Performance Measure Report
(December 1, 2025 – May 31, 2026)

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1. OC 1	Percent of Households/Individuals Assisted	0.7600%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
1.1. OC 2	Percent of Very Low Income Households Receiving Housing Assistance	1.0200%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
1.1. OC 3	Percent of Low Income Households Receiving Housing Assistance	0.4700%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
1.1. OC 4	Percent of Moderate Income Households Receiving Housing Assistance	0.3900%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
1.1.1. OP 1	Number of Households Assisted through Bond Authority or Other Mortgage Financing	7,750	1,689	4,656	The number of households assisted through bond authority or other mortgage financing is lower than anticipated due to market volatility that has created severe affordability issues for even the most qualified home buyers. Additionally, low available home inventory during and after the COVID-19 pandemic drove sales prices higher, which have remained elevated. As demand for TDHCA homebuyer loans remains steady despite continued volatility in the secondary mortgage market, higher program income and purchase price limits will allow for additional loans in subsequent quarters. Market conditions suggest performance will remain steady for the foreseeable future.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.1. EF 1	Average Loan Amount without Down Payment Assistance	$250,000	$243,866	$246,924	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.1. EF 2	Average Loan Amount with Down Payment Assistance	$235,000	$247,661	$243,515	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.1. EX 1	Number of Households Receiving Mortgage Loans without Down Payment Assistance	850	91	350	The demeand for mortgage loans without down payment assistance (DPA) has experienced a signifcant year-over-year decrease due to challenging market conditions and continued volatility. Despite a decrease in utilization of loans without DPA, the Department will continue to offer an unassisted rate option to qualified applicants who may benefit from a below market interest rate. Staff expect the number of mortgage loans without DPA to remain stable but below expectations in future quarters.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.1. EX 2	Number of Households Receiving Mortgage Loans with Down Payment Assistance	6,365	1,504	4,173	TDHCA has experienced a notable increase in demand for mortgage loans that include down payment assistance (DPA), particularly due to the program's competitive and below-market interest rates and a volatile housing market characterized by high interest rates and elevated home prices. However, stricter underwriting requirements have made it more challenging for some borrowers to qualify for TDHCA loan programs. Combined with declining housing affordability in higher-cost markets, these factors have contributed to lower overall production. Upcoming adjustments to program guidelines are expected to expand access and increase the number of households receiving assistance, with these improvements reflected in future reporting periods.
1.1.1. EX 3	Number of Households Receiving a Mortgage Credit Certificate without a Mortgage Loan	10	6	6	The number of MCCs issued by TDHCA is below expectation due to the absence of program funding to provide for MCCs. However, MCC Stand-Alone Program funding became available in Q2 and staff anticipate an increase in the number of MCCs in Q4.
1.1.1. EX 4	Number of Households Receiving a Mortgage Credit Certificate with a Mortgage Loan and with or without Down Payment Assistance	25	88	127	FY26 performance has far surpassed expectations due to a recent reprioritization of MCC Combo loans and a continuance in the funding for the MCC Combo Program. Staff anticipate the overperformance of the MCC Combo Program to continue in Q4.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.2. OP 1	Number of Households Assisted with Single Family HOME Funds	1,435	214	1,723	The number of HHs assisted with SF HOME funds in Q3 closely aligns with quarterly estimates. The year-to-date overperformance is largely attributable to the methodology of calculating the number of households assisted with Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA). Staff anticipate that Q4 performance will be similar to Q2 and Q3 performance and that the performance variance for the entire fiscal year will trend closer to expectation.
1.1.2. OP 2	Number of Households Assisted with Multifamily HOME, TCAP RF, National HTF, MF Direct Loans	200	51	255	The number of households assisted through HOME MF, TCAP RF, NHTF, and MF Direct Loan funds in Q3 is consistent with staff's expectations for quarterly performance. Year-to-date, the number of households assisted well exceeds staff's target due to construction delays that resulted in developments requesting extensions in prior fiscal years for which the final draws were subsequently submitted in Q1 of the current fiscal year.
