

Genesee County Consolidated Plan 2015 - 2019

# Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)

---

Program Year 2017

May 1, 2017 – April 30, 2018



**CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes**

**Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)**

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

During PY 2017, Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission (GCMPC) assisted local communities in completing 30 projects and worked on an additional 23 projects using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program funds. Project highlights include: infrastructure improvements including replacing water mains, sidewalk and street improvements, senior center improvements, demolitions, public service projects, including senior center and youth program operations, and rehabilitation of occupied single-family housing. In PY 2017, local communities demolished 2 single-family structures and worked on pre-demolition activities for four additional structures. Nine communities used their public service funds to assist with senior center operations in order to improve the services for seniors in Genesee County. Twenty owner-occupied single-family residential units were rehabilitated utilizing CDBG funds during PY 2017.

In PY 2017, HOME funds were used to assist thirteen senior citizens with home repairs. In addition, Habitat for Humanity completed four new construction homes sold to low-income families.

**Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)**

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee’s program year goals.

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Address the Needs of Homeless and At-Risk Persons	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOME: \$48000 / ESG: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	0	9		35	9	25.71%

Address the Needs of Homeless and At-Risk Persons	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOME: \$48000 / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	65	1451	2,232.31%	75	1451	1,934.67%
Address the Needs of Homeless and At-Risk Persons	Affordable Housing Homeless	HOME: \$48000 / ESG: \$	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	250	98	39.20%	150	98	65.33%
Expand Employment Opportunities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	60	12	20.00%			
Expand Employment Opportunities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	6	0	0.00%			
Improve Housing Conditions for Homeowners/Renters	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	1801		0	824	
Improve Housing Conditions for Homeowners/Renters	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	0	6		0	6	

Improve Housing Conditions for Homeowners/Renters	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	150	135	90.00%	40	37	92.50%
Improve Housing Conditions for Homeowners/Renters	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	0	9		0	9	
Improve Housing Conditions for Homeowners/Renters	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Buildings Demolished	Buildings	30	5	16.67%	13	0	0.00%
Improve Housing Conditions for Homeowners/Renters	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Housing Code Enforcement/Foreclosed Property Care	Household Housing Unit	2500	2245	89.80%			
Improve Public Facilities and Infrastructure	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	25000	22105	88.42%	10000	13082	130.82%

Improve Public Facilities and Infrastructure	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	0		0	1042	
Improve Public Facilities and Infrastructure	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Buildings Demolished	Buildings	0	5		0	5	
Increase Homeownership	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	10	6	60.00%			
Increase Homeownership	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	20	0	0.00%			
Promote Access to Public Services and Resources	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	0		9115	7006	76.86%
Promote Access to Public Services and Resources	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	30000	28854	96.18%	0	2285	

Promote Access to Public Services and Resources	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Housing Code Enforcement/Foreclosed Property Care	Household Housing Unit	0	0		0	20	
---	--	----------	---	------------------------	---	---	--	---	----	--

**Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date**

**Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.**

In GCMPC's Consolidated Plan (ConPlan), staff outlined priorities and objectives to meet the three basic goal areas (Decent Housing, Suitable Living Environment and Economic Opportunities) set forth by HUD's Community Planning and Development formula grants. During the ConPlan process, the community indicated that each of the statutory goal areas are equally important.

Decent Housing - Decent housing activities ensure decent, safe and sanitary housing, opportunities for homeownership, affordable rents and a range of housing choices and also includes preventing homelessness and ending chronic homelessness. The table below illustrates the primary goals included in the ConPlan under Decent Housing, and the activities and priority level.

In order to increase homeownership, Genesee County Habitat for Humanity (GCHFH) utilizes HOME funds to build homes for sale to qualified homebuyers. During PY 2017 four homes were completed and included accessibility features. GCMPC also provides funding to the Metro Community Development Corporation to provide TBRA services to qualified applicants. In PY 2017, funds were utilized to assist 9 households which included nine adults and five children.

In an effort to improve housing conditions, CDBG and HOME funds were set-aside for the Home Improvement Program (HIP) which assists homeowners with necessary housing repairs. During PY 2017 staff assisted 29 homes. Three jurisdictions utilized CDBG monies for salaries related to code enforcement in low- to moderate-income areas.

