



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Legislative Analysis

Housing & Community Development
Committee

July 14, 2010

9:30 A.M.

Commission Chamber

Charles Anderson, CPA
Commission Auditor
111 NW First Street, Suite 1030
Miami, Florida 33128
305-375-4354

**Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners
Office of the Commission Auditor**

**Legislative Notes
Housing & Community Development
Meeting Agenda**

July 14, 2010

Written analyses and notes for the below listed items are attached for your consideration:

Item Number(s)

3(B)

In addition, written fiscal impact analyses for the below listed items are attached for your consideration:

Item Number(s)

3(A)
3(D)

If you require further analysis of these or any other agenda items, please contact Guillermo Cuadra, Chief Legislative Analyst, at (305) 375-5469.

Acknowledgements--Analyses prepared by:
Mia Marin, Legislative Analyst

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
 OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR



FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Agenda Item: 3(A)

File Number: 101681

Type of Item: Resolution ratifying the memorandum of understanding between Miami-Dade County Community Action Agency and the Alliance for Aging, Inc. for the provision of Medicare beneficiaries outreach and assistance program.

Committee of Reference: HCDC

Date of Analysis: July 12, 2010

Funding Request: \$0

<p>Operating <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Operating Funding Source(s):</p> <p>General Fund <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Federal <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>State <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proprietary <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other (explain) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The Alliance will pay \$20 for each application completed and submitted.</p>	<p>Capital <input type="checkbox"/> CIP page number _____</p> <p>Recurring Estimated Operating Cost \$ _____</p> <p>Capital Funding Source(s):</p>
--	--

County Match required:

Yes \$ _____ % _____

No

ISSUES/COMMENTS None

It is estimated that approximately 1,680 elders will receive the services as outlined in the MOU. The Alliance for Aging will pay \$20 for each application completed and submitted.

Estimated number of elders-	1,680
Reimbursement for Application/per person	<u>\$20</u>
Total estimated reimbursement	\$33,600

How many staff and its cost will CAA contribute to this program?

How much is the cost of the space provided at the Centers?

Does CAA anticipate that Alliance for Aging reimbursement will cover all the program costs?

OCA contacted CAA on these issues and information should be available for the next Board meeting.

Prepared by: M. Abreu

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**



Legislative Notes

Agenda Item: 3(B)
File Number: 101243
Committee(s) of Reference: Housing, Community Development Committee
Date of Analysis: July 13, 2011
Type of Item: Resolution to Adopt the FY2011 Consolidated Planning Process Policies Document

Summary

This resolution adopts the FY2011 Consolidated Planning Process Policies (CPPP) which outlines the utilization of federally funded grants for Miami-Dade County (MDC).

Background and Relevant Legislation

United States Housing and Urban Development (HUD) require MDC to submit a Consolidated Plan every five years. The last plan was submitted in 2007. The CPPP contains policies for implementing the FY2008-12 Consolidated Plan. An annual Action Plan is also required by HUD that follows the Consolidated Plan year by year. The CPPP document serves as a guideline when submitting the FY2011 Action Plan due to HUD on November 15, 2010. The CPPP also includes guidelines for how MDC will allocate federal CDBG, HOME and Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds.

Legislative history of previously approved CPPP's including the following:

- FY2009 R-839-08
- FY2008 R-803-07
- FY2007 R-670-06

The FY2011 CPPP recommends amendments that address concerns expressed by the Chairs of the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSA) and the Community Advisory Committee (CAC).

The CAC represent Miami-Dade County's NRSA's. CAC members serve in an advisory capacity and provide recommendations to the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on the development and implementation of neighborhood plans and projects.

NRSA's are designated areas which have been targeted for revitalization and which are eligible for federal funding under the HUD Community block Grant Program (CDBG). There are eight NRSAs in MDC which include the following:

- Opa-locka;
- Model City;
- West Little River;
- Melrose;
- South Miami;
- Perrine;
- Leisure City/Naranja; and
- Goulds

Areas designated as NRSAs must have contiguous boundaries, be primarily residential, and have a population with at least 70 percent of the persons considered low-and-moderate income. The CPPP addresses the needs of the communities in NRSAs.

The FY2011 CPPP includes 10 new policies some of which were to address the needs identified in the NRSAs and CAC's to include the following:

- Allocation of CDBG Funds to Reserves Discontinued: Eligible projects not identified in NRSAs where redirected to the respective CAC or Commission District Fund (CDF) reserve accounts which is considered unallocated according to HUD. Funds not allocated to a specific activity before the 30-day public comment period will be recommended for a funding recommendation from the County Mayor (or designee).
- New Funding Methodology to Specific Areas in the NRSAs as Identified in the FY2008-12 Consolidated Plan: CDBG allocations to those initiatives in the designated areas must also meet the 30-day public comment period, currently \$17.36 million is estimated to be available for FY2011 to include the following categories: Administration (20%), County Departments (50%), Municipalities/Public Facilities/Capital Improvements/Economic Development (14%) and NRSAs (16%).
- \$1 Million Set Aside in HOME Funds to Homeownership Rehabilitation/Reconstruction: Creation of this new program will provide needs for families beyond what the County currently provides (seniors only).
- Increase Technical Assistance to Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO): Increase technical assistance to these organizations that have been negatively impacted by a depressed housing market.