1.1.2. EF 1	Average Amount per Household for Single Family Development	$0	$0	$0	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.2. EF 2	Average Amount per Household/Single Family Rehab, New Construction, or Reconstruction	$156,000	$164,929	$161,780	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.2. EF 3	Average Amount per Household for Acquisition with or without Construction	$0	$0	$0	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.2. EF 4	Average Amount per Household of Tenant-based Rental Assistance	$4,500	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.2. EF 5	Average Amount of HOME, TCAP RF, National HTF, or Other Funds per Household Multifamily Development	$175,439	$156,863	$139,159	The average HOME, TCAP RF, NHTF, and other funds per restricted unit is lower than expected due to only two developments submitting their final draw this quarter. The two developments that submitted their final draw were smaller than anticipated. Staff anticipate the average cost per development to be highter in Q4 due to our NHTF expenditure deadline. Looking ahead to FY27, staff believe that we may continue to see final draws much lower than anticipated due to increased minimum request amounts associated with recent NOFOs.
1.1.2. EX 1	Number of Households Assisted through Single Family Development Activities	0	0	0	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.2. EX 2	Number of Households Assisted through Single Family Rehab, New Construction, or Reconstruction	123	26	67	The number of HHs served through SF rehabilitation, new construction, and reconstruction programs were lower than expected in Q1 through Q3 due to a 2024 rule change that increased the allowable per project funding. Staff anticipate the increase in project submissions in Q3 to continue in Q4.
1.1.2. EX 3	Number of Households Assisted through Acquisition with or without Construct Assistance	0	0	0	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.2. EX 4	Number of Households Assisted through Tenant-based Rental Assistance	1,311	188	1,656	The number of HHs assisted through the TBRA program in Q3 closely aligns with quarterly estimates. The year-to-date variance is due to the methodology of calculating Q1 performance wherein all households enrolled as of September 1 are combined with HHs newly enrolled in the program in Q1. Although more HHs have applied for assistance than anticipated when program performance targets were estalished, staff anticipate Q4 performance similar to Q2 and Q3 and the performance variance for the entire fiscal year to trend closer to expectation.
1.1.2. EX 5	Number of Households Assisted through HOME Multifamily Activities	69	21	126	The number of households assisted through HOME MF activities in Q3 is higher than anticipated due to developers' delayed submission of final draws for developments supported through the HOME program. However, the number of households assisted through HOME MF activity in Q3 is fairly consistent with staff's estimated quarterly output, which staff believe will also be the case in Q4. Year-to-date, three HOME developments submitted their final draws in Q1, well before staff anticipated, pushing year-to-date peformance well above expectation.
1.1.2. EX 6	Number of Households Assisted through TCAP RF, National HTF, and MF Direct Loan Activities	108	30	129	The number of households assisted through TCAP RF, NHTF, and MF Direct Loan acitivites in Q3 is lower than expected due to construction delays that require developers to request extensions. A variety of environmental factors may contribute to the need to request an extension including, but not limited to, workforce shortages, regulatory delays, and delays associated with project financing. However, staff anticipate an increase in NHTF final draw submissions in Q4 at the approach of our NHTF expenditure deadline.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.3. OP 1	Number of Households Assisted through Texas Bootstrap - HTF	40	13	38	The number of households assisted through the Bootstrap program was higher than anticipated due to an increase in funding greater than anticipated when program targets were established which allowed TDHCA to assist more HHs than previously estimated. 46% of the Q3 activities are from previous NOFAs, likely due to construction or reimbursement request delays. Deobligated funds and repayments are also included in NOFA amendments, allowing for the assistance of more HHs. Program staff anticipate Q4 performance to remain consistent with Q2 and Q3 performance.
