

**PY 2006 - 2007
Consolidated Annual Performance
& Evaluation Report**

**Macomb HOME Consortium
Macomb Urban County**

Macomb County Board of Commissioners
William A. Crouchman, Chair

Department of Planning & Economic Development
Stephen N. Cassin, Executive Director
Donald Morandini, Deputy Director

September 29, 2007

Table of Contents

General Summary	4
1. Assessment of One-Year Goals and Objectives.....	4
a) Accomplishments vs. Goals and Objectives for the Reporting Period	4
b) CPD Formula Grant Funds Spent on Grant Activities	4
c) Why Progress Was Not Made Towards Meeting Goals and Objectives	5
2. Program Changes in Light of Experiences	5
3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.....	6
a) and b) Summary of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice / Actions Taken	6
4. Other Actions to Address Obstacles to Meeting Underserved Needs	7
5. Leveraging Resources	8
a) Progress in Obtaining Other Resources.....	8
b) How Formula Funds Leveraged Other Resources.....	9
c) Satisfaction of Match Requirements	9
Managing the Process (Actions to Comply with Planning Requirements).....	10
Citizen Participation (Summary of Process & Citizen Comments)	10
Institutional Structure (Actions Overcome Gaps & Enhance Coordination).....	10
Monitoring.....	11
1. How (and How Frequently) Monitoring Occurred	11
2. Results of Monitoring and Improvements Noted	11
3. Self-Evaluation	12
a) Program Impact on Neighborhood & Community Problems	12
b) Progress in Meeting Priority Needs & Objectives.....	12
c) Provision of Housing for Lower-Income Persons	13
d) Activities Not Progressing as Scheduled.....	13
e) How Activities & Strategies Affected Needs	13
f) Indicators of Results	13
g) Barriers to Strategy Implementation	13
h) Status of Major Goals and Targets.....	14
i) Adjustments & Improvements to Activities & Strategies.....	15
Actions to Evaluate and Reduce Lead-Based Paint.....	15
Actions to Foster & Maintain Affordable Housing.....	15
Actions to Improve Public Housing and Resident Initiatives	16
Actions to Remove Barriers to Affordable Housing	16
Homeless Needs	16
1. Actions Taken to Address Needs of Homeless Persons	16
2. New Federal Resources Obtained From Homeless SuperNOFA.....	17
Community Development Block Grant Program Narrative.....	17
1. Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives.....	17
a) Use of CDBG Funds for Consolidated Plan Priorities, Needs and Goals	17
c) Extent That CDBG Funds Benefited ELI, VLI, and LI Persons.....	17
D) Compliance With Planning/Administrative, and With Public Service Caps	17
2. Changes in Program Objectives	17
a) Nature of, and Reasons for, Changes in Program Objectives	17
b) Changes to be Made Based on Experience	17
3. Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Activities	17
a) Efforts to Obtain Resources Indicated in Consolidated Plan.....	17
b) Provision of Certifications of Consistency in Fair and Impartial Manner	17
c) Non-Hindrance of Consolidated Plan Implementation by Willful Action	17
4. Funds Not Used for National Objectives	17
a) How CDBG Funds did not Meet National Objectives	17
b) How Non-Compliance with Overall Benefit Certification Occurred.....	18

