

**Grantee: South Dakota**

**Grant: B-08-DN-46-0001**

**July 1, 2015 thru September 30, 2015 Performance Report**

---





will continually be monitored for potential changes; increases in foreclosures will potentially require an amendment to The Plan. Information gathered from a private source provides an indication that there are over 4,500 subprime mortgages in the state of South Dakota and at least one subprime mortgage in every county with exception of Buffalo, Jones, Mellette, Sully, Todd and Ziebach counties. The greatest number of subprime mortgages is located in Minnehaha, Pennington and Lincoln counties. Sioux Falls is located within both Minnehaha and Lincoln counties with Rapid City being located in Pennington. While there are subprime mortgages located in nearly every county in South Dakota, over 50 percent of the subprime mortgages are in the three counties listed previously. Per the raw data utilized for the calculation of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Allocation, South Dakota has an estimated 7,582 subprime mortgages; however, this information is not broken down by counties or zip codes. Based on the private information gathered, one could estimate that the percentages would remain the same and the top three counties would have nearly 70 percent more subprime mortgages than originally anticipated.

Of the 4,500 subprime mortgages, it is estimated that 16.35 percent of the loans are seriously delinquent. South Dakota ranks in the bottom two or three states for number of subprime mortgages, the outstanding loan amount and subprime per capita, however, it jumps up in the ranking when reviewing the percentage of the loans that are seriously delinquent. The 16.35 percent ranks South Dakota 35th, indicating that even if the number of subprime mortgages are lower than other states, there is a greater chance of foreclosure of these homes.

Following are counties with the highest sub-prime mortgages per the private data source.

Counties with more than 500 subprime mortgages:

Lincoln & Pennington; Minnehaha Pennington

Counties with more than 100 subprimergae:/&maptp>p&mgBoknsns;ns;nsp&mapbp&mp&mbp&mn;onsn;npapapp

**Areas of Greatest Need:**

amp;ma;sappns; Davison Lawrence Meade Union

In addition, based on the same information, the State of South Dakota has a 3.3 percent rate of subprime to estimated number of mortgages. Listed below are counties experiencing a subprime rate higher than 4 percent.

Beadle Bennett Charles Mix Clay Corson Davison Douglas Fall River Harding Hyde

Jerauld Kingsbury Marshall McCook Moody Sanborn Shannon Spink Stanley Tripp Turner

Future Risk-HUD has provided an Estimated Foreclosure and Abandonment Risk Score table providing information of areas of greatest need based on Census Block Groups. The scores are based on four different sources that are used to predict whether or not a neighborhood has a high or low risk for foreclosed and abandoned homes. The scores range from zero to ten, with tensuggesting a very high risk. Applicants are encouraged to utilize this data to begin reviewing the specified areas and further evaluate other data such as county records on foreclosures filings or tax foreclosures to define an area of need and appropriate activity. HUD's risk score table can be found at [http://www.huduser.org/datasets/nsp\\_target.html](http://www.huduser.org/datasets/nsp_target.html). Based on this information, the following counties currently indicate a Risk Score of seven or greater:

Beadle Clark Hand Lawrence Meade Minnehaha  
Moody Pennington Potter Roberts & nbs

**Areas of Greatest Need:**

p; Spink Yankton

**Distribution and and Uses of Funds:**

NSP funds have been targeted to areas of greatest demonstrated need. These areas have the greatest percentage and number of home foreclosures, highest number and percentage of homes financed by a subprime mortgage related loan, and those areas identified as likely to face a significant rise in home foreclosure rates. While the number of foreclosures and sub-prime mortgages in South Dakota are substantially less than other areas around the country, there are a number of foreclosures and sub-prime mortgage in the state, with the highest concentration in the Sioux Falls and Rapid City MSAs.

Funds were originally targeted to specific counties and Indian Reservations. The NSP Plan has been amended to authorize the use of NSP funds statewide.

**Public Comment:**

SDHDA posted the second Amended NSP Plan on its website on February 10, 2010. The 15 day public comment period began on the 10th and ended at 5:00 p.m. CT on February 24, 2010. Notice of the public comment period appeared in the daily newspapers and a statewide press release was sent to TV, print, and radio media.