1.1.3. EF 1	Average Amount per Household for Texas Bootstrap - HTF	$49,500	$49,500	$49,500	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.4. OP 1	Number of Households Assisted through Amy Young Barrier Removal - HTF	72	15	57	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.4. EF 1	Average Amount per Household for Amy Young Barrier Removal - HTF	$24,750	$19,854	$21,938	The average amount of funding per household that received assistance through the Amy Young Barrier Removal program was lower than anticipated due to a lower reimbursement request on five (33%) program activities. Program staff expect Q4 performance to more closely align with quarterly performance expectations.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.5. OP 1	Number of Households Assisted through Statewide Housing Assistance Payments Program	1,220	4	1,368	The number of households assisted through housing assistance payment programs is higher than anticipated due to the early termination of the Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) program. Program staff established the measure target under the assumption that the EHV program funding would continue to the extent that the majority of EHV voucher holders would move from the Department's service area to that of another Public Housing Authority (PHA). An earlier-than-anticipated termination of EHV program funding precluded this attrition of vouchers to other PHAs,contributing to significant overperformance in Q1. Q2 and Q3 performance is consistent with historical performance.
1.1.5. OP 2	Number of Section 8 Households Participating in Project Access Program	85	4	66	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.5. EF 1	Average Administrative Cost per Household for Housing Choice Voucher Program	$1,435	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
1.1.6. OP 1	Number of Households Assisted through Section 811 PRA Program	575	28	670	The number of HHs served through the Section 811 program in Q1 is always expected to include more than 25% of the FY target projection due to the methodology and calculation of this measure. The number of households served in Q1 exceeds the anticipated total for the entire fiscal year, in part, because the agency has begun providing assistance under the FY19 award, assistance that was not considered when developing the target for FY26 due to staff uncertainty about when this assistance would be available. The number of HHs served in Q2 and Q3 more closely aligns with the number of HHs we anticipate supporting in Q2 through Q4.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.7. OP 1	Number of Units Funded through the Housing Tax Credit Program	15,881	7,719	15,919	The number of restricted units placed in service was higher than anticipated in Q3 due to the deadline for submission of 4% Tax Credit development cost certifications that occurred in Q3. The number of restricted units for Q4 is expected to decrease. However, because some developments that experienced construction delays may finalize construction in Q4, the number of restricted units placed in service for the entire fiscal year will still be higher than originally projected. The annual performance target for this measure was exceeded with Q3 activity.
1.1.7. EF 1	Average Annual Tax Credit Amount per Restricted Unit for New Construction	$12,229	$13,625	$14,485	The average tax credit amount per restricted unit for new construction projects was higher than anticipated due a large number of 4% HTC developments requesting increases to the originally awarded tax credit amount, primarily due to increased construction and material costs. Additionally, as approved by the Board for the 2022 and 2023 QAPs, several 9% HTC developments received Supplemental Credits. Because construction costs continue to increase, the average tax credit amount per unit is expected to remain elevated through Q4 of 2026.
1.1.7. EF 2	Average Total Development Cost per Unit for New Construction	$257,512	$274,332	$278,462	The average total development cost per unit for New Construction was higher than anticipated due to increasing construction costs for most tax credits developments from the estimates included in developer applications. Although the average development cost per unit for Q3 decreased slightly from Q2, construction costs continue to increase and the average total development cost per unit for New Construction is expected to remain elevated through Q4 of 2026.
1.1.7. EF 3	Average Annual Tax Credit Amount per Restricted Unit for Acquisition Rehabilitation	$11,132	$11,110	$11,262	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.7. EF 4	Average Total Development Costs per Unit for Acquisition Rehabilitation	$254,839	$294,146	$280,536	The average total development cost per unit for Acquisition/Rehab was higher than anticipated due to increasing construction costs for most tax credits developments from the estimates included in developer applications. The average development cost per unit in Q3 increased slightly from Q2 and since construction costs continue to increase, the average total development cost per unit for Acquisition/Rehab is expected to remain elevated through Q4 of 2026.