GCMPC works with Metro Community Development (MCD) and the Continuum of Care (CoC) to address the needs of homeless and at-risk persons through the CoC. During PY 2017, \$138,161 was utilized to assist 1,555 people with ESG funds, 663 were children. GCMPC provides funding to the Fair Housing Center of Eastern Michigan (FHC) to ensure residents can choose where they would like to live.

Suitable Living Environment - A suitable living environment is exemplified by a neighborhood with a healthy real estate market, attractive public amenities, a sense of safety and security and where residents are involved in neighborhood concerns. The table below illustrates the primary goals included in the ConPlan under Suitable Living Environment, and the activities and priority level. In an effort to promote access to public services and resources many communities chose to utilize their public service funds on their local senior centers. Many paid for a portion of staff salaries (\$23,342), funded operational expenses (\$26,124) or assisted with transportation costs (\$10,482). Flint Township purchased food and supplies (\$10,969) for the

senior food pantry.

Economic Opportunity - The goal of economic opportunities is to build economic power within the neighborhood by supporting the development of small businesses and assisting people with getting and keeping quality jobs. The table below illustrates the primary goals included in the ConPlan under Economic Opportunities, and the activities and priority level. In the IDIS Table 1 above there should be an ESG funding source for the homeless categories (rows 1,2,3). The "expected" amount relates to the five year goals, however, we are only reporting one year accomplishments. This seems to cause a disparity in the measures of effectiveness and HOME funds are not utilized for these measures, but the field is pre-populated with no ability to change it to ESG.

Decent Housing	
OUTCOME: Increase Homeownership	
High Priority	Activity: Housing Rehabilitation
High Priority	Activity: Energy Efficiency Improvements to Housing
High Priority	Activity: Accessibility/Barrier Free Improvements
Low Priority	Activity: Down Payment Assistance
Low Priority	Activity: Fair Housing
Low Priority	Activity: Production of New Units
OUTCOME: Improve Housing Conditions for Homeowners/Renters	
High Priority	Activity: Housing Rehabilitation
High Priority	Activity: Energy Efficiency Improvements to Housing
High Priority	Activity: Accessibility/Barrier Free Improvements
Low Priority	Activity: Code Enforcement
Low Priority	Activity: Demolition, Clearance and Remediation
OUTCOME: Address the Needs of Homeless and At-Risk Persons	
High Priority	Activity: Emergency Shelters
High Priority	Activity: Accessibility/Barrier Free Improvements
Low Priority	Activity: Public Facilities and Services
Low Priority	Activity: Permanent Supportive Housing
Low Priority	Activity: Supportive Services



Low Priority	Activity: Production of New Units
Low Priority	Activity: Fair Housing

**Table 1**

Suitable Living Environment	
OUTCOME: Improve Public Facilities and Infrastructure	
High Priority	Activity: Street, Sidewalk and Water/Sewer Improvements
High Priority	Activity: Accessibility/Barrier Free Improvements
Low Priority	Activity: Public Facilities and Services
Low Priority	Activity: Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities
OUTCOME: Promote Access to Public Services and Resources	
Low Priority	Activity: Public Facilities and Services
Low Priority	Activity: Supportive Services

Economic Opportunities	
OUTCOME: Expand Employment Opportunities	
High Priority	Activity: Economic Development
Low Priority	Activity: Public Facilities and Services
OUTCOME: Promote Access to Public Services and Resources	
Low Priority	Activity: Public Facilities and Services
Low Priority	Activity: Fair Housing

**Table 2**

**CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted**

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted).

91.520(a)

	<b>CDBG</b>	<b>HOME</b>	<b>ESG</b>
White	30,808	39	303
Black or African American	2,244	21	1,103
Asian	394	0	2
American Indian or American Native	121	0	4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	12	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>33,579</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>1,415</b>
Hispanic	110	0	37
Not Hispanic	33,469	60	1,378

**Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds**

**Narrative**

Of the 35,054 individuals assisted with any funding source during PY 2017, 89% are white. Over 91% of people assisted with CDBG funds and 65% of those assisted with HOME funds are white. However, when looking strictly at ESG funds, the majority of individuals assisted (78%) are black. Just 00.4% of assisted individuals are Hispanic of any race. 100% of households assisted with TBRA funds are black.

