subrecipient;
- Agree to become knowledgeable of HOME-ARP program guidelines, HUD CPD Notice 21-10 and Appendix, and Federal and State Rules and Regulations;
  - Agree to receive both nonprofit capacity building and nonprofit operating funds, with the minimum amount being \$50,000 for each fund;
  - Have prior experience in innovative shelter programs and related service provision through coordinated efforts with other agencies, institutions, and other community service organizations;
  - Agree to be the fee simple owner, the sole general partner (with no special limited partner), or the sole managing member to develop a NCS of 50+ units;
  - The nonprofit capacity building and operating assistance must specifically expand the ability of the organization to develop a NCS -- the nonprofit must commit to provide a clear plan and strategy within six months of Board award for how the organization will prepare for and complete an NCS including, but not limited to: number of beds, potential services and partners, staffing plan for shelter; estimated financial requirements and funding needs/gaps of a future NCS;
  - Be able to expend 40% of NCO funds by month 12 of the Contract (subject to negotiation upon award), and 100% by month 24, Contract end date; and
  - Submit materials to meet the requirements of the NCS reservation within 16 months of the NCO Board award, as described under NCS activity within this Allocation Plan.
- **Reallocated funding of NCO Organizational Requirements** -- For NCO supported organizations that plan to undergo NCS Development, funds will be awarded to one or more 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4) nonprofits that:
    - Have the same requirements as the “Initial funding for NCO” above with the following changes:
      - Agree to be the fee simple owner, the sole general partner (with no special limited partner), or the sole managing member to develop or rehabilitate an NCS of appropriate size for the community;
      - Are able to expend 40% of NCO funds by month 18 of the Contract (subject to negotiation upon award), and 100% by month 36 of the Contract end date; and
      - Submit materials to meet the requirements of the NCS reservation within nine months of the NCO Board award, as described under NCS activity within this Allocation Plan.
    - Show a successful history of serving persons experiencing homelessness and demonstrate that the organization has community support and connections, and other competitive criteria as indicted in the NOFA.
    - A preference will be given for organizations that are located in or serve Bryan, Odessa and/or Pasadena. This preference would be achieved by including a point incentive in the Notice of Funding Availability or Invitation to Apply for organizations that have in-person office space located in Bryan, Odessa, or

Pasadena, or organizations that have an active grant or award for a federally funded shelter, housing, or services for the homeless population in Bryan, Odessa or Pasadena.

- **Initial funding of NCO Selection** -- TDHCA's Executive Director anticipates creating a list of nonprofit organizations for Part I of the Invitation to Apply and will make award recommendations to TDHCA's governing Board for the award of NCO funds and reservation of funding for Part II of the Invitation to Apply.
- **Reallocated funding of NCO Selection** -- Funds would be released competitively in a NOFA or in an Invitation to Apply. If released in an invitation to Apply, TDHCA's Executive Director anticipates creating a list of nonprofit organizations for Part I of the Invitation to Apply and will make award recommendations to TDHCA's governing Board for the award of NCO funds and reservation of funding for Part II of the Invitation to Apply. With either option, there will be a preference for projects in Bryan, Odessa, and/or Pasadena.
- **Both Initial Funding of NCO and Reallocated funding of NCO fiscal requirements** -- In any fiscal year, nonprofit operating assistance or non-profit capacity building may not exceed the greater of 50% of the general operating expenses of the nonprofit organization, or \$50,000. If an organization applies for both operating assistance and capacity building assistance in any fiscal year, the aggregate total amount of assistance it may receive is the greater of 50 percent of the organization's total operating expenses for that fiscal year or \$75,000.
- **Initial funding of NCO Request Min** -- Minimum Request Amount: \$50,000
- **Initial funding of NCO Request Max** -- Maximum Request Amount: \$3,324,229. However, the total minimum and maximum request may be further limited in the NOFA or the Invitation to Apply.
- **Reallocated funding of NCO Request Min** -- Minimum Request Amount: \$50,000
- **Reallocated funding of NCO Request Max** -- Maximum Request Amount: Approximately \$750,000, but the total amount available in the Invitation to Apply or NOFA, or as limited therein.

*If any portion of the PJ's HOME-ARP administrative funds were provided to a subrecipient or contractor prior to HUD's acceptance of the HOME-ARP allocation plan because the subrecipient or contractor is responsible for the administration of the PJ's entire HOME-ARP grant, identify the subrecipient or contractor and describe its role and responsibilities in administering all of the PJ's HOME-ARP program:*  
Not applicable

*PJs must indicate the amount of HOME-ARP funding that is planned for each eligible HOME-ARP activity type and demonstrate that any planned funding for nonprofit organization operating assistance, nonprofit capacity building, and administrative costs is within HOME-ARP limits. The following table may be used to meet this requirement.*

**Use of HOME-ARP Funding**

	<b>Original Approx. Funding Amount*</b>	<b>Original % of the Grant</b>	<b>Budget* after Reduction and Reallocation</b>	<b>Change in \$ from original</b>	<b>Reductio n/Realloc ated % of the Grant</b>	<b>Statutory Limit</b>
Non-Congregate Shelters	\$56,511,887	42.5%	\$59,531,387	\$3,019,500	45%	n/a
Affordable Rental Housing Incl. Capitalized Operating Reserves	\$56,511,887	42.5%	\$57,649,564	\$1,137,677	43%	n/a
Non-Profit Operating/Non-Profit Capacity Building	\$6,648,458	5%	\$3,974,229**	(\$2,674,229)	3%	10%
Administration and Planning	\$13,296,915	10%	\$12,322,872	(\$974,043)	9%	15%
<b>Total HOME ARP</b>	<b>\$132,969,14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$133,478,052</b>	<b>\$508,905</b>	<b>100%</b>	

\* Based on the applications received, these amounts and percentages may fluctuate.