1.1.7. EX 1	Number of Restricted Units Constructed via New Construction Activities	8,417	4,525	10,156	The number of restricted New Construction units was higher than anticipated in Q3 due to the deadline for submission of the 4% Tax Credit developments occurring in Q3. Fewer restricted New Construction units are expected for Quarter 4. However, because some developments that experienced construction delays may soon finalize construction, the number of restricted New Construction units for the fiscal year will still be higher than originally projected. The 2026 annual target has already exceeded with Q3 activity.
1.1.7. EX 2	Number of Restricted Units Funded through Acquisition Rehabilitation Activities	7,464	3,194	5,763	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
1.1.8. OP 1	Number of Restricted Units Funded with Multifamily MRB Program	1,382	564	1,837	The number of restricted units funded through the MRB program was higher than anticipated in Q3 due to the earlier than anticipated receipt of cost certifications for multiple properties. Since the 2026 annual target was exceeded with Q3 activity, and with the expectation that additional cost certifications will be received in Q4, the number of restricted units funded through the MRB program will remain above expectation for the remainder of 2026.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.8. EF 1	Average Amount of Bond Proceeds per Restricted Unit for New Construction	$142,929	$177,305	$152,255	The average bond proceeds per restricted unit for Acquisition/Rehabilitation projects was higher than anticipated in Q3 due to the submission of two cost certifications with a high amount of Bond Proceeds per restricted unit. With the expectation that additional cost certifications will be received in Q4, staff anticipate that the average amount of bond proceeds per new construction unit will remain elevated through the remainder of 2026.
1.1.8. EF 2	Average Total Development Costs per Unit for New Construction	$258,859	$308,716	$277,973	The average total development cost per unit for New Construction was higher than anticipated in Q3 due to increasing construction costs for most tax credits developments from the estimates included in developer applications. As construction costs continue to increase, staff anticipate that the average total development cost per unit for New Construction to remain elevated through the remainder of 2026.
1.1.8. EF 3	Average Amount of Bond Proceeds per Restricted Unit for Acquisition Rehabilitation	$117,600	$0	$133,838	No Acquisition/Rehabilitation units through the MRB program were reported in Q3. The average bond proceeds per restricted unit for acquisition/rehabilitation projects remains higher than anticipated due to the submission of one cost certification in Q2 with a high amount of Bond Proceeds per restricted unit. With the expectation that additional cost certifications will be received in Q4, the average is anticipated to remain elevated through the remainder of 2026.
1.1.8. EF 4	Average Total Development Costs per Unit for Acquisition Rehabilitation	$275,967	$0	$265,693	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
1.1.8. EX 1	Number of Restricted Units Funded through New Construction Activities	950	564	1,441	The number of restricted New Construction units funded through the MRB program was higher than anticipated in Q3 due to the earlier than anticipated receipt of cost certifications for multiple properties. Since the 2026 annual target has already beend exceeded with Q3 activity, and with the expectation that additional cost certifications will be received in Quarter 4, the number of New Construction restricted units funded through the MRB program will remain above expectation for the remainder of 2026.
1.1.8. EX 2	Number of Restricted Units Funded through Acquisition Rehabilitation Activities	432	0	396	No restricted Acquisition/Rehabilitation units were reported through the MRB program in Q3. However, due to the higher than anticipated receipt of cost certifications for multiple properties in Quarters 1 and 2, and because the number of MRB-funded restricted Acquisition/Rehabilitation units is approaching the estimate for the entire year and additional cost certifications are expected to be received in Quarter 4, the number of restricted Acquisition/Rehabilitation units funded through the MRB program is likely to remain above expectation for the remainder of 2026.
