



Charlottesville FY 26 Housing Operations & Program Support (HOPS) Report

March 13, 2025

CAHF Committee Members:

Phil d'Oronzio
Richard Fravel
Misty Graves
Taylor Harvey-Ryan
S. Lisa Herndon

City Staff Liaison:

Antoine Williams, Housing Program Manager

Contents

- A. INTRODUCTION 1**
 - 1. Background 1
 - 2. Operational Funding Review Process 1
 - 3. Ranking Distribution by Category: 2
 - 4. The grid below shows how the quality rankings aligned:..... 2
 - 5. City Manager & Executive Review in Budget Process 3
- B. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION OUTCOMES: Funding Level Recommendations 3**
 - 1. Applications Not Recommended for FY26 HOPS Funding..... 4
 - 2. List of Organizations Not Recommended..... 4
 - 3. List of Organizations Awards-Recommended to Council 6
 - 4. Remaining HOPS Balance for Discretionary Use 6
 - 5. Final Considerations for City Council 6
- C. SUMMARY OF ALL APPLICATIONS..... 6**
 - 1. Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP) 7
 - 2. Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless (BRACH) 7
 - 3. Charlottesville Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)..... 8
 - 4. Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA)..... 8
 - 5. Community Housing Partners (CHP) 8
 - 6. Community Services Housing (CSH)..... 9
 - 7. Georgia’s Friends 9
 - 8. Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville 9
 - 9. International Rescue Committee (IRC).....10
 - 10. International Rescue Committee (IRC).....10
 - 11. Legal Aid Justice Center (LAJC).....11
 - 12. PACEM11
 - 13. Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)12
 - 14. Region Ten Community Services Board (Region Ten).....12
 - 15. The Haven at First & Market, Inc. (The Haven)13
 - 16. The Haven at First & Market, Inc. (The Haven)13

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

Starting in FY24, affordable housing-specific applications were removed from the Vibrant Community Fund process and reviewed in a separate process. This affordable-housing-specific application process is now called the Housing Operations & Program Support (HOPS) program. This funding supports the operational needs of non-profit organizations involved in affordable housing and homelessness prevention.

The CAHF Committee is tasked with evaluating the applications received through the HOPS application cycle and recommending to the City Council suggested priorities for using CAHF funding. The Committee reviews applications and scores them based on their quality, the importance of the type of service being provided, and alignment with the City's affordable housing goals.

On August 19, 2024, a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was issued, detailing the timeline and funding amount for the HOPS Grant program. The NOFA announced that **\$575,000** would be available for allocations and awards in **FY26**, with the application period set from September 18, 2024, to October 18, 2024. By the submission deadline, staff received 16 applications for funding, totaling \$1,472,348 in requests.

2. Operational Funding Review Process

The Committee reviewed the applications for quality using an objective rubric that evaluated:

- Program details and outcomes,
- Understanding of participants,
- Strategies used to meet those needs,
- Use of best practices,
- Evaluation plan and metrics used,
- Demonstration of need for the program,
- Organizational capacity
- Alignment with City priorities,
- Staff and Board composition,
- Local collaborative efforts,
- Engagement of high need and underserved populations,
- Program participants' involvement in evaluation and governance,
- Proposed outcome and outcomes achieved in the previous year, and
- Fiscal stability.

Priority is given to programs that provide essential services to vulnerable populations, including programs targeting individuals experiencing homelessness and programs that positively impact the state of homelessness in the City of Charlottesville.

Committee members individually reviewed and rated the applications before coming together as a group. First, they ranked the applications based on how well they aligned with the City’s affordable housing goals, as well as the quality and completeness of each application. These rankings were determined collectively and categorized as follows:

Category	Definition
A	Proposals in this category are highly aligned with the committee's funding priorities and are deemed to have significant impact and feasibility.
B	Proposals in this category have merit but may require additional scrutiny or clarification from applicants before full funding can be justified.
C	Proposals in this category are either unclear, provide limited benefit or alignment with City's goals, or have significant concerns that raise doubts about their viability.

3. Ranking Distribution by Category:

- **7 applications** ranked **A**
- **5 applications** ranked **B**
- **1 application** ranked **C**

Committee members evaluated the applications individually, using a scoring framework and rubric¹ developed by the Committee to assess the quality of each applicant’s responses and their proposed projects. After discussing each application as a group, the Committee finalized their scores. They then tabulated these scores and addressed any significant discrepancies among the reviewers' evaluations. Ultimately, the Committee calculated an overall score based on the average of the individual scores, with a maximum possible score of 105.