5. Anti-Displacement and Relocation	18
a) Steps Taken to Minimize Displacement	18
b) Steps Taken to Identify Entities Covered by URA and Section 104 (d)	18
c) Steps Taken to Ensure Timely Notices to Displaced Entities	18
6. Low/Mod Job Activities	18
a) Efforts to Ensure First Consideration	18
b) Listing of Permanent Jobs Created and Retained and Made Available to LMI Persons .	18
c) Actions to Provide Skills, Education and Training for Skilled LMI Jobs	18
7. How Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities Demonstrate Compliance w/National Objective.	18
8. Program Income Received	18
a) Amount of PI returned by Fund	19
b) Repayments for Float-Funded Activities	19
c) Other Loan Repayments by Category	19
d) PI Received From Sale of Property	19
9. Adjustments for Disallowed Costs	19
a) Activity Name and IDIS Number	19
b) Affected Program Year	19
c) Amount of Repayment	19
d) If Multi-Year Reimbursement, Amount and Schedule for Reimbursement	19
10. Loans and Other Receivables	19
a) Principal Balance for Each Float-Funded Activity	19
b) Total Number Outstanding Loans and Principal Balance as of End of Reporting Period	19
c) List of Forgivable and Deferred Loans	19
d) Number of CDBG Defaulted Loans	19
e) List of For Sale Properties Acquired/Improved with CDBG Funds	19
11. Lump Sum Draw-down Agreements	19
12. Housing Rehabilitation	19
a) Number of Projects and Units Completed for Each Program	20
b) Total CDBG Funds in Each Program	20
c) Other Public and Private Funds Used	20
13. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area Progress	20
Anti-Poverty Strategy	20
Non-Homeless Special Needs	20
HOME Narrative	21
1. Assessment of Progress Made in Implementing HOME Program Objectives	21
2. The results of on-site rental housing inspections:	22
3. Assessment of Affirmative Marketing Actions:	22
4. An Assessment of Outreach to W/MBE's:	22
5. Analysis of Fund Distribution to Housing Needs in Consolidated Plan:	22
6. HOME Match Report	23
7. HOME W/MBE Report	23
Emergency Shelter Narrative	23
HOPWA Narrative	23
Public Participation Narrative	23
Appendices	23

Macomb HOME Consortium Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report Program Year 2006 – 2007

Executive Summary

The Macomb HOME Consortium, MHC or Consortium, formed in 2006, is comprised of the Urban County of Macomb (itself comprised of 21 communities), the Charter Township of Clinton, and the Cities of Roseville and Sterling Heights. In 2006 the Consortium received \$1,407,116 in HOME funds. The Urban County of Macomb also received \$1,710,959 in CDBG funds. This report addresses the Consortium's HOME, as well as the Urban County's CDBG, programs. The other Consortium members will report on their respective CDBG programs. During the July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007 reporting period, a total of \$4,915,181.73, including \$3,095,454.30 (CDBG) and \$1,819,727.43 (HOME) was spent. The Consortium, and its housing and service partners, provided affordable housing, essential infrastructure, public facilities, and essential human services provided to lower-income (LI), elderly, and people in danger of homelessness (or "at-risk" populations).

Each of the four Consortium partners teamed with other entities to implement programs and activities. Further detail is found in the following narrative, with an activity breakdown in IDIS Reports CO4PR03, 06, 26 and 33, attached.

General Summary

1. Assessment of One-Year Goals and Objectives

a) Accomplishments vs. Goals and Objectives for the Reporting Period

The Consortium established the following priority objectives through its Consolidated Planning process. The reader should refer to the Consortium's Consolidated Plan for a full recounting of these objectives.

Priority Objective #1: Affordable housing for LI owners and renters is the top priority in Macomb County.

Priority Objective #2: The maintenance of existing, and the creation of new public facilities and infrastructure in LI and/or blighted areas.

Priority Objective #3: Programs to assist the homeless, and prevent homelessness among at-risk populations, including those with special needs.

Priority Objective #4: The provision and expansion of human services to LI people, particularly those with special needs and those at risk of homelessness.