SDHDA received no written comments for the February 2010 comment period.

SDHDA posted the first Amended NSP Plan on its website on August 19, 2009. The 15 day public comment period began on the 19th and ended at 5:00 p.m. CT on September 2, 2009. Notice of the public comment period appeared in the daily newspapers and a statewide press release was sent to TV, print, and radio media. .

Written comments for the August and September 2009 comment period are as follows:

Two written comments were received in regards to not permitting NSP funds to be used for acquisition unless properties were foreclosed or abandoned. SDHDA received confirmation from HUD that NSP funds can only be used for acquisition when properties are foreclosed or abandoned. No changes were made to The Plan regarding these comments.

SDHDA posted the NSP Plan on its website November 10, 2008. The 15 day public comment period began on the 10th and ended at 5:00 p.m. CT on November 25, 2008. Notice of the public comment period appeared in the daily newspapers and a statewide press release was sent to TV, print, and radio media. Interested parties were also given the opportunity to discuss with SDHDA staff and comment on the NSP plan at the SDHDA annual conference held on November 18 and 19, 2008.

Written comments received for the November comment period are as follows:

One written comment indicated their appreciation for allowing NSP funds to be utilized to demolish blighted structures. No change to the NSP Plan was made.

A written comment requested incorporating in The Plan that "blighted" could be defined by a local TIF or BID ordinance. Per the



Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 194, dated October 6, 2008, the NSP plan is to define a blighted structure. The Federal Register did not request definition of a blighted area. Area Median Income requirements will be utilized in determining that the proposed activities will meet the National Objective of serving households of 120 percent AMI or less.

Another written comment requested that The Plan incorporate a provision that the Governor's House could be utilized as "infill" to redevelop demolished or vacant properties. This comment has been incorporated.

One comment was received asking that the demolition of structures such as former schools, churches or commercial building or other such facilities, for the redevelopment as housing, be defined as an authorized use under this Plan. Further clarification was made in The Plan to indicate these structures would be eligible for demolition, only if they are considered Blighted Structures.

A written comment suggested making the application process as simplified as possible. SDHDA will take this comment into consideration when drafting the application form. If other funding sources utilized in conjunction with NSP funds, applicants will need to follow timeliness of the most restrictive program. No change was made to The Plan for this comment. ;

## Definitions and Descriptions:

### Definitions:

Blighted Structure-South Dakota law does not have a definition of "Blighted Structure." Blighted Structures will be defined as physical structures exhibiting signs of deterioration or is potentially hazardous to persons or surrounding property, including but not limited to: (a) a structure that is in danger of partial or complete collapse; (b) a structure with any exterior parts that are loose or in danger of falling; or (c) a structure with any parts, such as floors, porches, railings, stairs, ramps, balconies or roofs, that are accessible and that have either collapsed, are in danger of collapsing or are unable to support the weight of normally imposed loads.

Vacant Property-South Dakota does not have a definition of "Vacant Property" in the state law. Vacant Property can refer to either a building or land that for a minimum of 90 days has been:

1. unoccupied and unsecured (not prohibiting entry);
2. unoccupied and secured by other than normal means;
3. unoccupied and a dangerous structure;
4. unoccupied and condemned;
5. unoccupied and has city code violations; or
6. condemned and illegally occupied.

Vacant Property does not mean any building being constructed pursuant to a valid permit issued pursuant to the city building code and residential code for one- and two-family dwellings.

Raw land would not be defined as Vacant Property. Vacant Property could include buildings or land which was previously developed via infrastructure improvements such as roads, water, sewer, power lines, etc. However, land that has been farmland, open space, wilderness, etc. would not be defined as Vacant Property.

Abandoned-Per Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 194 dated October 6, 2008, Abandoned will be defined as follows: A home is Abandoned when mortgage or tax foreclosure proceedings have been initiated for that property, no mortgage or tax payments have been made by the property owner for at least 90 days, AND the property has been Vacant for at least 90 days.

Foreclosed-Per Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 194 dated October 6, 2008, Foreclosed will be defined as follows: A property "has been foreclosed upon" at the point that, under state or local law, the mortgage or tax foreclosure is complete. HUD generally will not consider a foreclosure to be complete until after the title for the property has been transferred from the former homeowner under some type of foreclosure proceeding or transfer in lieu of foreclosure, in accordance with state or local law.