2.1.1. OP 1	Number of Information and Technical Assistance Requests Completed	7,750	2,486	7,212	The number of completed information and technical assistance requests was higher than anticipated due to an increase of utility requests. Staff believe the increase in utility requests is associated with higher temperatures across the state that have driven up utility bills to a point that households are not able to afford. HRC also received a large number of requests for property tax payment assistance in response to the discontinuation of the Homeowners Assistance Fund (HAF) program.
3.1. OC 1	Percent of Eligible Population that Received Homeless & Poverty-Related Assistance	3.5000%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
3.1. OC 2	Percent of Persons Assisted that Achieve Incomes Above Poverty Level	0.0200%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
3.1.1. OP 1	Number of Persons Assisted that Achieve Incomes Above Poverty Level	650	111	577	The number of persons that achieved incomes above poverty is higher than expected due to growing effectiveness of subrecipients in program administration as well as the cumulative impact of sustained assistance. Despite a small dip in production in Q3 compared to previous quarters, year-to-date production is still well above target.
3.1.1. OP 2	Number of Persons Assisted by the Community Services Block Grant Program	330,000	82,294	233,612	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
3.1.1. EF 1	Average Subrecipient Cost per Person for the CSBG Program	$110	$113	$118	The average subrecipient cost per person in Q3 is higher than anticipated due to the decrease in the number of persons served during the quarter. When program activity decreases and less individuals receive services, total expenditures including administrative expense are distributed across a smaller client base, resulting in a higher average cost per person.
3.1.1. EX 1	Number Persons in Poverty Meeting Income Eligibility	9,500,000	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
3.1.2. OP 1	Number of Persons Enrolled in the Emergency Solutions Grant Program	33,500	4,448	16,060	The number of individuals assisted through the ESG program is lower than anticipated likely due to delinquent reporting. Any underreporting in Q3 will be captured in performance adjustments made during the annual reporting at year end.
3.1.2. OP 2	Number of Persons Assisted by the Homeless Housing and Services Program	6,900	1,968	4,032	The number of individuals assisted through the HHSP program is lower than anticipated likely due to delinquent reporting. Any underreporting in Q3 will be captured in performance adjustments made in the annual reporting process at year end.
3.1.2. EF 1	Average Subrecipient Cost per Person for the Emergency Solutions Grant Program	$455	$498	$414	The average subrecipient cost per ESG program participant may be lower than anticipated due to the provision of lower cost services such as Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter. Subrecipients often prefer to administer these lower cost programs because they can be implemented immediately, rather than having to wait for the client to enter into a lease agreement prior to the receipt of assistance as is required by higher cost programs.
3.1.2. EF 2	Average Subrecipient Cost per Person for the HHSP and EHF Program	$575	$505	$584	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
3.2. OC 1	Percent of Very Low Income Households Receiving Energy Assistance	2.8000%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
3.2.1. OP 1	Number of Households Receiving Utility Assistance	150,000	44,936	87,195	The number of households assisted is lower than anticipated due to cyclical variation in program demand. During the winter months with milder temperaturesprogram demand is lower, as captured in the Q1 and Q2 figures. Conversely, program demand is higher during the summer when high temps force households to rely more heavily on air conditioning. Consequently, program output is highest in Q3 and Q4, which staff believe will make up for the limited program demand in Q1 and Q2.
3.2.1. OP 2	Number of Dwelling Units Weatherized by the Department	2,000	1,001	2,427	The number of dwelling units weatherized in Q3 is well above target due to cyclical variations in weather that provide ideal conditions for weatherization projects in March through May. Paired with strong quarterly production in Q1 associated with the ramp up in activity at the beginning of each contract year, year-to-date performance is well above expectation. Staff anticipate Q4 production will decline, but total output in FY26 will remain above the established target.
3.2.1. EF 1	Average Subrecipient Cost per Household Served for Utility Assistance	$1,000	$1,295	$1,318	The average subrecipient cost per household is higher than anticipated due to a reduction in the number of households served. When program activity decreases and less individuals receive services, total expenditures including administrative expense are distributed across a smaller client base, resulting in a higher average cost per person. However, the number of households assisted increased signficantly in Q3 and staff believe the number of households in Q4 will remain elevated, which may result in a decrease in the average subrecipient cost per household.