Priority Objective #5: The provision of comprehensive planning and management and capacity development.

b) CPD Formula Grant Funds Spent on Grant Activities

Expenditures totaled \$3,095,454.30 (CDBG) and \$1,819,727.40 (HOME) between 7/1/06-6/30/07, based on IDIS Reports PR06, PR26, and PR33, confirmed by County accounting data.

c) Why Progress Was Not Made Towards Meeting Goals and Objectives

The County met the timeliness standard established by regulation, after having failed to meet it in 2005. We expect the level of performance to improve even more during the coming year.

a) CDBG – Rehabilitation – This program is effective, but limited CDBG funding required phase out of the substantial rehabilitation activity two years ago. Twelve emergency repairs were made at a cost of \$62,523.20.

b) HOME Rehabilitation – The County, based on IDIS Report PR33, used \$1,819,727.40 in HOME funds during the reporting period. Forty homes were substantially rehabilitated for \$1,558,937.43. The remainder was spent for Program administration and activity delivery charges. Nine other homes were under repair on June 30, 2007.

c) HOME – The County met HOME project commitment and completion targets during the reporting period. This speaks to staff and administrative effectiveness.

2. Program Changes in Light of Experiences

HUD staff monitored the County's CDBG and the Consortium's HOME Programs between April 20 and April 22, 2007. Its letter of June 28, 2007 contained 5 findings of non-compliance, plus one Concern and one Comment. The Consortium's July 18, 2007 and August 14, 2007 responses provided documentation that should clear three of the findings, and addressed the outstanding comment and concern. It requested until October 1, 2007 to resolve the remaining two findings. HUD cleared 2 of the 5 findings on August 16, 2007, with clearance of the remaining findings held until implementation of promised corrective actions.

Other actions, in light of the above, and previous, experience follow.

- 2006 was the Macomb HOME Consortium's first year of operations, and its directors developed basic guidelines and governance. The Consortium, for example, decided to distribute funds (except for CHDO reserves and administrative costs) to each member based on the HUD funding formula. The Urban County, with a continuing HOME program, has been able to commit and expend its portion of HOME funds. The other members are considering proposals at this time. The Consortium is working to develop transitional housing.
- Despite strenuous efforts over the preceding two-years to address a recognized problem, the Urban County failed to achieve HUD's timeliness standard in 2006. In order to resolve that situation, the County, with Board of Commissioner approval, instituted a 1.5-year annual expenditure benchmark for all communities. Communities were apprised of the change and received monthly progress reports. Fortunately, no funds were recaptured from local units of government. This emphasis will continue and increase in the future to ensure even greater progress. The County is now in compliance with the timeliness standard.
- With diminished resources, it is difficult to address all priorities. As mentioned, CDBG funds, formerly used for housing rehabilitation, are limited to emergency repairs. Even in this more limited role, the need exceeds resources. The County has therefore partnered with the MCCA weatherization program to jointly fund some projects. It cannot, however, report that many homes were repaired in this manner during the reporting period. The County still seeks other ways to expand this program.
- In recognition of the need for homeless assistance, the County's Board of Commissioners authorized several actions, including CDBG funding of the Macomb Continuum of Care (CoC). The MHC was active in the CoC general membership, permanent housing, and multi-purpose facility committees, and is working with it to develop transitional housing.
- Several communities undertook comprehensive plans, with County (and CDBG) support, to

combine to: 1) promote (re) development, and 2) address resident, particularly LI and special needs, concerns. The County's Planning Department, for example, commissioned a study of the County's aging population to find ways to promote independent living. Partly financed with CDBG, it will focus on zoning and development practices, and the results will be shared with local communities in order to promote senior friendly development in the future.

- The Consortium increased administrative efficiency and program effectiveness by implementing changes in activity design, administration, and by revamping application materials. The changes made were well received by stakeholders. During the past year, it promoted transitional housing development, worked to address foreclosure affecting large numbers of families, and considered the possibility of affordable rental development. It continues to improve programs and program delivery.

3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

a) and b) Summary of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice / Actions Taken

Macomb County updated its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) on January 15, 2005. That document reached the following conclusions:

- Although Macomb County and its CDBG communities are becoming more racially and ethnically diverse, each should take more concrete steps to continue this trend including steps to identify and counter negative responses to the growing minority population in the County. The steps taken should be publicly acknowledged and further promoted.