The County’s total population as of the 2010 Census indicates that 74.5% of the population is white, 20.7% black or African American and 3% Hispanic of any race. The numbers of assisted individuals should be close to the percentages of the County’s total population.

## CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

### Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	CDBG	1,727,746	1,942,805
HOME	HOME	711,518	719,137
HOPWA	HOPWA		
ESG	ESG	154,500	138,161
Other	Other		

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

### Narrative

GCMPC receives all Community Development Program funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The resources made available amount for each Program includes PY 2017 funding, as well as any remaining funding in open contracts from previous program years. The amount expended was adjusted to reflect information provided in the PR23 reports for CDBG and HOME.

### Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

### Narrative

Genesee County does not have target areas for Community Development projects. GCMPC distributes funds to the 29 participating local units of government on a rotating basis and projects are completed in each of these communities.

## Leveraging

**Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.**

An important aspect of funding Genesee County Community Development Program activities is the ability to leverage funds above and beyond those received from the Federal Government. Leveraged funds provide not only critically needed monetary supplements to projects, but also meet the local match requirements of many federal programs.

The HOME Program requires each funded activity to provide a minimum of 25% non-federal match. Due to this requirement, between 1992 and June 2005, GCMPC successfully leveraged a surplus of HOME Program match funds. HOME funds were used to leverage match from sources such as: donations of land; contributions of materials and services; waivers of local taxes for housing construction and rehabilitation; and, case donations from participating financial lending institutions. Since June 2005, Genesee County has adopted a formal policy waiving HOME match monies previously required from project awardees from all approved HOME activities. The 25% match requirement is provided for all HOME activities by Genesee County from the surplus match generated prior to June 2005.

While no longer required, HOME Program funds continue to leverage match funds from donated land, in-kind donations, other federal funding sources such as the Self-help Homeownership Opportunity Program (SHOP) and fundraising efforts by Community Development Housing Organizations (CHDOs). In PY 2017 Habitat for Humanity leveraged \$175,946, the majority of these funds were leveraged through local fundraising efforts, labor, and materials.

The CDBG Program leveraged funds associated with PY 2017. Leveraged resources include: in-kind contributions, Genesee County Senior Millage revenues, general funds provided by the local units of government and donations of local staff time. The State of Michigan Drinking Water Revolving Trust Fund has also been utilized by communities to assist projects that require more funds than are available from any one source.

The ESG Program leveraged funds with PY 2017 monies and a 100% match is a requirement of ESG funding. Leveraged resources included: in-kind contributions, general funds provided by the agencies and grants from local charitable organizations, such as, the United Way, Department of Human Services, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

<b>Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match</b>	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	5,724,996
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	175,946
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	5,900,942
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	119,753
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	5,781,189

**Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report**

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
Habitat for Humanity	07/01/2017	165,946	0	0	0	10,000	0	175,946

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

**HOME MBE/WBE report**

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at begin-ning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
22,130	211,889	5,778	16,854	228,241

Table 7 – Program Income

<b>Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period</b>						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
<b>Contracts</b>						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-Contracts</b>						
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
<b>Contracts</b>						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			
Number	0	0	0			
<b>Sub-Contracts</b>						
Number	0	0	0			
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			

**Table 8 - Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises**

<b>Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted</b>						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property**

<b>Relocation and Real Property Acquisition</b> – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		0		0		
Businesses Displaced		0		0		
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0		0		
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0		0		
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition**



## CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	3,135	0
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	3,500	9
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	2,500	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,135</b>	<b>9</b>

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	25	9
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	5	6
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	40	29
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	6	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>44</b>

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

**Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.**

More realistic goals would have been five affordable housing units provided to homeless households; Twenty affordable housing units provided to non-homeless households; and, five affordable housing units to special-needs households. The numbers provided above were based on the thought that all households that may benefit from HUD grants would be included, not only those that were provided an affordable housing unit.

The Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) that are awarded HOME funds changes from year to year, and different CHDOs have different housing goals. In the past we have worked with organizations that provide housing to homeless seniors and/or special-needs households, but during the past year, no organizations doing those activities were funded and therefore no units were provided to homeless or special-needs households. The goal of twenty affordable units for non-homeless households also relies primarily on CHDOs and the HOME funded TBRA Program. During the year, nine households were provided TBRA assistance and four households purchased Habitat for Humanity homes.