3.2.1. EF 2	Average Cost per Home Weatherized	$8,600	$7,852	$7,936	The average cost per home weatherized is lower than anticipated due to more households seeking weatherization assistance. In instances when the amount of program funding is fixed, the average amount per households will be lower than the target if more households request assistance than was anticipated when the target was established. Quarter-over-quarter, the average cost per home decreased due to an increase in production volume, more standard work scopes, and improved operational efficiency across subrecipients.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
3.2.1. EX 1	Number of Very Low Income Households Eligible for Utility Assistance	5,500,000	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
3.3.1. OP 1	Number of Colonia Residents Receiving Direct Assistance from Self-help Centers	1,280	677	1,738	The number of colonia residents served through Colonia Self-Help Centers (CSHCs) was higher than anticipated as a result of an aggressive tool lending campaign conducted by three CSHCs (Maverick, Val Verde, and Webb contracts). Hidalgo confirmed their submission, citing that they are aggressively catching up on tool lending reporting after staff technical assistance and guidance. 50% of the current contracts are in the construction/closeout phase of their contracts, resulting in higher than average construction activity.
4.1. OC 1	Percent of Formula-Funded Receiving Onsite Monitoring	56.6000%	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
4.1.1. OP 1	Number of Annual Owners Compliance Reports Received and Reviewed	2,831	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
4.1.1. OP 2	Number of File Reviews	727	189	568	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
4.1.1. OP 3	Number of Physical Inspections	679	283	887	The number of physical inspections completed in Q3 was higher than anticipated due to staff conducting property inspections scheduled for Q4 in Q3 in conjunction with the productivity gains associated with the addition of a new full-time position to the Physical Inspections Unit.
4.1.1. EX 1	Number of Active Properties in the Portfolio	2,831	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
4.1.1. EX 2	Number of Active Units in the Portfolio	347,585	-	-	Measure performance reported in Q4.
4.1.2. OP 1	Number of Monitoring Reviews of All Non-formula Contracts	150	33	112	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
4.1.2. OP 2	Number of Single Audit Reviews	105	14	274	The number of completed single audit reviews was higher than anticipated due to changes in audit criteria by the United States Office of Management and Budget, creating an influx of single audit reviews to be performed. The unusually high quarterly variances are the result of increased staff training, experience, and focus, in conjunciton with updated processes used to clear the backlog of single audit reviews. Along with clearing the backlog, audit reviews for quarters 2 and 3 where subrecipients had submitted their single audit were performed. Both of these circumstances has led to program performance far exceeding expectations.
4.1.2. OP 3	Number of Formula-Funded Subrecipients Receiving Monitoring Reviews	32	9	24	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.

Measure	Description	Annual Target	Q3 Performance	FY26 To Date Performance	Provided Explanations
4.1.2. EX 1	Number of Non-formula Contracts Subject to Monitoring	330	330	330	Actual performance within acceptable range of projected performance. No explanation of variance required.
4.1.2. EX 2	Number of Previous Participation Reviews	550	169	341	The number of previous participation reviews completed in Q2 was lower than estimated due to the cyclical nature of program funding. However, the number of reviews completed in Q3 has partially compensated for the Q2 shortfall, which staff believe will be fully remedied in Q4.
4.1.2. EX 3	Number of Formula-Funded Subrecipients	53	9	24	The number of formula funded subrecipients is lower than anticipated due to a methodological change in the measure. Previously, the measure used quarterly production which was subsequently switched to the total number of subrecipents. A reduction in the number of CA/HHSP subrecipients has resulted in a reduction in the number of CA/HHSP subrecipients for which TDHCA must provide onsite monitoring.