Affordable Rents-Affordable Rents will be defined as a tenant paying no more than 30 percent of their annual income for gross housing costs, including utility costs, with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

Land Bank-Per Federal Register Vol. 74, No. 117 dated June 19, 2009, A land bank is a governmental or nongovernmental nonprofit entity established, at least in part, to assemble, temporarily manage, and dispose of vacant land for the purpose of standing main

## Definitions and Descriptions:

tain, assemble, facilitate redevelopment of, market, and dispose of the land-banked properties. If the land bank is a governmental entity, it may also maintain foreclosed property that it does not own, provided it charges the owner of the property the full cost of the service or places a lien on the property for the full cost of the service.

### Continued Affordability:

Depending on the type of activity and funding level, the affordability periods will vary. Affordability periods as outlined under the HOME Program 24 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 92.252(a), (c), (e), and (f) and 24 CFR 92.254, will be utilized for NSP funding. Applicants will indicate within their application, the number of units and the respective AMI levels to be served with the NSP funds. SDHDA will require the NSP assisted units to remain restricted to the respective AMI levels for the entire affordability period per the restrictive covenant document.

Restrictive covenants will be filed on the real estate per the terms indicated below:

New Construction of Rental Housing 20 years of affordability

Single Family New Construction,

Rental Housing (rehabilitation or acquisition),

Homeownership Assistance or Demolition of

Blighted Structures

NSP Funding per unit -	under \$15,000	5 years of affordability
	\$15,000 – 40,000	10 years of affordability
	Over \$40,000	15 years of affordability

### Housing Rehab Standards:

Housing that is rehabilitated with NSP funding must meet all applicable local codes, rehabilitation standards, ordinances, and zoning ordinances at the time of project completion. All housing assisted with NSP funds must meet, at a minimum, the Housing Quality Standards in 24 CFR Part 982.401. If rehabilitation standards in effect in the locality of the project are less restrictive, or there are no rehabilitation standards then at a minimum, one of the three model codes Uniform Building Code (ICBO), National Building Code (BOCA), Standard Building Code (SBCCI); or the Council of American Building Officials (CABO) one or two family code; or the Minimum Property Standards (MPS) in 24 CFR Part 200.925 or 200.926 will apply.

Applicants are encouraged, to the greatest extent possible, to strategically incorporate modern green building and energy efficiency improvements to provide long-



term affordability and increases sustainability and attractiveness of housing and neighborhoods.

### **Low Income Targeting:**

It is estimated that \$7,644,000 (39 percent) may be allocated for housing serving individuals and families whose income does not exceed 50 percent of the area median income (AMI). Discussions are underway with nonprofit agencies and service providers to redevelop Vacant Property for permanent housing for tenant populations serving special needs and homeless. It is anticipated that approximately \$5,000,000 will be used to purchase and renovate, redevelop, or newly construct housing under 24 CFR 570.201(e) to serve this targeted population. Discussions with potential applicants indicates that majority of these funds will be requested for Sioux Falls, Rapid City and Indian reservations.

To the greatest extent possible, nonprofit agencies will be encouraged to create financing mechanisms necessary to allow households of 50 percent AMI to purchase single family homes that were previously Abandoned or Foreclosed. NSP funds will also be eligible for the acquisition and rehabilitation of Abandoned or Foreclosed homes for rental units.

### **Acquisition and Relocation:**

NSP funds are anticipated to serve households of 50 percent or less, 80 percent or less, and 120 percent or less of AMI in each of the different eligible activities.

An estimated \$1,000,000 is anticipated to be used to demolish Blighted Structures, resulting in approximately 100 units across the state of South Dakota. A small number of dwelling units may be converted to rental housing with emphasis on special needs housing. However the Vacant Property may also be Blighted Structures and the cost of rehabilitation would be too costly.

In order to meet NSP program requirements, census tracts and block groups will be utilized to ensure at least 51 percent of the residents within the census tract or block group have incomes at or below 120 percent AMI, or the corresponding targeted AMI level.