- **The lowest score received was 78**
- **The highest score received was 101**

4. The grid below shows how the quality rankings aligned:

Over 95 points	90-95 points	85-90 points	Below 85 points
3 applications	8 applications	4 applications	1 application

5. City Manager & Executive Review in Budget Process

As part of the City's broader budget planning process, the City Manager and Executive Team review the CAHF Committee's funding recommendations in the context of the City's budgetary frameworks, financial constraints, and strategic funding priorities.

This executive-level review ensures that the proposed allocations align with the City's overall financial strategy and long-term planning. The review process may result in adjustments or recommendations based on the following:

- Availability of funds in the City's overall budget,
- Intergovernmental agency funding policies,
- Competing City priorities across departments, and
- Alignment with broader City housing strategies and fiscal policies.

This review does not reject the Committee's evaluation but is a necessary step in balancing housing funding within the City's overall financial obligations.

A key example of this process was the March 13, 2025, Council Budget Work Session, during which the Executive Team provided recommendations to the Council regarding funding levels for HOPS and CAHF allocations. This included:

- Excluding intergovernmental and fundamental organizations (e.g., CRHA, BRACH, and PHAR) from competitive HOPS funding eligibility based on financial policy considerations.
- Ensuring that final funding recommendations fit within the City's overall fiscal plan.

As is consistent with the City's funding review process, no funding recommendation is final until formally approved by the City Council. This process allows for additional transparency, oversight, and Council input before final allocations are determined.

B. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION OUTCOMES: FUNDING LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY26 HOPS ALLOCATION

The Housing Operations & Programs Support (HOPS) fund provides critical financial support to organizations offering housing stability services, emergency shelter, case management, and homeownership support in Charlottesville.

For the FY26 funding cycle, the City received \$1,472,348 in total funding requests but had \$575,000 available for allocation. After thorough evaluation by the CAHF Committee and subsequent review by the City Manager and Executive Team, the City is recommending \$452,574 in HOPS funding, leaving a remaining balance of \$122,426 for discretionary housing initiatives.

This funding allocation reflects strategic prioritization of programs that provide direct and immediate benefits to vulnerable populations while also considering broader budget constraints and City policies regarding intergovernmental and fundamental organizations.

1. Applications Not Recommended for FY26 HOPS Funding

Despite the high level of demonstrated need, \$1,019,774 in requests could not be funded due to budget limitations, eligibility considerations, or prioritization of direct service programs.

A. Key Reasons for Non-Funding Decisions

1. Budget Constraints:

- The City had \$575,000 in available funds, while total requests exceeded \$1.47 million—more than double the available budget.
- The high demand meant that some programs, even those with merit, could not be supported within the funding limits.

2. Policy Considerations & Eligibility Restrictions:

- As part of the March 13, 2025, Executive Review, funding to intergovernmental and fundamental organizations (CRHA, PHAR, and BRACH) was deemed ineligible under competitive HOPS funding.
- These agencies provide essential services but were recommended for alternative funding sources outside of the competitive process.

3. Funding Prioritization for Direct Housing & Shelter Services:

- Programs that provide immediate housing stability, case management, and emergency shelter services were prioritized over those focusing on system coordination, advocacy, or long-term planning.

2. List of Organizations Not Recommended (\$605,500 in requests in the table below)

Organization	Program	Amount Requested	Eligibility and Status
1. Charlottesville Redevelopment & Housing Authority (CRHA)	Resident Services	\$75,000	<i>Intergovernmental agency – ineligible for competitive HOPS funding</i>
2. Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless (BRACH)	System Coordination	\$27,500	<i>Fundamental organization – ineligible for competitive HOPS funding</i>

3. Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)	Leadership & Civic Engagement	\$13,950	<i>Fundamental organization – ineligible for competitive HOPS funding</i>
4. Community Housing Partners (CHP)	Housing Operations Support	\$101,500	Eligible for Competitive Grant as General Organization
5. International Rescue Committee (IRC)	IRC Charlottesville Rental Assistance Program	\$35,000	Eligible for Competitive Grant as General Organization
6. International Rescue Committee (IRC)	Rental Assistance & Housing Specialist	\$86,000	Eligible for Competitive Grant as General Organization
7. Legal Aid Justice Center (LAJC)	Eviction Prevention Services	\$100,000	Eligible for Competitive Grant as General Organization
8. Region Ten Community Services Board	Region Ten Homelessness Prevention	\$20,000	<i>Fundamental organization – ineligible for competitive HOPS funding</i>

While these organizations are not receiving HOPS funding for FY26, the City recognizes their importance.