\*\*\$1,137,677 of NCO moved to rental development.

-	<b><u>Budget after additional reduction in 2025</u></b>	<b><u>Change from 2024 update</u></b>	<b><u>Reduction/ Reallocated % of the Grant</u></b>	<b><u>Statutory Limit</u></b>
<u>Non-Congregate Shelters</u>	<u>\$64,005,338***</u>	<u>\$4,473,951</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>n/a</u>
<u>Affordable Rental Housing Incl. Capitalized Operating Reserves</u>	<u>\$53,175,613</u>	<u>(\$4,473,951)</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>n/a</u>
<u>Non-Profit Operating/Non-Profit Capacity Building</u>	<u>\$3,974,229.00</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>10%</u>
<u>Administration and Planning</u>	<u>\$12,319,395</u>	<u>(\$3,477)</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>15%</u>
<b><u>Total HOME ARP Allocation</u></b>	<b><u>\$133,474,575</u></b>	<b><u>(\$3,477)</u></b>	<b><u>100%</u></b>	<b>-</b>

\*\*\*\$4,473,951 moved from rental to NCS due to recission of one rental award.

***Additional narrative, if applicable:***

While TDHCA agrees with much of the public input on the need for the variety of requested or suggested activities, unfortunately there is greater need than there are funds available. The consultation input was widely supportive of the need for development of Rental Housing with services, Supportive Housing and Non-Congregate Shelter and the data supports this need.

TDHCA feels these unique one-time funds will have the greatest long-term impact for Texans by being used for acquisition and development of Non-Congregate Shelter (NCS), development of rental housing, and development of Supportive Housing (SH) with associated capitalized operating subsidies. After excluding the funds for Administration/Planning and Non-Profit Capacity/Operating, funds will initially be made available equally proportioned between Non-Congregate Shelter and Rental Housing; if applications received do not fully utilize those funds, funds may be shifted between those two categories.

NP Operating and Capacity Building Assistance will only be awarded to those organizations that it is reasonable to expect will be successful recipients of NCS or RSHH funds within 24 months of award. While the NP Operating and NP Capacity Building is shown as one line item in the table so that funds can be used for both, the Department will commit these activities to each project separately in IDIS as needed. The NP Operating and NP Capacity Building Assistance applications will be released within the NOFAs for NCS and Rental Housing development. If awards for NP Operating and NP Capacity Building do not fully utilize those funds related to building capacity or assisting with operating costs for nonprofits applying for NCS or RSHH, funds may be shifted into NCS or Rental Housing for those activities.

TDHCA will consider revising its rules to provide for a portion of its annual allocation of ESG to be used to support NCS shelter operations funded by HOME-ARP and such planning will be reflected in future One Year Action Plan submissions.

If all funds are not obligated for the activities reflected in the table above, TDHCA may reprogram the funds into Supportive Services and/or TBRA activities; however, it should be noted that any funds obligated later in the performance period with HUD will likely only be available in non-Participating Jurisdictions based on state law.

In October 2023, HUD informed TDHCA of a reduction of \$3,808,153 due to a federal allocation error. In August 2024, HUD reallocated \$4,317,058 to TDHCA with the condition that the reallocated amount will have a preference for activities in Odessa, Bryan or Pasadena. The net positive result of these two actions is \$508,905.

In 2023/2024, HOME-ARP completed a rental development competition; a portion of the available funding from non-profit capacity building/operating funds that were meant to support rental development organizations were awarded for the activity of rental development, as allowed in the allocation plan. However, additional nonprofit capacity building/operating funds to support rental development remained after the end of the

competition and was reduced to help offset the October 2023 reduction by HUD. In addition, a portion of administration was reduced to also offset the October HUD 2023 reduction.

The reallocated funds have been added to the non-congregate shelter, nonprofit capacity building/operating and administration line items. The administration increase was in line within the allowed percentage of the \$4.3 million in reallocated funds as shown in the table above.

***Describe how the characteristics of the shelter and housing inventory, service delivery system, and the needs identified in the gap analysis provided a rationale for the plan to fund eligible activities:***

As noted in the Data Analysis section, Texas has significant need for both shelter and rental housing inventory to serve the eligible population for HOME-ARP. The Homeless Needs Inventory and Gap Analysis Table 1's PIT count shows a homeless population that is greater than the share of emergency shelter and transitional housing units. While PSH can help to address these gaps, the turnover in permanent supportive housing is much lower than emergency shelter and transitional housing by design, and therefore not as widely available. This demonstrates a need for more PSH along with emergency shelter, transitional housing, or general rental housing.

In addition, the Rental Housing Mismatch Table 3 shows that about 70% of renters with incomes between 0-30% AMI and about 66% of renter with incomes >30-50% AMI are cost burdened. Cost burden is an issue that the HOME-ARP rental activity is able to address, since QPs will may only 30% of their income toward rent, eliminating the burden.

While the needs for tenant-based rental assistance and supportive services are also strong, there are other one-time recovery funding sources for rental assistance (Emergency Rental Assistance reallocations to Texas Rent Relief and Emergency Housing Vouchers) and supportive services (Housing Stability Services) that are currently in the application or contracting phases. Because HOME-ARP can be used for capital investment and because construction allows for longer-term solutions, HOME-ARP is programmed for rental and shelter activities, with capacity building/nonprofit operating assistance to support these activities. This was supported by the comments heard in the consultations.