Actions Taken: As reported in the AI, fair housing is increasingly common. The number of minority residents rose from 3.3% in 1990 to 7.3% in 2000. New census estimates for 2005 indicate a substantial increase in the number of minorities living in Macomb County. Between 2000-2005, the Asian-American population increased by 37%, the Hispanic population increased by 29%, and the number of African-Americans increased by 144%. This continues the trend towards heterogeneity in the County¹. Macomb County is becoming more diverse.

There are, moreover, distinct ethnicities represented, including Macedonian, Arab, plus South and East Asian. DPED has developed informational brochures to promote mutual understanding. The brochures will be used by business and community leaders to improve the business climate, welcome newcomers, facilitate harmony between ethnic communities, and promote Macomb County as a desirable place to live and conduct business.

- African-American and disabled residents are under-represented in the general population. The County should study real estate practices, and the home-seeking choices made by those groups, to determine the extent of perceived or actual unlawful discriminatory practices.

Actions Taken: The Consortium promoted housing for disabled people by awarding HOME funds to Springhill Housing Corporation (SHC), to acquire and rent decent, safe and sanitary homes to LI developmentally-disabled individuals at prices they can afford. So far, 8 homes with 15 dwelling units have been purchased with a combination of \$690,562.24 in HOME (excluding project delivery charges) and \$115,655 in Michigan Interfaith Trust Fund money. The funds invested have sufficiently reduced the mortgages to produce affordable rents. All units are occupied by eligible households. None of the individuals assisted is minority.

It has encouraged housing opportunities for minority families. More than 38% of the homebuyers assistance, and 11.3% of housing rehabilitation assistance went to minority households, according to HUD's June 30, 2007 Dashboard Report.

¹ U.S. Census-American Community Survey Data

- There are home-seekers who believe that they have experienced unlawful discrimination, and continued use of the offices of the Michigan Department of Civil Rights, HUD, and particularly the Fair Housing Center (with its ability to test for discriminatory practices) is warranted.

Action Taken: The County supports this recommendation. Budget restraints prohibit the County from providing substantial monetary support to the FHC, but the County did make a small financial contribution in Spring 2007.

- Several community Master Plans and Zoning Ordinances should be reviewed and/or corrected to ensure that they do not become impediments to fair housing. The County should work with its CDBG communities to achieve this end.

Action Taken: The County advisee local communities on an array of planning issues, but has little direct control over local planning decisions. Still, this input can be valuable to local planners. County planning staff, for example, commissioned a study of the County's aging population, hoping to identify design and other measures to address impediments to independent living for elderly people. The results will be shared with localities.

- The County should fully report impediments to fair housing and any activities taken to affirmatively further fair housing, as required by Program regulations.

Action Taken: The County is acting on the recommendations made, and is reporting on those actions, as evinced above.

- Other Actions Taken: The County provides CDBG and/or HOME housing rehabilitation deferred payment loans to LI families. Forty homes were substantially rehabilitated and twelve more received emergency repairs. This program has enabled many homeowners remain in their properties over the course of the year.

The creation of the MHC, on July 1, 2006, enabled 3 additional communities to provide affordable housing.

The County supports the CoC with financial, staff and other resources, ranging from staff level through the Board of Commissioners.

4. Other Actions to Address Obstacles to Meeting Underserved Needs

This section addresses actions taken by the Urban County of Macomb, not those taken by the other members of the MHC. Despite continuing annual grants to the 21 municipalities in the Urban County there are insufficient funds to address every need. The County has therefore focused on the housing needs of homeowners; the need for community facilities and infrastructure; and the need for public services (including youth, seniors, recreation, and homeless programs). This approach has made substantial inroads on many needs in the community. It was, until recently, less able to address needs among the homeless and special needs populations. This has changed as follows:

- The County's Board of Commissioners has, since 2005, allocated \$25,000 in CDBG funds to the CoC, for strategic planning, thus ensuring a base level of funding. In spring 2006, moreover, the Board folded the CoC into County government. This action ensures increased managerial attention, enhanced funding opportunities, and increased the level of collaboration between the CoC, and affiliated organizations.
- The CoC received 15 Housing Choice Vouchers for use by the chronically homeless, and is

working with the Departments of Defense and HUD, the County, and Chesterfield Township on a proposal to house homeless youths, abused women and their dependents in vacated military housing at Selfridge Air National Guard base. The work continues.