A. Key Factors in Funding Decisions

1. Direct and Immediate Impact:

- Priority was given to programs that provide immediate housing stability services, such as case management, shelter operations, and homeownership assistance.

2. Alignment with City Housing Priorities:

- Funded programs align with the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Affordable Housing Strategy, ensuring that HOPS funds support the most impactful housing initiatives.

3. Organizational Capacity and Track Record:

- Organizations that demonstrated strong program outcomes, financial sustainability, and ability to scale their services were prioritized for funding.

3. List of Organizations Recommended for FY26 HOPS Funding (\$458,550)

Organization	Program	Award-Recommended*
9. The Haven	Day Shelter Program	\$80,825
10. The Haven	Vital Housing Services	\$108,825
11. PACEM	Case Management	\$50,000
12. Piedmont Housing Alliance	Charlottesville Affordable Housing Program	\$92,500
13. Georgia’s Friends	Georgia’s Friends Recovery Residence & Support Programs for Women	\$7,976
14. Habitat for Humanity	Homeownership Program	\$52,500
15. Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)	System of Care	\$22,500
16. Community Services Housing, Inc. (CSH)	Housing Development Support	\$43,424
Total		\$458,550

* Award-recommended amounts may be modified after the date of publication of this report.

4. Remaining HOPS Balance for Discretionary Use

- After funding allocations, \$122,426 remains available in HOPS for the City Manager’s discretionary use on emerging housing needs or emergency interventions.

5. Final Considerations for City Council

- **High Unmet Demand:** 69% of total HOPS requests went unfunded, reflecting the urgent need for additional resources in housing support and homelessness prevention.
- **Funding Strategy for Future Cycles:** The City may consider alternative funding streams or policy adjustments to support eviction prevention, system coordination, and legal aid services, which were not prioritized in this cycle.
- **Importance of Strategic Oversight:** The March 13 Executive Review played a critical role in ensuring that funding allocations aligned with the City’s broader budget constraints, intergovernmental policies, and strategic housing priorities.

C. SUMMARY OF ALL APPLICATIONS

The following section provides a summary of all operational funding applications submitted for FY26 HOPS consideration. Each summary includes the program name, amount requested, purpose of funding as described by the applicant, committee scoring, and funding level recommendations from both the CAHF Committee and the Executive Team. Applications are listed in alphabetical order by organization name.

1. Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)

Program Name: AHIP's System of Care

Requested Funding: \$150,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: HOPS funding directly supports the costs of enrolling city residents into AHIP's System of Care, which provides pre-construction services by AHIP staff. Funding will allow AHIP staff to assist clients in crisis by providing resources and recourse for critical housing repair.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 91

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$22,500 (15%)
- CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$22,500 (15%)
- Difference: \$0

2. Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless (BRACH)

Program Name: Homeless System of Care Coordination

Requested Funding: \$55,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: The requested funding will support BRACH in maintaining its staffing capacity to improve system coordination within the homelessness Continuum of Care and address emergent, critical needs for unsheltered people. The current staff includes one executive director and an administrative coordinator, who was hired in February 2024 with the support of the FY2024-25 HOPS award. This additional capacity translates to long overdue support for the Executive Director as BRACH works to implement new and innovative partnerships for housing, long-term planning, much-needed outreach on the Downtown Mall and beyond, and collaborative program applications that address large-scale needs that will eventually poise BRACH to make homelessness rare, brief, and non-recurring in our community.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 94

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
- CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$27,500 (50%)
- Difference: -\$27,500
- Note: Marked ineligible on March 13 as a fundamental organization.

3. Charlottesville Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)

Program Name: Leadership Development and Civic Engagement

Requested Funding: \$93,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: The requested funding will support the continuation and expansion of the PHAR Internship Program by covering personnel costs, program materials and supplies, transportation, and the alumni program.