However, if HOME-ARP funding is not fully used after offering technical assistance and capacity building/nonprofit operating costs, HOME-ARP may be reprogrammed to supportive services or tenant-based rental assistance. By the time one or more rental or NCS application cycles are completed, the other one-time recovery sources for rental assistance and services may have expired. Reprogramming HOME-ARP funds into TBRA or supportive services will allow for a more gradual ramp down of these activities in communities that were heavily assisted through the other programs. The QP of persons who were formerly homeless but temporarily housed may be the most served QP if this reprogramming should take place.

## HOME-ARP Production Housing Goals

### ***Estimate the number of affordable rental housing units for qualifying populations that the PJ will produce or support with its HOME-ARP allocation:***

TDHCA estimates that with the funds programmed as reflected in the table above, 565 units of non-congregate shelter and 202 units of Rental Housing or Supportive Housing (including funded operating reserves) can be produced or supported.

### ***Describe the specific affordable rental housing production goal that the PJ hopes to achieve and describe how it will address the PJ's priority needs:***

TDHCA's goal will be to produce or support 202 units of Rental Housing or Supportive Housing, and 565 units of non-congregate shelter helping to create or support more housing across the state. For the second amendment to the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan, the new goal of non-congregate shelter units would be approximately 298 units due to the original assumption of construction costs being too low, and due to rising costs of construction.

Priority needs for each of the QP include deeply affordable housing, housing subsidies so that no more than 30% of income goes to housing, and reduced barriers to entry to rental housing, all of which would be provided by TDHCA's rental development programs. Shelter was a priority need specifically identified for persons experiencing homelessness. Funding construction for rental housing and NCS would address several of the priority needs listed for the QPs.

## Preferences

### ***Other qualifying criteria***

TDHCA does not intend to establish other qualifying criteria for persons to qualify for HOME-ARP.

### ***Identify whether the PJ intends to give preference to one or more qualifying populations or a subpopulation within one or more qualifying populations for any eligible activity or project:***

- Preferences cannot violate any applicable fair housing, civil rights, and nondiscrimination requirements, including but not limited to those requirements listed in 24 CFR §5.105(a).
- PJs are not required to describe specific projects to which the preferences will apply.

TDHCA will not require any specific set-asides or preferences that must be applied to all applicants, but may allow each NCS applicant to utilize any one or more of the following preference categories where one member of the household is from one of the categories, including combining categories if so reflected in their application and approved by TDHCA in the written agreement:

- Persons who are experiencing homelessness
- Persons who were formerly homeless but housed with temporary resources
- Persons With Disabilities (which includes Persons with Substance Use Disorders and Persons Living with HIV/AIDS)
- Persons With Violence Against Woman Act (VAWA) Protections and Human Trafficking
- Chronically Homeless
- Homeless or At-Risk of Homelessness Veterans (including Wounded Warriors as defined by the Caring for Wounded Warriors Act of 2008)
- Homeless or At-Risk of Homelessness Families with Children
- Persons At-Risk of Homelessness
- Persons Exiting Institutions or Systems of Care/Reentry
- Persons referred through Coordinated Entry

For Rental Housing and SH, TDHCA will not require any specific set-asides or preferences. Applicants may request to establish a preference to serve the households with at least one member that contains the following special needs populations that will be reflected in the written agreement:

- Persons who are experiencing homelessness
- Persons who were formerly homeless but housed with temporary resources
- Persons With Disabilities (which includes Persons with Substance Use Disorders and Persons Living with HIV/AIDS)
- Persons With Violence Against Woman Act (VAWA) Protections and Human Trafficking
- Chronically Homeless
- Homeless or At-Risk of Homelessness Veterans (including Wounded Warriors as defined by the Caring for Wounded Warriors Act of 2008)
- Homeless or At-Risk of Homelessness Families with Children
- Persons At-Risk of Homelessness
- Persons Exiting Institutions or Systems of Care/Reentry
- Persons referred through Coordinated Entry

For Rental Housing and SH, Applicants may also request to have a preference required by another federal fund source in the Development such as Veterans or a specific disability such as Persons Living with HIV/AIDS.

If a property is intending to use only Coordinated Entry and not a project-specific waitlist, the system must meet the requirements in HUD CPD Notice 21-10, which requires that Coordinated Entry provide sufficient referrals for the project and that all qualifying populations have an opportunity to participate within the project's geographic region. If any of these factors are not met, then a project-specific waitlist must also be used. This may mean before Coordinated Entry can be used as the basis for a property's waitlist, the local system may have to add:

- persons who are at-risk of homelessness with incomes up to 50% AMI (not under 30% AMI, as is common in other federal homeless programs);

- persons who have income at or below 30% AMI and are paying more than 50% of monthly household income toward housing costs; and
- households who have qualified as homeless previously, are housed with temporary/emergency assistance, and who need additional housing assistance or supportive services to avoid a return to homelessness.

These three HOME-ARP qualifying populations are unique, and may not be included in other homelessness assistance programs; therefore, they may not already be incorporated into Coordinated Entry. In addition, the geographic region for the project will include the entire primary market area of the rental development, as defined in 10 TAC §11.303(d)(8).