Homeownership assistance and acquisition and rehabilitation of Abandoned or Foreclosed homes for resale or rental are anticipated to serve more households of 120 percent AMI. Under the eligible use of purchase and rehabilitate residential properties that have been Abandoned or Foreclosed and redevelopment of demolished or Vacant Property, it is anticipated that a majority of the funds will be utilized to serve households that do not exceed 50 percent AMI. There is strong public interest in providing housing opportunities for special needs or homeless populations, creating an estimated 65 units of permanent housing for households at or below 50 percent AMI, 43 units for 80 percent AMI and 35 units for 120 percent AMI. Since 50 percent of the current foreclosures are located in Sioux Falls and Rapid City, it is estimated that 50 percent of the NSP funds for this activity will be utilized in these two communities.

For the total activities it is anticipated that 85 units and \$7,644,000 million of the funding will be utilized for households of 50 percent AMI or less. An additional 73 housing units and \$5,761,000 million of NSP funds will be for households of 80 percent AMI or less. The remaining \$4,235,000 million will be targeted for households of 120 percent of AMI or less.

Capacity of nonprofit agencies, developers and changes within community needs will dictate the need to further evaluate the estimated funding and AMI levels for the specified activities.

### **Public Comment:**

ow a portion of the administration funds to be utilized by the recipient in carrying out their proposed activity. SDHDA will utilize the administration funds to cover costs associated with NSP. If SDHDA contracts with another entity to assist in administering NSP, administration funds will be utilized to pay for their services. In addition SDHDA could utilize a portion of the administration funds to fund eligible activities. Applicants will outline in their application budgets, the cost associated with administering their program or developing their project. Applicants will be compensated according to a reasonable budget as outline in their application. Additional clarification regarding the 10 percent administration funds was incorporated into The Plan for this comment.

One written comment requested clarification of "vacant". Clarification was made in The Plan to state Vacant Property can refer to a building or land.

Another written comment was in regards to demolish Blighted Structures and whether NSP funds could be utilized to acquire the property. Further clarification was provided in The Plan as follows "NSP funds can only be used for the cost of clearing the Blighted Structure. No NSP funds can be requested for purchase of the Blighted Structure unless the project also qualifies under acquisition of an Abandoned or Foreclosed property".

A comment requested clarification on whether NSP funds could be utilized to acquire the demolished or vacant structure. NSP funds can be used to acquire demolished or Vacant Property. Further clarification was made in The Plan.

The final written comment was in regards to affordability restrictions. References to the affordability restrictions were modified in The Plan to accurately reflect the proper page.

### **Public Comment:**

mmments were received indicating that \$1 million dollars targeted to demolition activity may be insufficient. The \$1 million was a calculated estimate that may be modified if necessary. HUD will not require one-for-one replacement of low- and moderate-income dwellings units that are demolished or converted for activities assisted with NSP, however, the NSP funds are to be focused on neighborhood stabilization. While demolition is an eligible activity NSP funds should be focused on providing housing opportunities for eligible households. No change was made to The Plan; however, SDHDA will monitor the dollar amount requested per activity to determine modifications at a future date, if necessary.

A written comment requested further clarification of the allocation process. Additional information was provided in The Plan to further explain this process.

A couple of written comments were in regards to the application process – one concerning a point system and the second in relation to environmental reviews. No point system will be utilized with this funding source. HUD environmental reviews will be completed for each activity and the level of review will be dependent on the type of activity being requested. Additional clarification regarding the application process was incorporated into the NSP Plan. In addition, careful consideration will be given while drafting the NSP application form to ensure it will provide guidance to the applicant and outline the information needed to



fulfill HUD requirements.

One commentator requested SDHDA to consider formulating a community score for each county. HUD has created an Estimated Foreclose and Abandonment Risk Score based on census tracts, which is similar to this proposal. This information can be found on the HUD website at [http://www.huduser.org/datasets/nsp\\_target.html](http://www.huduser.org/datasets/nsp_target.html). In addition it is anticipated that South Dakota's information may continue to change, affecting the areas determined to have the greatest need. Based on this information, no change was made to The Plan. SDHDA would like to utilize the information currently available and remain flexible to entertain applications as demonstrated need may change.