This will enable PHAR to expand the internship program, launch the youth leadership program, and develop an internship alumni program.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 91

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$13,950 (15%)
 - Difference: -\$13,950
 - Note: Marked ineligible on March 13 as a fundamental organization.
-

4. Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA)

Program Name: CRHA Resident Services

Requested Funding: \$150,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: CRHA is requesting funds to help support our Resident Services department. These funds will go toward supporting our Resident Service Coordinators (RSCs), who provide on-site case management, connect residents to supportive services, work with Property Managers to divert evictions, and act as wraparound support as residents pursue personal and professional goals.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 95

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$75,000 (50%)
 - Difference: -\$75,000
 - Note: Marked ineligible on March 13 as an intergovernmental organization.
-

5. Community Housing Partners (CHP)

Program Name: CRHA Resident Services

Requested Funding: \$101,500

Purpose of Requested Funding: CHP is requesting funding for a one-year full-time Housing Stability Coordinator to assist affected residents who continue to struggle financially. This special project provides not only a dedicated staff person but also dollars to assist vulnerable residents in becoming lease compliant.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 78

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
 - Difference: \$0
-

6. Community Services Housing (CSH)

Program Name: Community Services Housing

Requested Funding: \$86,848

Purpose of Requested Funding: The requested funding is to develop, own, and operate clean, safe, affordable housing for people with disabilities and extremely low incomes in Charlottesville.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 94

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$43,424 (50%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$43,424 (50%)
 - Difference: \$0
-

7. Georgia's Friends

Program Name: Georgia's Friends Recovery Residence & Support Programs for Women

Requested Funding: \$10,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: Georgia's Friends is seeking funds to sustain general operations that support residence life and programs at Georgia's House, the sober-living home we operate at 405 Ridge Street in Charlottesville. Continued support will help underwrite annual costs, which are approximately \$18,000 per resident per year. Funds would also be used to support our structured program that supports women in the early stages of recovery from substance use disorders. The funding will help underwrite annual costs, which are projected to be ~\$360,000 in the City's FY25.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 92

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$7,976 (80%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$7,976 (80%)
 - Difference: \$0
-

8. Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville

Program Name: Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville Homeownership Program

Requested Funding: \$75,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: HOPS funds will be used to hire an additional financial empowerment coach who will work directly with these newly approved homebuyers in the Core (Non-Southwood) and Pathways programs. In addition, funds will support staff providing expanded pre-application financial coaching services for residents living in both the Carlton Mobile Home Park and the Southwood Mobile Home Park. These services include comprehensive financial assessments, loan pre-qualification, financial coaching, and application support (for a Habitat home or a home on the market).

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 98

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$52,500 (70%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$52,500 (70%)
 - Difference: \$0
-

9. International Rescue Committee (IRC)

Program Name: IRC Charlottesville Rental Assistance Program

Requested Funding: \$35,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: The Charlottesville Rental Assistance Program, which this proposal is designed to fund, is structured so that clients will contribute income from employment and 70% of their TANF towards their rent, submitting payment directly to their landlord. IRC Charlottesville will contribute the balance for one month if funds are available. This process will be repeated for another month if necessary; however, it is with clear understanding that it is the family's responsibility to undertake full accountability as soon as possible. For those IRC clients who qualify for Intensive Case Management (ICM) or Supplemental Case Management (SCM) services, this program may support portions of their rent for an average of four months, depending on the level of vulnerability and assessment guidelines.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 85

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
- CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
- Difference: \$0

10. International Rescue Committee (IRC)

Program Name: IRC Housing Specialist and Financial Coach Position

Requested Funding: \$51,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: This funding would be used to fund a .5FTE staff position for a Housing Specialist and a .25FTE for a Financial Coach to serve clients the IRC is resettling in the Charlottesville community. These roles are key in performing multiple functions, including apartment search, landlord outreach, payment of client initial rent and security deposit,

furniture procurement, utilities set up, and client education on financial literacy. This all leads to the coordination and execution of moving clients to their first apartment. Over the past 26 years, there has always been a challenge in finding housing opportunities for our clients who come with no U.S. rental history, employment history, and no credit. The Housing Specialist is continually working on building new landlord relationships and maintaining existing ones, who waive or minimize these normal requirements. Over the past few years, the affordable housing market has become exponentially more challenging, making the roles of the Housing Specialist and Financial Coach that much more important.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 89

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
- CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
- Difference: \$0

11. Legal Aid Justice Center (LAJC)

Program Name: Legal Services to Prevent Evictions and Ensure Housing Stability

Requested Funding: \$100,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: Legal Services to Prevent Evictions and Ensure Housing Stability will provide free legal services, including tenancy rights information, service navigation, legal advice, and legal representation to low-income, elderly, and disabled residents in the City of Charlottesville. The program will provide a full range of services to eligible clients to prevent unlawful evictions and preserve safe and affordable housing. The goal of this program is to prevent homelessness through legal representation. This program aligns with Charlottesville's Affordable Housing Plan to "Design, fund, and implement a legal services program for residents facing eviction."