If Coordinated Entry is used with other referral methods, the Owner would establish prioritization criteria between the Coordinated Entry and other referral methods and maintain any waitlists in chronological order. If using Coordinated Entry alone, with other referral methods, or in coordination with a project-specific waitlist, the waitlist must take persons in chronological order, with priority given to those with preferences stated in the written agreement between the Owner and the Department. In addition, if up to 30% of the HOME-ARP units are reserved for low-income household who are not qualifying populations, a project-specific waitlist must be used for these units.

HOME-ARP may allow development of housing that meets requirements under the Housing for Older Persons Act. TDHCA may also consider permitting rental housing owners to give a preference or limitation as indicated in this section and may allow a preference or limitation that is not described in this section to encourage leveraging of federal or state funding, provided that another federal or state funding source for the rental housing requires a limitation or preference.

For NCS, and RSHS, no otherwise eligible individuals with disabilities or families including an individual with a disability who may benefit from the services provided may be excluded on the grounds that they do not have a particular disability.

***If a preference was identified, explain how the use of a preference or method of prioritization will address the unmet need or gap in benefits and services received by individuals and families in the qualifying population or category of qualifying population, consistent with the PJ's needs assessment and gap analysis:***

Consultations revealed that those populations listed above for a preference are often challenging to serve in a congregate shelter setting and are best able to be housed in NCS.

The ability for several of the QPs to be a preference would aid them with meeting a priority need, such as deeply affordable quality housing or housing subsidies so no more than 30% of income goes to housing. These QPs are persons who are experiencing homelessness, persons at-risk of homelessness, persons with Violence against Woman Act (VAWA) Protections and Human Trafficking, and persons who were formerly homeless but housed with temporary resources.

Several homeless subpopulations were also included as a preference. Persons who meet the definition of chronically homeless were identified through the consultation process as often being the hardest to reach and hardest to assist of the homeless population. Homeless or At-Risk of Homelessness Veterans are overrepresented among the homeless population compared to the general population. Finally, at least one consultation identified homeless families with children as having an unmet need, since many of this population were newly homeless or doubled up, and did not rank highly on CE.

Persons with disabilities were recommended to be listed as a priority by several consulted groups, including homeless service providers, developers of permanent supportive housing, and fair housing/disability advocates. Discussion topics included persons with dual diagnoses (Mental Health Disorder and Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities) and seniors with disabilities that Medicaid are not able to assist. Because fair housing laws require that eligible individuals with disabilities who may benefit from the services may not be excluded on the grounds that they do not have a particular disability, specific disabilities were not listed as a preference. As a result, Persons with Disabilities (which includes Persons with Substance Use Disorders and Persons Living with HIV/AIDS) was included as a preference.

Several CoCs commented during their consultation that there needed to be ways to incentivize the developers to give second chances for criminal history. The preference for Persons Exiting Institutions or Systems of Care/Reentry would address that need. In addition, youth exiting foster care would be addressed with this preference, which could reduce rates of unaccompanied children and youth experiencing homelessness.

Just as HOME-ARP is based on the framework of the HOME annual program, with additional flexibilities and alternative requirements, the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan is an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2021 Action Plan which is based on the needs assessment of the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan. Regarding Colonia residents, farmworkers, or persons affected by disasters, while not a specified preference population they would be eligible for HOME-ARP if they meet the eligibility criteria.

Finally, during the consultations Coordinated Entry (CE) was seen as a tool for determining eligibility and preference, though many of the consulted agencies did not want to be limited to only CE. Allowing persons referred through CE to be a preference allows the use of a project-specific wait list in chronological order with the benefit of using the vulnerability assessment tools in the CE, and without the need to expand the CE for this funding source.

***If a preference was identified, describe how the PJ will use HOME-ARP funds to address the unmet needs or gaps in benefits and services of the other qualifying populations that are not included in the preference:***

The state is not establishing a statewide preference and across all providers different preferences will be utilized. The two QPs not included as optional preferences were persons

at greatest risk of housing instability: extremely low-income households with severe cost burden, and households that met the definition of at-risk of homelessness with an alternative requirement of incomes up to 50% AMI. These QPs had fewer barriers to housing or needs for case management, or had higher incomes than the other QPs. Other state and local funds will assist other low-income households including, but not limited to, Housing Tax Credits, HOME, ESG, ERA2 Housing Stability Services funds, and 811 PRA.

### **HOME-ARP Refinancing Guidelines**

*If the PJ intends to use HOME-ARP funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily rental housing that is being rehabilitated with HOME-ARP funds, the PJ must state its HOME-ARP refinancing guidelines in accordance with 24 CFR 92.206(b). The guidelines must describe the conditions under which the PJ will refinance existing debt for a HOME-ARP rental project, including:*

- ***Establish a minimum level of rehabilitation per unit or a required ratio between rehabilitation and refinancing to demonstrate that rehabilitation of HOME-ARP rental housing is the primary eligible activity***

TDHCA will follow its guidelines found in 10 TAC Chapters 10, 11, and 13 for any rental housing or SH involving refinancing, unless otherwise described in the NOFA. The 10 TAC for TDHCA can be found online at [https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.ViewTAC?tac\\_view=3&ti=10&pt=1](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=3&ti=10&pt=1)

TDHCA may use HOME-ARP funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is being rehabilitated with HOME-ARP funds as described in 24 CFR §92.206(b)(2). TDHCA shall use its underwriting and evaluation standards, site and development requirements, and application and submission requirements found in 10 TAC, Chapter 10, 11 and 13, for refinanced properties in accordance with its administrative rules. TDHCA may allow for lower per-unit rehabilitation costs than those required in 10 TAC §11.101(b)(3), potentially allowing rehabilitation costs as low as \$1,000 per unit provided:

- (1) the minimal rehabilitation costs can be supported in a Scope and Cost Review;
- (2) the request is in accordance with the HOME-ARP Allocation Plan, TDHCA's rules, and the applicable NOFA;
- (3) the HOME-ARP eligible rehabilitation costs – whether funded entirely or partially by TDHCA's HOME-ARP funds – are greater than the refinancing costs (i.e. payoff amount plus closing and title costs);
- (4) That a minimum funding level – minimal rehabilitation costs as described above, or the applicable per unit costs in 10 TAC §11.101(b)(3) – is set for rehabilitation on a per unit basis;
- (5) that a review of management practices demonstrates disinvestments in the property has not occurred;

- (6) That long-term needs of the project can be met;
- (7) That the financial feasibility of the development will be maintained over an extended affordability period;
- (8) That whether new investment is being made to maintain current affordable units and/or creates additional affordable units is stated;
- (9) That the required period of affordability is specified;
- (10) That the HOME-ARP funds may be used throughout the entire jurisdiction (except as TDHCA may be limited by the Texas Government Code) is specified; and
- (11) That HOME-ARP funds cannot be used to refinance multifamily loans made or insured by any Federal program, including CDBG, is stated.

- ***Require a review of management practices to demonstrate that disinvestment in the property has not occurred; that the long-term needs of the project can be met; and that the feasibility of serving qualified populations for the minimum compliance period can be demonstrated.***

The TDHCA staff review of HOME-ARP RSHH applicants involving refinancing and rehabilitation of an existing property will include a review of management practices and establish feasibility for the HUD-ARP affordability period.

- ***State whether the new investment is being made to maintain current affordable units, create additional affordable units, or both.***

The TDHCA HOME-ARP RSHH program will support both creation of new affordable units, and acquisition and rehab of current affordable units.

- ***Specify the required compliance period, whether it is the minimum 15 years or longer.***

The minimum HUD affordability periods will be used for NCS and RSHH, and HUD compliance requirements will be considered satisfied at the end of that term. For RSHH, TDHCA will require the property to remain affordable for at least a 30 year state affordability period per Texas Gov't Code §2306.185(c). The level of affordability required for the portion of the state affordability period that follows after the HOME-ARP period is over will be provided for in the NOFA.

- ***State that HOME-ARP funds cannot be used to refinance multifamily loans made or insured by any federal program, including CDBG.***

TDHCA will not allow HOME-ARP funds to be used to refinance multifamily loans made or insured by any federal program including CDBG.

- ***Other requirements in the PJ's guidelines, if applicable:***

RSHH Properties will be allowed to use methods other than Coordinated Entry for selecting tenants.

Tiny homes are not prohibited in and of themselves, but must meet all requirements of either being NCS, rental housing, or SH (including not charging more than 30% of household's income).

Units cannot receive HOME-ARP operating subsidy on units that are receiving an operating subsidy or project-based rental assistance from another source.

**Appendix A. Organizations that Participated in the HOME-ARP Consultations**

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
1	Accessible Housing Austin	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jolene	Keene	Austin
2	Affordable Home of South Texas, Inc.	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Karla	Montemayor	McAllen
3	Alliance of Community Assistance Ministries	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Sarah	Malcolm	Houston
4	Alliance of Community Assistance Ministries	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Sharon	Zachary	Houston
5	American GI Forum National Veterans Outreach Program Inc.	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Monica	Alexander	San Antonio
6	American GI Forum National Veterans Outreach Program Inc.	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Sergio	Dickerson	San Antonio
7	American GI Forum National Veterans Outreach Program Inc.	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Dixie	Maddox	San Antonio
8	ArkTex Council of Governments	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Violence Providers Consultation	Mae	Lewis	Texarkana
9	Arlington Housing Authority	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Lydia	Willingham	Arlington
10	Austin Area Urban League	Public Housing Agency Consultation/Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Quincy	Dunlap	Austin
11	Austin Area Urban League	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation/Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Earl	Grant	Austin

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
12	Beat Aids	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Syed	Qadri	San Antonio
13	Brazos Valley Center for Independent Living	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jackie	Pacha	Bryan
14	Briones Consulting & Engineering	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Sophia	Briones	San Antonio
15	Career and Recovery Resources, Inc.	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Nkechi	Agwuenu	Houston
16	Career and Recovery Resources, Inc.	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kelly	Young	Houston
17	Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Galveston-Houston	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Steve	Mikelman	Houston
18	Catholic Diocese of Brownsville	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Nadia	de Ramirez	Brownsville
19	Central County Services	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Felicia	Burden	Temple
20	Central County Services	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Paola	McIntosh	Temple
21	Christian Community Action	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Daphne'	Adams	Lewisville
22	City House	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Donna	Melton	Plano
23	City of Amarillo	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Lauren	Ebben	Amarillo

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
24	City of Austin	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Dianna	Grey	Austin
25	City of Austin	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Patrick	Russell	Austin
26	City of Austin	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Letitia	Brown	Austin
27	City of Austin	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Dawn	Perkins	Austin
28	City of Denton	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Alma	Espino	Denton
29	City of Fort Worth	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Tara	Perez	Fort Worth
30	City of Houston	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Alan	Isa	Houston
31	City of Houston	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Kristingail	Robinson	HOUSTON
32	City of Houston	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Jared	Briggs	Houston
33	City of Plano	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Sarah	Carroll	Plano
34	City of San Antonio	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Anabel	Villa	San Antonio
35	City of Socorro	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Alejandra	Valadez	Socorro
36	Coalition for the Homeless of Houston	Public Housing Agency Consultation/Continuum of Care Consultation	Jessica	Preheim	Houston