Another written comment requested SDHDA to hold meetings with potential applicants regarding the final NSP Plan. Upon approval of the NSP Plan by HUD, SDHDA will host future meetings to further discuss NSP funding and eligible activities. No changes were made to The Plan regarding this comment.

One written comment asked if SHDA would consider all eligible activities. There are five eligible activities as outlined in HERA Section 2301 (c) (3). SDHDA will not entertain land banking as an eligible activity, so no change was made to The Plan for this comment. All other activities are outlined within The Plan.

In addition this comment further stated that The Plan should notify applicants that all eligible activities are subject to change and interpretation based on HUD's approval of The Plan and/or changes being issued regarding the NSP Notice. This notice was incorporated into The Plan to ensure applicants are aware of these potential changes.

A written and verbal comment received was in regards to the 10 percent administration funds. The comments requested SDHDA's consideration to all

Overall	This Report Period	To Date
<b>Total Projected Budget from All Sources</b>	N/A	\$41,226,639.16
<b>Total Budget</b>	\$14,914.78	\$21,804,090.20
<b>Total Obligated</b>	\$14,914.78	\$21,804,058.41
<b>Total Funds Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$20,711,841.10
<b>Program Funds Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$18,759,854.64
<b>Program Income Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$1,951,986.46
<b>Program Income Received</b>	\$14,914.78	\$2,204,058.41
<b>Total Funds Expended</b>	\$0.00	\$20,689,981.41
<b>Match Contributed</b>	\$0.00	\$25,422.41

## Progress Toward Required Numeric Targets

Requirement	Required	To Date
<b>Overall Benefit Percentage (Projected)</b>		0.00%
<b>Overall Benefit Percentage (Actual)</b>		0.00%
<b>Minimum Non-Federal Match</b>	\$0.00	\$25,422.41
<b>Limit on Public Services</b>	\$2,940,000.00	\$0.00
<b>Limit on Admin/Planning</b>	\$1,960,000.00	\$773,638.23
<b>Limit on State Admin</b>	\$0.00	\$773,638.23

## Progress Toward Activity Type Targets

## Progress Toward National Objective Targets

National Objective	Target	Actual
<b>NSP Only - LH - 25% Set-Aside</b>	\$4,900,000.00	\$8,542,099.11

## Overall Progress Narrative:



For quarter ending 9/30/15, the administration budget was modified for program income received.

## Project Summary

Project #, Project Title	This Report Period	To Date	
	Program Funds Drawdown	Project Funds Budgeted	Program Funds Drawdown
1, Homeownership Assistance	\$0.00	\$63,853.02	\$63,853.02
2, Acquisition	\$0.00	\$4,898,819.91	\$4,546,316.47
3, Clearance and Demolition	\$0.00	\$241,054.00	\$144,239.23
4, Redevelopment/Reconstruction	\$0.00	\$14,315,570.41	\$12,762,609.95
5, Administration	\$0.00	\$1,698,605.52	\$656,680.42
6, Land Banking	\$0.00	\$586,155.55	\$586,155.55



## Activities

**Project # / Title:** 2 / Acquisition

**Grantee Activity Number:** 1008-01-2

**Activity Title:** Black Hills Area HFH - 1213 Racine

**Activity Category:**

Acquisition - general

**Project Number:**

2

**Projected Start Date:**

05/01/2009

**Benefit Type:**

Direct ( HouseHold )

**National Objective:**

NSP Only - LMMI

**Activity Status:**

Completed

**Project Title:**

Acquisition

**Projected End Date:**

08/01/2011

**Completed Activity Actual End Date:**

**Responsible Organization:**

Black Hills Area Habitat for Humanity

**Overall**

**Total Projected Budget from All Sources**

**Jul 1 thru Sep 30, 2015**

N/A

**To Date**

\$142,500.00

**Total Budget**

\$0.00

\$142,500.00

**Total Obligated**

\$0.00

\$142,500.00

**Total Funds Drawdown**

\$0.00

\$142,500.00

**Program Funds Drawdown**

\$0.00

\$142,136.77

**Program Income Drawdown**

\$0.00

\$363.23

**Program Income Received**

\$3,750.00

\$18,803.41

**Total Funds Expended**

\$0.00

\$142,500.00

**Match Contributed**

\$0.00

\$0.00

**Activity Description:**

Acquisition and rehabilitation of a foreclosed single family home for sale to a homebuyer at or below 60% AMI.