- Community Advisory Committee Membership Policy Eliminated: Policy was never implemented and the CDBG guidelines require members be appointed by the community.
- Establish a Cure Period for Housing Applicants Only: Currently applicants are not allowed to provide additional information or correct mistakes in their application. Applicants are now allowed a specified period of time to provide information to address specific issues relating to the application. *According to the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), applicants can only cure their applications as it relates to proof of funding and site control.*
- Provide Innovation Funding: To promote green initiatives.
- New Construction Projects for Homeownership Units Will Not be Funded: Proposes no funding for construction of new homeownership units. *According to DHCD, this has not been done for a few years since the housing market has been impacted by the economic downturn.*
- Develop Strategy to Assist DHCD Funded for Sale Homeownership Projects: Reprogrammed funds will be used to fund this strategy and priority will be given to housing projects that have received prior allocation of County funds but have been affected by the economic downturn.
- Increase Funding to County Departments: Recommend a cap on allocations be raised from 40% to 50%. *According to DHCD, the rationale behind the increase is the bulk of the programs and projects under CDBG are run by County Departments.*

At the June 9, 2010 Housing & Community Development (HCDC) meeting, several citizens commented on their concerns regarding the Proposed FY2011 CPPP to include the following:

- CDBG Home funds not recommended for rehabilitation projects;
- No reference to technical assistance and capacity building;
- Leveraging requirement should not be required for elderly housing;
- \$25,000 leveraging fee for CBO's as a security for funding activity is burdensome;
- 84% of the recommended funds going directly to County Departments and Administration is disproportionate in comparison to what the community receives;
- Economic Development is being grouped as a line item for receipt of funds with other entities (municipalities, public facilities and capital improvement) thereby further decreasing the amount CBO's receive;
- Double standards between the CBO applicants and Housing Applicants for the cure process that allows only housing applicants the ability to cure their applications of errors;
- Promissory note process does not allow the CBO's to work at 100% capacity when the access of funds to the applicant comes five (5) months later thereby making it very difficult to pay back loans; and
- Funds issued as loans to CBO's causes hardship for repayment.

Additionally, at the June 9, 2010 HCDC meeting, Committee members commented their concerns and directed responses to their concerns to County staff to include the following:

HCDC Committee Members Concerns	County Staff Responses
Lack of technical assistance included in CPPP	Staff has provided as much technical assistance as their current limited resources can expend and noted that over the years technical assistance funds have been drastically cut.
Why are loans used as the mechanism to provide funding rather than grants?	The use of loans rather than grants was an approved County policy to ensure that the grantees of these loans would meet the national objective requirements. Once the objectives were met on the loan the grantee would not be obligated to pay, however if the objectives were not met they would be obligated to pay rather than the County.
Percentage of funding allocations is disproportionately higher for County Departments and Administration rather than to the community.	The difference of allocation from last year to County Departments and Staff is an increase of \$1.7 million and those funds were used to provide for Public Works which created 91 jobs. The creation of 91 jobs is more than double the ratio for the national objective requirement for investment and job creation.
What was the application process for the eight (8) NRSA's?	One general request for applications was issued Countywide for all areas. All applications were accepted. No applications were received from several NRSA's.
Why CAC's were being eliminated from CSBG process?	CSBG funding received by CAA prohibits appointments by elected officials.
Direct County staff to obtain a written opinion from the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) as to the changes that occurred thereby requiring members to be democratically elected rather than appointed by elected officials.	County staff will request the information to DCA to provide to HCDC committee members.
Would like to see increased participation to allow NRSA to receive funds with assistance and for the funds to go back (NRSA pool fund) if the national objectives are not met.	The NRSA were required to participate in the creation of the NRSA priorities list to better address the needs that have not consistently been met for the last several years. The proposed process does not preclude applications from being received Countywide.
County staff must meet with HCDC Committee members to get their feedback in order to revise the CPPP to be presented at the next HCDC meeting in July 2011.	County staff acknowledged the directive.

Prepared By: Mia B. Marin

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR



FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Agenda Item: 3(D)

File Number: 101647

Type of Item: Resolution Reprogramming CDBG 2005 Disaster Recovery Initiative Round 2 and Round 3 Funds

Committee of Reference: HCDC

Date of Analysis: July 12, 2010

Funding Request: \$0

<p>Operating <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Operating Funding Source(s):</p> <p>General Fund <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Federal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>State <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Proprietary <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other (explain) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Capital <input type="checkbox"/> CIP page number _____</p> <p>Recurring Estimated Operating Cost \$ _____</p> <p>Capital Funding Source(s):</p>
--	--

County Match required:

Yes \$ _____ % _____

No

ISSUES/COMMENTS None

There is a scrivener's error on the amount to be recaptured. On first page, second paragraph of the memorandum states \$1,567,299. On page number 2, in the illustrated table and in the resolution, the adjusted total amount award is \$1,764,499 for a difference of \$197,200.00.

OCA contacted the department and they agreed that it was a scrivener's error.

Prepared by: M. Abreu