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
37	Coalition for the Homeless of Houston	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Caybryn	Southern	Houston
38	Coalition for the Homeless of Houston	Continuum of Care Consultation	Renee	Cavazos	Houston
39	Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Atlee	McCampbell	Corpus Christi
40	Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Judy	Telge	Corpus Christi
41	Combined Community Action, Inc.	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kelly	Franke	Giddings
42	Combined Community Action, Inc.	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Deanna	Lowrey-Green	La Grange
43	Community Action Committee in Victoria	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Tiffany	Ross	Victoria
44	Community Council of South Central Texas	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Belinda	Lacey	New Braunfels
45	Community Council of South Central Texas	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Belinda	Lacey	New Braunfels
46	Community Council of South Central Texas	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Virginia	Lemeilleur	Kerrville
47	Community Council of South Central Texas	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation/Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Belinda	Lacey	New Braunfels
48	Community for Permanent Supportive Housing	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Robin	LeoGrande	Plano

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
49	Community Healthcore	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Marijobeth	Faries	Longview
50	Community Healthcore	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Chesley	Knowles	Longview
51	Concho Valley Community Action Agency	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Sarah	Eckel	San Angelo
52	Concho Valley Community Action Agency	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Mark	Bethune	San Angelo
53	Concho Valley Community Action Agency	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Sarah	Eckel	San Angelo
54	Cornerstone Community Action Agency	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Shenika	Arredodno	Coleman, TX
55	Corpus Christi Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Gary	Allsup	Corpus Christi
56	Covenant House	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Felicia	Broussard	Houston
57	CSH	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Brooke	Page	Regional
58	Dallas City Homes	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Kristen	Williams	Dallas
59	Denton County Friends of Family	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Katherine	Boswell	Denton
60	Denton County MHMR	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jessica	Logar	Flower Mound
61	Denton County MHMR	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jennifer	Meyer	Denton

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
62	Disability Rights Texas	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Stephanie	Duke	Houston
63	Disability Rights Texas	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Tanya	Lavelle	Austin
64	Eagle Pass Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Mary	Velasquez	Eagle Pass
65	ECHO	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Andrew	Willard	Austin
66	Edgewood Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Janice	Wingo	Edgewood
67	El Paso Coalition for the Homeless	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation/Continuum of Care Consultation	Camille	Castillo	El Paso
68	Endeavors	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Alanah	Lavinier	San Antonio
69	Envolve LLC	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Deidra	Bugg	Memphis
70	Families in Crisis	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	William	Hall	Killeen
71	Families in Crisis	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	William	Hall	Killeen
72	Family Gateway	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Amanda	Dycus	Dallas
73	Family Gateway	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Ellen	Magnis	Dallas

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
74	Family Promise of Lubbock	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kris	Michaels	Lubbock
75	Fayette County Habitat for Humanity	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kenny	Couch	La Grange
76	Fishpond Development, LLC	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Lisa	Vecchietti	Austin
77	Fishpond Development, LLC	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Clint	Ivy	Austin
78	Foley Jones & Associates	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	MaryEllen	Forgay	Houston
79	Fort Hood Area Habitat for Humanity	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Ken	Cates	Killeen
80	Fort Hood Area Habitat for Humanity	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Kristin	Hannibal	Killeen
81	Fort Worth Housing Solutions	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Brian	Dennison	Fort Worth
82	Foundation for the Homeless	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Charisse	Damiani	Austin
83	Front Steps Inc	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jessica	Cochran	Austin
84	Galveston County	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Francis	Aguillon	Galveston
85	Galveston County	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	James	Gentile	Galveston
86	Golden Crescent Aging & Disability Resource Center	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Angelique	Rodriguez	Victoria

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
87	Grace Like Rain	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Amy	Brock	Denton
88	GrantWorks, Inc.	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Donna	Johnson	Austin
89	Gulf Coast Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Deinisha	Tryals	Galveston
90	Gulf Coast Housing Partnership	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Anna	Labadie	New Orleans
91	H.O.P.E. Haven	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kristyn	Stillwell	Houston
92	Haven for Hope	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Katherine	Dillard Gonzalez	San Antonio
93	Heart of Texas Behavioral Health Network	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Shaun	Lee	Waco
94	Helen Farabee Center	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Lauren	Hargrove	Wichita Falls
95	Hope's Door New Beginning Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Christina	Coultas	Plano
96	Housing Authority City of Arlington	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Mindy	Cochran	Arlington
97	Housing Authority of Bexar County	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Terry	Trevino	San Antonio
98	Housing Authority of La Joya	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Lulu	Cardenas	La Joya
99	Housing Authority of Lubbock Texas	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Michael	Chapman	Lubbock

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
100	Housing Authority of the City of Beaumont	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Jackie	Sostand	Beaumont
101	Housing Trust Group	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Katelyn	Cutler	Miami
102	Housing Trust Group	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Quinn	Gormley	Austin
103	Housing Trust Group	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Taylor	Thomas	Austin
104	Houston Area Women's Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Nike	Blue	Houston
105	Houston Area Women's Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Lourdes	Calderon	Houston
106	Houston Area Women's Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Lan	Nguyen	Houston
107	Houston Area Women's Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Benita	Slater	Houston
108	Houston Area Women's Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Selah	Tacconi	Houston
109	Houston Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Mark	Thiele	Houston
110	Hudson County Latino Foundation	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	McKensie	Sprow	Hudson
111	Integral Care Austin	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Marlene	Buchanan	Austin
112	Integral Care Austin	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Kali	Holyfield	Austin