**Location Description:**

1213 Racine Street, Rapid City, Pennington County, SD

**Activity Progress Narrative:**





## Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period		Cumulative Actual Total / Expected	
	Total		Total	
# of Properties	0		1/1	
# of Parcels acquired voluntarily	0		1/1	
Total acquisition compensation to	0		90250/100000	

	This Report Period		Cumulative Actual Total / Expected	
	Total		Total	
# of Housing Units	0		1/1	
# of Singlefamily Units	0		1/1	

## Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	1/0	0/1	1/1	100.00
# of Persons	0	0	0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0
# Owner Households	0	0	0	1/0	0/1	1/1	100.00

## Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

## Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

**Grantee Activity Number:** 1008-02-2  
**Activity Title:** Black Hills HFH - 420 Watertown

**Activity Category:**

Acquisition - general

**Project Number:**

2

**Projected Start Date:**

05/01/2009

**Benefit Type:**

Direct ( HouseHold )

**National Objective:**

NSP Only - LMMI

**Activity Status:**

Completed

**Project Title:**

Acquisition

**Projected End Date:**

12/31/2010

**Completed Activity Actual End Date:**

**Responsible Organization:**

Black Hills Area Habitat for Humanity

Overall	Jul 1 thru Sep 30, 2015	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	\$96,537.87
Total Budget	\$0.00	\$96,537.87
Total Obligated	\$0.00	\$96,537.87
Total Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$96,537.87
Program Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$38,752.59
Program Income Drawdown	\$0.00	\$57,785.28
Program Income Received	\$3,217.92	\$14,993.21
Total Funds Expended	\$0.00	\$96,537.87
Match Contributed	\$0.00	\$0.00

**Activity Description:**

Acquisition and rehabilitation of 1 foreclosed single family home for sale to homebuyer at or below 60% AMI.

**Location Description:**

420 East Watertown Street, Rapid City (Pennington County)

**Activity Progress Narrative:**

**Accomplishments Performance Measures**

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	0	1/1
# of Parcels acquired voluntarily	0	1/1
Total acquisition compensation to	0	42300/42300



	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	0	1/1
# of Singlefamily Units	0	1/1

### Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	1/0	0/1	1/1	100.00
# Owner Households	0	0	0	1/0	0/1	1/1	100.00

### Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

### Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	



**Grantee Activity Number:** 1008-03-2  
**Activity Title:** Black Hills HFH - 417 Idaho

**Activity Category:**

Acquisition - general

**Project Number:**

2

**Projected Start Date:**

07/01/2009

**Benefit Type:**

Direct ( HouseHold )

**National Objective:**

NSP Only - LMMI

**Activity Status:**

Completed

**Project Title:**

Acquisition

**Projected End Date:**

12/31/2010

**Completed Activity Actual End Date:**

**Responsible Organization:**

Black Hills Area Habitat for Humanity

Overall	Jul 1 thru Sep 30, 2015	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	\$112,267.08
Total Budget	\$0.00	\$112,267.08
Total Obligated	\$0.00	\$112,267.08
Total Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$112,267.08
Program Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$57,799.01
Program Income Drawdown	\$0.00	\$54,468.07
Program Income Received	\$3,794.88	\$18,974.40
Total Funds Expended	\$0.00	\$112,267.08
Match Contributed	\$0.00	\$0.00

**Activity Description:**

Acquisition and rehabilitation of 1 foreclosed single family home for sale to homebuyer at or below 60% AMI.

**Location Description:**

417 East Idaho Street, Rapid City (Pennington County)

**Activity Progress Narrative:**

**Accomplishments Performance Measures**

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	0	1/1
# of Parcels acquired voluntarily	0	1/1
Total acquisition compensation to	0	88500/88500



	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	0	1/1
# of Singlefamily Units	0	1/1

### Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	1/0	0/1	1/1	100.00
# Owner Households	0	0	0	1/0	0/1	1/1	100.00

### Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

### Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
Personal Funds	\$1,589.72
Total Other Funding Sources	\$0.00

---



<b>Grantee Activity Number:</b>	<b>1039-00-2</b>
<b>Activity Title:</b>	<b>Pleasant Hill Village</b>