GCMPC had ambitious goals in PY 2017. Staff utilize numbers from past performance to inform the one-year goals, but we increased the numbers slightly in order to push staff to work toward higher goals for specific activities. The goals are also affected by which CHDOs apply for, and are awarded, HOME Program funds.

**Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.**

GCMPC staff estimates the number of units to be provided, and to whom, in the annual action plan. Staff will continue to base future goals off of the needs of previous years, previous funding and the fluctuations in both.

**Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.**

<b>Number of Households Served</b>	<b>CDBG Actual</b>	<b>HOME Actual</b>
Extremely Low-income	11	10
Low-income	2	1
Moderate-income	3	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>

**Table 13 – Number of Households Served**

**Narrative Information**

In PY 2017, CDBG funds assisted 16 households, which served 34 people, with activities that required income to be determined. These 34 people were assisted through the Genesee County Home Improvement Program (HIP).

In PY 2017, HOME Program funds assisted 26 households with activities that require income to be determined. They were assisted through HOME HIP, TBRA and HOME new construction funds.

## **CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c)**

**Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:**

### **Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs**

The One Stop Housing Resource Center strives to eliminate barriers for those served by providing services that meet the needs for the individual and family and enhances the community safety-net by placing service providers in one, easily accessible location. In addition to housing referrals, One Stop offers referrals for basic needs (food, clothing, personal care items, etc.), emergency services (bus passes, motel stays), screenings and inspections, Housing Choice Voucher program assessments, utility payments, security deposits and first month of rent payments, access to a permanent mailing address and access to an array of supportive services.

Staff at local ESG subrecipient agencies are especially skilled at engaging homeless persons and making appropriate referrals through their assessment abilities and excellent working relationships with other service providers. Many organizations in the community work together to identify and assist in homeless verification, assessment of needs and linkage to appropriate resources based on those needs.

### **Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons**

ESG funded agencies provide essential services to address individuals with both emergency and transitional housing needs. The programs are specifically designed to ensure the safety and well-being of both residential and non-residential individuals. Individual, family and group counseling as well as crisis intervention, life skills, education and employment assistance and family reunification are key components for those in need of the services. Many agencies have a long history in the community which has allowed them to establish excellent working relationships with other service providers and allows for cooperative service linkages with little delay or waiting periods.

A typical individual or family stays at a shelter for 30 to 90 days. Many of the agencies work with clients to resolve the issues that brought about their homelessness and develop a long-range plan toward permanent stability. The comprehensive approach used is intended to connect families to community resources and work on solving the root cause of their homelessness, with the end result being every client obtaining permanent housing.

**Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing,**

## **health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs**

The One Stop Housing Resource Center offers space for community partners to provide specialized services including the following: BECKA Management (housing agent for Housing Choice Voucher Program), Department of Veteran's Affairs, Hamilton Health Clinic, Genesee Health System, Genesee Health Plan, Genesee Health Plan Bi-Lingual Services, Disability Network, YWCA and Shelter of Flint's Permanent Supportive Housing program.

GCCARD administers several programs that assist low-income clients, some of which help people avoid becoming homeless such as: assistance with utility bills; funds for deliverable fuels (propane, fuel oil, etc.); water shutoff assistance; rent and mortgage assistance; help enroll families in health care plans; installation of energy saving measures in low-income clients' homes, which allows them to pay for other emergency items like health care and transportation; funding for energy efficient appliances; emergency home repair program; regular food assistance for those 60 and over; and, emergency food program.

**Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again**

Shelter of Flint's Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Program includes initiatives for chronically homeless families as well as veterans. Shelter of Flint maintains a PSH Registry that holds a record of all their Emergency Shelter clients and their SPDAT score, as well as the same information for clients of other shelters that are referred. This registry allows the case managers to access this information efficiently in order to move clients from homelessness to permanent housing. For clients that are not eligible for permanent supportive housing, Shelter of Flint's Housing Resource Specialist for the HCS program assists them in applying for a voucher.

GCCARD assists clients with security deposits and first month's rent which helps to overcome the initial cost barrier many homeless individuals or families may face. GCCARD also administers a program through HUD called the Samaritan Plus Program which involves tracking and overseeing clients with disabilities. These clients would likely be homeless without the rental assistance and oversight that they attend doctor appointments.