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
113	LDG Development	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Dru	Childre	Austin
114	Legacy Community Development Corp	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Marie	Nguyen	Port Arthur
115	Legacy Health	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Sherri L	King	Waco
116	Legal Aid of North West Texas	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	K'Lisha	Rutledge	Dallas
117	LifeWorks Austin	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kate	Bennett	Austin
118	LifeWorks Austin	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Darcy	Rendon	Austin
119	LifeWorks Austin	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Erin	Whelan	Austin
120	McCormack Baron Salazar Developers	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Louis	Bernardy	San Antonio
121	Metro Dallas Homeless Alliance	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Mackeshia	Brown	Dallas
122	Metro Dallas Homeless Alliance	Continuum of Care Consultation	Trudy	Hernandez	Dallas
123	Metro Dallas Homeless Alliance	Continuum of Care Consultation	Sarah	Kahn	Dallas
124	Metrocrest Services	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Tracy	Eubanks	Farmers Branch
125	Metrocrest Services	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Mike	Harris	Farmers Branch
126	Metrocrest Services	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Jennifer	Lajoie	Farmers Branch

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
127	MHMR Tarrant County	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Brian	Wall	Fort Worth
128	Mid-Coast Family Services	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Lisa	Griffin	Victoria
129	Mid-Coast Family Services	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Mallory	Thurman	Victoria
130	Midwest Housing Equity Group	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Andrea	Frymire	OKC
131	MVAH Partners	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Misty	Middleton	Hillsboro
132	N/A	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Carrie	Kline	N/A
133	N/A	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Virginia	LeMeilleur	N/A
134	N/A	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Monica	Washington	Round Rock
135	N/A	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Ramonia	Williams	Highlands
136	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Ginger	Bennett	Austin
137	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Roger	Canales	Cibolo
138	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Robin	Freeman	Beaumont
139	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jimi	Gibson	Bay City

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
140	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Marilyn	Hartman	Austin
141	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Sherri L	King	Denton
142	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Cecil	King	San Antonio
143	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Marie	Lopez	N/A
144	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Katherine	Owens	Longview
145	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Libby	Rivera	Edinburg
146	N/A	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Renee	Lopez	Hutto
147	N/A	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Monica	Barrera	El Paso
148	N/A	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Renee	Buffington	Houston
149	National Housing Advisors, LLC	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Ellen	Rourke	Dallas
150	New Hope Housing	Service Providers	Shamika	Piggee	Houston
151	New Hope Housing	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Tweenzette	Ross	Houston
152	Northwest Assistance Ministries	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Allison	Brooks	Houston
153	Omni Properties & Investments, LLC	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Geneva	Murphy	San Antonio

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
154	Palladium USA	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Avis	Chaisson	Dallas
155	Palladium USA	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Cody	Hunt	Dallas
156	Panhandle Community Services	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Audra	Rea	Amarillo
157	Panhandle Community Services	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Magi	York	Amarillo
158	Panhandle Regional Planning Commission	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Isabell	Villarreal	Amarillo
159	Paulos Properties, LLC	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Flora	Brewer	Fort Worth
160	Pay It Forward	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Genny	Slater	San Antonio
161	Presbyterian Night Shelter	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Debbi	Rabalais	Fort Worth
162	Project Vida	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Maribel	Miranda	El Paso
163	Promise House	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Charles	Wolford	Dallas
164	Recovery Resource Council	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kelvin	Divinity	Dallas
165	Recovery Resource Council	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Tamieka	McLaurin	Fort Worth
166	Rockdale Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Mario	Casarez	Rockdale

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
167	Roommateme Network	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	George	Farhat	Dallas
168	Safehaven Tarrant County	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Sheri	Campbell-Husband	Arlington
169	Safehaven Tarrant County	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Nichole	Masters-Henry	Arlington
170	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Mario	Cuevas	San Antonio
171	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Meredith	Donovan	Woodway
172	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Suzanne	Kanon	Fort Worth
173	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Crystal	Lenz	Beaumont
174	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Holly	McDonald	Galveston
175	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Jason	Moore	Beaumont
176	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Elizabeth	Rodriguez	Beaumont
177	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Betty Kay	Schlesinger	Sherman
178	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Emily	Shafer	Corpus Christi
179	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Roxanne	Vilanova	San Antonio

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
180	Salvation Army	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Samantha	Wyman	Dallas
181	Salvation Army	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Meredith	Donovan	Waco
182	Salvation Army	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Hilda	Hilda Moreno	EL PASO
183	SAMMinistries	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Rex	Brien	San Antonio
184	SAMMinistries	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Elizabeth	de los Santos	San Antonio
185	SAMMinistries	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Nikisha	Baker	San Antonio
186	SAMMinistries	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Curtis	Ruder	San Antonio
187	SAMMinistries	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Gay Lynn	Schwenk	San Antonio
188	SAMMinistries	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Elizabeth	de los Santos	San Antonio
189	San Angelo Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Rebecca	Salandy	San Angelo
190	San Antonio Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Tim	Alcott	San Antonio
191	San Antonio Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Melissa	Garza	San Antonio
192	San Antonio Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Nadia	Islam	San Antonio