**Activity Category:**  
Rehabilitation/reconstruction of residential structures

**Activity Status:**  
Completed

**Project Number:**  
2

**Project Title:**  
Acquisition

**Projected Start Date:**  
04/28/2011

**Projected End Date:**  
10/01/2012

**Benefit Type:**  
Direct ( HouseHold )

**Completed Activity Actual End Date:**

**National Objective:**  
NSP Only - LH - 25% Set-Aside

**Responsible Organization:**  
Sakura, LLC

Overall	Jul 1 thru Sep 30, 2015	To Date
<b>Total Projected Budget from All Sources</b>	N/A	\$560,421.05
<b>Total Budget</b>	\$0.00	\$560,421.05
<b>Total Obligated</b>	\$0.00	\$560,421.05
<b>Total Funds Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$560,421.05
<b>Program Funds Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$520,511.11
<b>Program Income Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$39,909.94
<b>Program Income Received</b>	\$4,125.00	\$46,750.00
<b>Total Funds Expended</b>	\$0.00	\$560,421.05
<b>Match Contributed</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00

**Activity Description:**

This activity involves the acquisition and rehabilitation of a foreclosed, multifamily property consisting of 8 six-plex buildings containing 48 townhouse units. 12 of the 48 units are targeted to households at or below 50% AMI.

**Location Description:**

1714 North 7th Street, Rapid City, SD (Pennington County)

**Activity Progress Narrative:**

**Accomplishments Performance Measures**

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
<b># of Properties</b>	0	2/1



	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	0	24/12
# of Multifamily Units	0	24/12

### Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	12/12	0/0	12/12	100.00
# Renter Households	0	0	0	12/12	0/0	12/12	100.00

### Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

### Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
Lender Loan	\$1,600,000.00
Other Loan Source	\$200,000.00
Personal Funds	\$262,237.00
Total Other Funding Sources	\$0.00

### Project # / Title: 5 / Administration

<b>Grantee Activity Number:</b>	<b>1000</b>
<b>Activity Title:</b>	<b>Administration</b>

**Activity Category:**

Administration

**Project Number:**

5

**Projected Start Date:**

05/01/2009

**Benefit Type:**

( )

**National Objective:**

N/A

**Activity Status:**

Under Way

**Project Title:**

Administration

**Projected End Date:**

03/05/2013

**Completed Activity Actual End Date:**

**Responsible Organization:**

South Dakota Housing Development Authority1



<b>Overall</b>	<b>Jul 1 thru Sep 30, 2015</b>	<b>To Date</b>
<b>Total Projected Budget from All Sources</b>	N/A	\$1,698,637.31
<b>Total Budget</b>	\$14,914.78	\$1,698,637.31
<b>Total Obligated</b>	\$14,914.78	\$1,698,605.52
<b>Total Funds Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$773,638.23
<b>Program Funds Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$656,680.42
<b>Program Income Drawdown</b>	\$0.00	\$116,957.81
<b>Program Income Received</b>	\$26.98	\$158.09
<b>Total Funds Expended</b>	\$0.00	\$746,998.75
<b>Match Contributed</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00

### Activity Description:

Administration of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) in South Dakota. The grantee will use the designated program funds and 10% of all program income for this activity.

### Location Description:

NSP funds have been targeted to areas of greatest demonstrated need. These areas have the greatest percentage and number of home foreclosures, highest number and percentage of homes financed by a subprime mortgage related loan, and those areas identified as likely to face a significant rise in home foreclosure rates. While the number of foreclosures and sub-prime mortgages in South Dakota are substantially less than other areas around the country, there are a number of foreclosures and sub-prime mortgage in the state, with the highest concentration in the Sioux Falls and Rapid City MSAs. Funds were originally targeted to specific counties and Indian Reservations. The NSP Plan has been amended to authorize the use of NSP funds statewide.

### Activity Progress Narrative:

### Accomplishments Performance Measures

No Accomplishments Performance Measures

### Beneficiaries Performance Measures

No Beneficiaries Performance Measures found.

### Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

### Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found





**Other Funding Sources**

**Amount**

No Other Funding Sources Found

Total Other Funding Sources

---