## **CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)**

### **Actions taken to address the needs of public housing**

All Public Housing activities in Genesee County are administered by the Flint Housing Commission. The Flint Housing Commission manages each of the public housing units that are located entirely within the City of Flint municipal boundaries.

### **Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership**

NA

### **Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs**

NA

## **CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)**

**Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)**

Community resistance is one of the barriers to affordable housing and staff works regularly to inform and educate local officials of the need for safe, sanitary and affordable housing in their community by providing data that illustrates the number and percentage of residents in their community that could be in need of housing assistance.

While Michigan is a “home rule” state, which means individual communities make their own decisions on policies at the local level, such as zoning ordinances and housing policies, GCMPC staff reviews new master plans and master plan updates, as well as new zoning ordinances and proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance. This provides GCMPC with an opportunity to check that the proposed changes will not create additional barriers to affordable housing.

Due to “home rule”, the County has no legal standing to alter decisions made by the local units of government. GCMPC will continue to show communities the need for, and value of, access to affordable housing.

Based on information provided by organizations utilizing funding to create affordable housing, some barriers have been identified over the last couple of years. These barriers include specific zoning code provisions and permitting fees and tap-in charges that can add significant additional cost to projects aimed at providing affordable housing to those most in need.

## **Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

Underserved populations in Genesee County include: persons paying in excess of 30% of their income towards rent and/or living in substandard housing; persons with physical disabilities; persons being discriminated against in housing, employment and transportation; and, homeless persons.

During PY 2017 Habitat for Humanity expended \$202,926 toward the new construction of four affordable, accessible housing units. Habitat for Humanity includes accessibility features into all of their new builds, as well as energy efficiency measures to ensure that not only will the mortgage payment be affordable, but the cost of utilities will also remain low.

The HOME funded Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) Program also helps underserved populations by providing rental assistance for up to two years, which allows those that struggle to find and afford shelter, an opportunity to save money while working and/or going to school. Because employment or enrollment in employment training programs is a requirement for the program, it provides an incentive

to become financially stable.

**Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

Genesee County requires that each housing unit funded with Community Development Program funds be inspected for the occurrence of lead-based paint prior to occupancy or rehabilitation. If lead-based products are present, abatement measures are required in order for the eligible activities to utilize Genesee County CDBG and/or HOME Program funds. Each unit is inspected and cleared of lead when necessary.

**Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

GCMPC staff continues to encourage Section 3 business enterprises to apply for contract opportunities funded with CDBG and HOME Program funds. To the extent feasible, GCMPC also enforces the Section 3 requirement on construction projects over \$100,000. These efforts encourage hiring and training for low-income workers.

Public service funds through CDBG provide assistance to senior centers, some of which utilize funds to stock a food pantry for low-income seniors. This assistance lessens the burden on those that are struggling in poverty.

The HOME funded Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) program helps families in need with rental assistance for up to two years. This type of assistance can have a great impact on a poverty-level family to find stable housing and focus their efforts and limited resources on other priorities. During PY 2017 fourteen individuals or families were assisted through the TBRA Program, including five children.

**Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

During PY 2017, GCMPC worked with an array of partners to execute activities outlined in the 2015 – 2019 Consolidated Plan. Within these partnerships, community projects were developed, maintained and furthered by GCMPC staff.

Staff continued to encourage the formation of new and innovative partnerships in efforts to leverage additional resources for the CDBG and HOME Programs. Genesee County worked with its partners to assure that both sides were able to contribute in a productive way. GCMPC staff held small working meetings in order to provide individualized technical assistance where necessary.

**Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

During PY 2017, GCMPC staff regularly attended Continuum of Care meetings, Flint Area Community Housing Resource Board meetings and had regular communications with entities providing services such

as the Flint Housing Commission, emergency shelters, rapid re-housing, realtors, Legal Services of Eastern Michigan and Metro Community Development among others.

In addition, staff attended many County-wide events including Hamilton Health Clinic event, Berston Fieldhouse Community Resource event and the Fox 66 Fall Festival which brought out over 5,000 people. These events offer the opportunity to provide information to residents but also to engage with other housing and social service agencies. It provides an opportunity to compare notes and see how we may be able to help each other, collaborate, offer referrals, and/or leverage funds.

**Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)**

The Fair Housing Center/Legal Services of Eastern Michigan (LSEM) is Genesee County's contractual partner and acts as the agency responsible for managing the Fair Housing Center. GCMPC funds activities of the Fair Housing Center with CDBG funds. During PY 2016 LSEM staff completed an assessment of each local municipality's parking lot and compliance with ADA requirements. When the assessment was first conducted in 2005, just seven of 33 local units of government were in compliance. In 2015 sixteen local units were in compliance and the most recent compliance assessment done in 2016 found that only three were not in compliance.

LSEM staff also completed the "Public Knowledge, Attitude, and Awareness Fair Housing Survey in Genesee County, 2016". The report concluded that there is "a great need to continue to educate the community about fair housing law" and made the following recommendations 1) to increase the level of advertising on fair housing laws; 2) increase knowledge levels via community presentations; and, 3) gather additional surveys during presentations and/or through social media to gauge public awareness.

Linguistic profiling testing utilized phone calls to determine a difference in treatment between black and white females and black and white males. The results demonstrated that white males receive more favorable responses than the other testers. The testing resulted in three recommendations including conducting on-site testing, further examination of the results of the telephone audits to determine if specific geographic areas need focused training, and continue telephone audits for linguistic profiling with other races and ethnicities.

In PY 2016 LSEM also conducted an investigative report into due process and equal treatment in landlord/tenant court proceedings. This report found that a high percentage of individuals are not told of the right to legal representation and information regarding legal aid assistance.

Six tests were conducted to analyze the prevalence of steering by real estate brokerages. All six came back inconclusive for steering, however, one was positive for racial discrimination. An additional seven tests were conducted outside of a specific project. One complaint was filed and another seven complaints were received from residents in Genesee County.



In PY 2017, LSEM conducted 77 paired tests in 14 communities throughout Genesee County, with 61 related to rental properties, 3 related to lending practices, and 13 related to sales. 30 of the tests conducted were inconclusive, 41 were negative, and 6 had positive results. LSEM received 22 community fair housing complaints, of which 12 were reasonable accommodation/modification complaints. LSEM introduces their services and presents little known facts and findings surrounding Fair Housing Law at the Flint/Genesee Fair Housing Conference held annually in April which staff attends.

## **CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230**

**Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements**

GCMPC staff continued to implement a monitoring policy designed to ensure that all CDBG, HOME, and ESG program funds received by subrecipients were utilized in a way that complies with all CPD grant requirements. Three primary goals have been established as a basis for all monitoring visits: 1) to evaluate project performance; 2) to ensure accountability for all funds expended; and, 3) to ensure that applicable CDP and other federal and state requirements are being met.

The process for monitoring the Genesee County CDBG Program during PY 2017, as in each program year, began at the time any procurement activity was initiated, work started, and whenever any CDBG funds were expended on a project. Once a CDBG project has begun, each subrecipient must include a Performance Report with any request for funding reimbursement. Regular site visits were conducted by GCMPC staff for the purpose of evaluating progress, ensuring compliance, and providing technical assistance where necessary.

GCMPC created a Minority Business Enterprise/Women Business Enterprise/ Handicap Business Enterprise directory that is included in all bid packets, as well as being given to the local units of government with applicable projects. Staff worked with the communities to make sure minority businesses were properly contacted and encouraged to submit bids for contractor and subcontractor positions.

For all construction projects, monitoring began prior to bids being solicited and continued on a regular basis until the projects were completed. Meetings were held with each subrecipient to discuss outstanding issues and technical assistance was provided by GCMPC staff whenever needed. On-site visits were conducted to evaluate project progress and to determine compliance with applicable regulations, such as prevailing wage under the Davis-Bacon Act. During these visits, GCMPC staff conducted interviews and observed employees' work duties to ensure compliance.

Results of on-site visits were reviewed and compared to desk reviews of wage decisions, payrolls, and other labor standards documentation. Desk reviews were also conducted for all public service and non-construction projects at the time requests for reimbursement were received, in order to ensure proper documentation of all costs incurred.

Whenever occurrences of compliance issues were determined, GCMPC staff issued a written statement to the subrecipient addressing all concerns. Subrecipients were required to address and correct issues generally no later than thirty (30) days from the time of the notice.

During PY 2017, as in each program year, rehabilitation activities are monitored throughout project phases, and annually throughout the applicable periods of affordability. For the single-family housing

rehabilitation projects, staff conducted pre-bid and pre-construction meetings with each contractor, attended construction draw meetings, and monitored daily activities throughout the rehabilitation phases and through the reimbursement request and desk review process.

**Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)**

**Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.**

As outlined in Genesee County's Citizen Participation Plan, and based on HUD's regulations, GCMPC staff puts the CAPER out for public comment for 15 days. During the public comment period, a public hearing is held. Notices of performance reports are published in the Flint Journal, on GCMPC's website, and sent to GCMPC's public participation list. Printed copies are available to the public at the GCMPC offices' front desk, the offices of all local units of government in the County, and at the library branches. Comment sheets are included with all items to help streamline feedback from the community.

**CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)**

**Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction’s program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.**

After each program year GCMPC staff evaluates the Community Development Program and discusses changes that may make the program run more effectively and efficiently. There were no changes during, or at the end of, PY 2017. Staff began an investigation of communities within Michigan and across the country comparable in terms of HUD allocation amounts and population in an effort to develop changes that may enhance the impact of CDBG funding and alleviate administrative burden to local units of government. Staff found that no one model best fits every community, and every community tailors its programs to meet its specific needs. That said, several changes have been proposed to the County Board that are anticipated to increase the amount of residents served with CDBG funding, help the local units of government in their planning efforts, while also alleviating administrative burden. These changes have been determined to be appropriate and have support from the local units of government, and are expected to be implemented in PY 2019.

**Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?**

No

**[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.**

## **CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)**

### **Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations**

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

TBRA units are inspected on a regular basis, as clients and units are identified. The inspections include an HQS inspection and any deficiencies must be corrected by the property management company prior to an agreement for rental payments being executed. TBRA clients can utilize rental assistance funding for up to two years, and when necessary rehab staff re-inspects units prior to the second year lease signing or inspects another unit if the client decides to move locations.

During PY 2017 staff conducted on-site monitoring visits to all HOME rental units to ensure compliance with HOME Rules. An HQS inspection was conducted as well as file monitoring. It was found that the majority of apartment complexes that have elevators to service multiple floors were missing the current elevator license. It was found that the State had a serious backlog of inspections that had not been completed at the time of our monitoring visit. Several are still waiting for the State Inspector. American House North sent staff an email in March 2018 stating that the State inspector had visited and informed them that the certificate could take as long as nine months to receive. Minor concerns have been corrected with a couple complexes.

### **Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 92.351(b)**

After HOME funds have been awarded and construction is underway, staff works with CHDOs to develop an affirmative marketing plan. Staff reviews the plan submitted by the agency and will make suggestions and require changes as needed. The agency and staff will work together until an acceptable affirmative marketing plan is complete. Staff continues to monitor the actions of the agency to ensure they are following their plan. The plans include how outreach will be provided to home seekers so that all age groups, racial and ethnic backgrounds, genders, disability and marital status groups have equal opportunities to access the affordable housing activity.

### **Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics**

In PY 2017 GCMPC received \$211,889 in program income. All program income received during the PY was from loan payoffs from the Home Improvement Program (HIP) or the Downpayment Assistance Program. These funds are returned to HIP to continue activities to assist other homeowners with necessary repairs

to their homes.

**Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 91.320(j)**

Genesee County took actions to foster and maintain affordable housing by investing CDBG and HOME Program funds in high priority projects that served single-family homeowners and homebuyers. Over 97% of CPD Grant Program funds allocated to Genesee County are provided to projects and activities that serve the low- to moderate-income and/or homeless populations of the County.

As energy costs have risen significantly recently, the cost to remain current on energy bills has become a barrier to keeping housing-related costs affordable. Many low and moderate income homeowners purchased homes when energy costs were much lower and established budgeting according to the average cost at the time they purchased their homes. Combining high energy costs with a house payment has proven burdensome for many households. The Genesee County Home Improvement Program (HIP) utilized CDBG and HOME Program funds to assist in providing energy efficiency improvements, including windows and insulation, in conjunction with other safety, barrier-free, and structural improvements to single-family homes and affordable housing projects.

Habitat for Humanity utilized HOME Program funds to create new affordable housing that is very energy efficient which will keep housing-related costs low for low- to moderate-income families. Habitat installs all Energy Star rated appliances (stove, refrigerator, washer and dryer) and water-sense fixtures to help with energy efficiency. Habitat utilizes a basement system with foam built into the walls and, when feasible, 2x6 walls are constructed both of which allow for more insulation and reduced utility costs.

# CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

## ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

### For Paperwork Reduction Act

#### 1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

##### Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	GENESEE COUNTY
Organizational DUNS Number	078404738
EIN/TIN Number	386004849
Identify the Field Office	DETROIT
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Flint/Genesee County CoC

##### ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Mr
First Name	David
Middle Name	0
Last Name	Yeoman
Suffix	0
Title	Planner 1

##### ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	1101 Beach Street
Street Address 2	Room 223
City	Flint
State	MI
ZIP Code	-
Phone Number	8107666564
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	Yeomand@CO.GENESEE.MI.US

##### ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix
First Name
Last Name
Suffix
Title
Phone Number
Extension
Email Address

## 2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date 05/01/2017  
Program Year End Date 04/30/2018

### 3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** SHELTER OF FLINT  
**City:** FLINT  
**State:** MI  
**Zip Code:** 48502,  
**DUNS Number:**  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 52993

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** GENESEE COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION RESOURCE DEPARTMENT  
**City:** FLINT  
**State:** MI  
**Zip Code:** ,  
**DUNS Number:**  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 10815

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** GENESEE COUNTY YOUTH CORPORATION  
**City:** Flint  
**State:** MI  
**Zip Code:** 48502, 1010  
**DUNS Number:** 163904600  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 21321



**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** MY BROTHER'S KEEPER  
**City:** Flint  
**State:** MI  
**Zip Code:** 48503, 5641  
**DUNS Number:** 361170116  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 21321

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** METRO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
**City:** Flint  
**State:** MI  
**Zip Code:** 48502, 1824  
**DUNS Number:** 836594150  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 7725

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** YWCA OF GREATER FLINT  
**City:** Flint  
**State:** MI  
**Zip Code:** 48502, 1711  
**DUNS Number:** 099659806  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** Y  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 28737

## CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

### 10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	53,655
Total Number of bed-nights provided	38,587
Capacity Utilization	71.92%

Table 24 – Shelter Capacity

### 11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)

The Continuum of Care’s lead agency, Metro Community Development, has approved performance standards and methods for evaluating outcomes already in place. Metro Community Development is the agency that handles the administration of HMIS for the Continuum of Care, with funding policies and procedures already established.

Challenges to providing services include maintaining funding for sufficient staff. Trying to eliminate homelessness requires a concerted effort in street outreach with face to face engagement, direct connection to resources, and near continuous ongoing contact to maintain a support system of caring adults. Without sufficient staff the effort is fragmented, inconsistent and far less effective. Unemployment in the area, insufficient housing, and an unskilled labor force for the jobs available remain significant barriers to eliminating homelessness. Community strategies, systems of support through our ESG partner agencies, and shared resources remain our best defense to reduce homelessness.

## CR-75 – Expenditures

### 11. Expenditures

#### 11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2015	2016	2017
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	61,659	12,064	12,869
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal Homelessness Prevention</b>	<b>61,659</b>	<b>12,064</b>	<b>12,869</b>

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

#### 11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2015	2016	2017
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	10,789	6,864
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,789</b>	<b>6,864</b>

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

#### 11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2015	2016	2017
Essential Services	107,595	0	0
Operations	0	59,884	62,367
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>107,595</b>	<b>59,884</b>	<b>62,367</b>

Table 27 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

**11d. Other Grant Expenditures**

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2015	2016	2017
Street Outreach	0	0	0
HMIS	7,541	7,733	9,665
Administration	11,311	2,890	11,246

**Table 28 - Other Grant Expenditures**

**11e. Total ESG Grant Funds**

Total ESG Funds Expended	2015	2016	2017
	188,106	93,360	103,011

**Table 29 - Total ESG Funds Expended**

**11f. Match Source**

	2015	2016	2017
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	149,000	149,000
State Government	33,880	47,027	47,027
Local Government	0	30,050	0
Private Funds	83,004	0	75,000
Other	22,623	94,332	30,050
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
<b>Total Match Amount</b>	<b>139,507</b>	<b>320,409</b>	<b>301,077</b>

**Table 30 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities**

**11g. Total**

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2015	2016	2017
	327,613	413,769	404,088

**Table 31 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities**