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
193	San Antonio Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Lorraine	Robles	San Antonio
194	San Antonio Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Joel	Tabar	San Antonio
195	San Antonio Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Jessica	Wayneck	San Antonio
196	San Benito Housing Authority	Public Housing Agency Consultation	David	Cortez	San Benito
197	Sanchez Compliance & Consulting	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Juanita	Sanchez	Cedar Park
198	SEARCH Homeless Services	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Alexis	Loving	Houston
199	Shared Housing Center, Inc	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kimberly	Johnson	DALLAS
200	South Alamo Regional Alliance for the Homeless	Continuum of Care Consultation	Chelsey	Viger	San Antonio
201	South Plains Associates of Governments	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Roxanna	Ancira	Lubbock
202	Southeast Texas Housing Finance Corporation	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jonathan	Campbell	Houston
203	Superior Health Plan	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jennifer	Bourquin	Austin
204	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Kimberly	Doty	Fort Worth
205	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Nathan	Crites-Herren	Fort Worth

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
206	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kimberly	Doty	Fort Worth
207	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Anthony	Hogg	Fort Worth
208	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Lauren	King	Fort Worth
209	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Kathryn	Welch	Fort Worth
210	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	Continuum of Care Consultation	Kim	Doty	Tarrant
211	Texarkana, City of	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Vashil	Fernandez	Texarkana
212	Texarkana, City of	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Daphnea	Ryan	Texarkana
213	Texas Council on Family Violence	Continuum of Care Consultation	Breall	Baccus	Austin
214	Texas Department of Criminal Justice	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address Needs of Qualifying Population	Sherri	Cogbill	Austin
215	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address Needs of Qualifying Population	Valinda	Bolton	Austin
216	Texas Department of Juvenile Justice	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address Needs of Qualifying Population	Marqus	Butler	Austin

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
217	Texas Education Agency	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address Needs of Qualifying Population	Cal	Lopez	Austin
218	Texas Health and Human Services	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	LaJean	Burnett	Austin
219	Texas Health and Human Services Commission	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address the Needs of Qualifying Populations	Carrissa	Dougherty	Austin
220	Texas Health and Human Services Commission	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address the Needs of Qualifying Populations	Suzie	Brady	Austin
221	Texas Health and Human Services Commission	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address the Needs of Qualifying Populations	Claire	Irwin	Austin
222	Texas Homeless Network	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Jim	Ward	Austin
223	Texas Homeless Network	Continuum of Care Consultation	Mary	Stahlke	Austin
224	Texas Homeless Network	Continuum of Care Consultation	Eric	Samuels	Austin
225	Texas Housers	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Elizabeth	Roehm	Austin
226	Texas Veterans Commission	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Blake	Harris, Ph. D.	Austin
227	Texas Veterans Commission	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Michelle	Nall	Austin

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
228	Texas Veterans Commission	Veteran Service Provider Consultation	Chip	Osborne	Austin
229	Texas Veterans Commission	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address the Needs of Qualifying Populations	Blake	Harris	Austin
230	Texas Workforce Commission	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address the Needs of Qualifying Populations	Deborah	Arellano	Austin
231	The Care Group of Texas	Public Housing Agency Consultation	Tammy	Guidry	Houston
232	The Childrens Center, Inc	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Marsha	Wilson Rappaport	Galveston
233	The Chosen Ones Outreach Enrichment Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Teresa	Finch	Galveston
234	The Chosen Ones Outreach Enrichment Center	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Reverend	Lawson	Galveston TX
235	The Harris Center for Mental Health and IDD	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Tammara	McAdory	Houston
236	The Harris Center for Mental Health and IDD	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Sandra	Brock	Houston
237	The Harris Center for Mental Health and IDD	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Lakeisha	Davis	Houston
238	The Safe Alliance	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Julia	Spann	Austin

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
239	The Safe Alliance	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Hosie	Washington	Austin
240	The Stewpot	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	JR	Ratliff	Dallas
241	The Women's Home	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation/Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Chiamaka	Ofoma	Houston
242	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless Chair	Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless/Public Agencies that Address the Needs of Qualifying Populations	Mike	Doyle	Fort Worth
243	Tracy Andrus Foundation	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Tracy	Andrus	Marshall
244	Tri-County Fort Worth Healthcare	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Stephanie	Ward	Conroe
245	Tri-County Community Action, Inc.	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Beth	Eubanks	Gilmer
246	Tri-County Community Action, Inc.	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Tammy	Luster	Marshall
247	Under 1 Roof Dallas	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Verna	Jones	Dallas
248	Union Gospel Mission of Tarrant County	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Don	Shisler	Fort Worth
249	Valley Association for Independent Living	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Genesis	Garcia Lezama	MCALLEN

#	Organization	Consultation	First Name	Last Name	City
250	Valley Association for Independent Living	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Laurie	Gonzalez	McAllen
251	Valley Association for Independent Living	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Jorge	Villarreal	McAllen
252	Vivent Health	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Mamadou	Balde	Denver
253	Volunteers of America	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Deborah	Welchel	Lago Vista
254	Volunteers of America	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Brigitte	Ogne	DC
255	West Central Texas Council	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	Justine	Ingra,	Abilene
256	West Central Texas Council	Fair Housing and Disability Advocate Consultation	John	Meier	Abilene
257	Woodridge Consulting LLC	Homeless Service Providers/Domestic Service Provider Consultation	Jim	Wooldridge	Killeen