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 88

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
- CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
- Difference: \$0

12. PACEM

Program Name: PACEM Case Management

Requested Funding: \$100,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: A cornerstone of our success is housing-focused case management, equipping guests with the knowledge and support necessary to transition from our shelter to permanent, stable housing. The core of our approach lies in our capacity to collaborate with both secular and nonsecular organizations, forging partnerships that provide critical support to those most in need.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 95

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$50,000 (50%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$50,000 (50%)
 - Difference: \$0
-

13. Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)

Program Name: Charlottesville Affordable Housing Program

Requested Funding: \$185,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: Funding will support essential frontline staff who play a crucial role in directly engaging with and providing vital resources to Charlottesville’s most vulnerable and resilient low-income families. These efforts aim to stabilize household finances, improve overall quality of life, and strengthen the fabric of our community. We are deeply committed to approaching this work through a Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) lens, ensuring that equity and inclusivity are embedded in every aspect of our operations.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 95

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$92,500 (50%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$92,500 (50%)
 - Difference: \$0
-

14. Region Ten Community Services Board (Region Ten)

Program Name: Region Ten Homelessness Prevention

Requested Funding: \$20,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: The Region Ten Homelessness Prevention program would assist individuals with paying rent and/or utility arrear payments; damage mitigation, allowing for a second security deposit and damages that go beyond the scope of the typical security deposit funds; identification and DMV fees, which are often a barrier to applications; utility deposits; application fees for lease and other rental agreements; cleaning services; and cleaning supplies.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 87

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
 - CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$0 (0%)
 - Difference: \$0
-

15. The Haven at First & Market, Inc. (The Haven)

Program Name: Day Shelter Program

Requested Funding: \$110,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: While our Rapid Re-Housing and Homeless Prevention programs are federally funded, The Haven’s Day Shelter relies on private funding. Funding ensures that every single human being who enters the Day Shelter has access to the basic care and respite services to meet their daily human needs at no cost to themselves while also simply being able to exist in a safe, secure, climate-controlled, welcoming, and nonjudgmental space. As demand for The Haven’s Day Shelter services has increased, costs to provide those services have grown. We continue to experience near-record-high rates of inflation in a community with an already abnormally high cost of living; funding support will help ensure ongoing competitive compensation for the demands and performance expectations of the Day Shelter team, who engage every day and most closely with our community’s most vulnerable members.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 101

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$80,825 (73%)
- CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$80,825 (73%)
- Difference: \$0

16. The Haven at First & Market, Inc. (The Haven)

Program Name: Vital Housing Services

Requested Funding: \$150,000

Purpose of Requested Funding: Funding from HOPS for The Haven’s Vital Housing Services will be used to support the salaries of Housing Team staff, who administer financial support (rental subsidies, first month’s rent, etc.) and provide housing navigation and stabilization services for program beneficiaries with efficiency, compassion, and trauma-informed care. In order to operate our Vital Housing Services, The Haven also requests support for functions crucial to the operation of our Housing Services, such as: Coordinated Entry System operation and staff who ensure equitable access and enrollment into housing programs; Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) administration to ensure accurate data reporting; website administration to facilitate increased transparency regarding our Housing Department policies, procedures, and data; and/or IT support to address the hardware and software needs of our Housing Department, including telecommunications.

Committee Ranking/Scoring: 101

Funding Level Recommendation:

- Executive Team Funding Level: \$108,825 (72.6%)
- CAHF Committee Funding Level: \$108,825 (72.6%)
- Difference: \$0

End of Report

The city remains committed to expanding housing stability efforts and will continue working with stakeholders to strengthen support systems for Charlottesville residents.

- **Point of Contact:** Antoine Williams, Housing Program Manager, Office of Community Solutions, williamsan@charlottesville.gov (434) 970-3513