- The CoC applied for HHS capacity building funds and HUD SuperNOFA funding in 2006, receiving roughly \$602,159 to create a multi-purpose facility for chronically homeless individuals, and \$140,347 for long-term rental housing. It also received \$87,000 in a State of Michigan Emergency Shelter Grant and sub-distributed to the Macomb Homeless Coalition, Family Youth Interventions, the Macomb County Warming Center, Turning Point, the Salvation Army, and MCREST.
- Many local communities awarded CDBG funds to service providers including Solid Ground (transitional housing, and supportive services), Care House (aid to abused children), St. Vincent DePaul (emergency food, clothing and other support to at-risk families), Lighthouse Outreach (emergency food, clothing and rental assistance), MCCSA (Chore Services), MCREST (emergency shelter and services), Samaritan House (emergency shelter, food and services), Macomb Family Services (senior homemaker and at-risk family assistance), RBW Senior Program (senior services), Richmond/Lenox EMS (senior transportation services), SMART (senior transportation services) Turning Point (emergency shelter and services to abused women and their dependents). These contributions provided substantial assistance to the service providers, as detailed in Section 5 below.
- The County has provided CDBG support for the Solid Ground transitional housing facility located in the City of Roseville. Solid Ground also uses donations from individuals, foundations, churches, another entitlement community, and donations of labor and materials from contractors, unions, and businesses. Progress has been impressive.
- The County assisted first-time home-buyers, in collaboration with MCCSA, which operates the Consortium's ADDI program. The MCCSA program requires personal commitment from the homebuyer. Typically, a homebuyer requires from 6 to 18 months to satisfy program requirements (including savings and completing educational requirements) and purchase his/her home. To date, 4 homes have been acquired. All funds, including those awarded on July 1, 2007, are reserved for eligible homebuyer candidates. This is not reflected in IDIS since projects are set up in IDIS when funds are needed, and due to a lengthy period of due diligence. Despite this, the program is making excellent progress, and we believe that those assisted will be successful, long-term, homeowners.
- Although a long-time partner, Housing Opportunities for Macomb, dissolved in 2006, the Consortium has been approached by two other entities, the Warren Community Development Corporation and the Macomb County Chapter of Habitat for Humanity, which seek Consortium support for homeownership programs.

The Consortium has approved two additional Community Housing Development Organizations, Warren CDC and Solid Ground, during the reporting period.

5. Leveraging Resources

a) Progress in Obtaining Other Resources

The County has leveraged significant levels of funding from other sources, as shown in the following table.

Organization	Anticipated	Received	Comments
Macomb County	\$3,404,775.00	\$3,036,247.00	HOME and CDBG Grants
Macomb County	\$425,000.00	\$355,080.17	HOME & CDBG PI
Macomb County	\$162,969.00	\$202,288.00	HOME Match
MCCSA	\$20,000,000.00	\$22,900,000.00	Multiple Service Programs
Macomb Family Services	\$20,000.00	\$21,000.00	Senior Chores, Assistance to at-risk families.
Care House	\$715,233.00	\$603,065.00	Services to sexually abused children & families.
MCREST	\$264,037.00	\$1,200,000.00	14,498 shelter nights; 1,123 people housed
Lighthouse Outreach Center	\$36,307.00	\$513,572.00	Utility, food, homeless prevention assistance
Richmond/Lenox EMS	\$846,000.00	\$225,000.00	Ambulance and transit services
Samaritan House	\$181,428.00	\$53,000.00	Utility, food, homeless prevention assistance
Solid Ground	\$470,497.61	\$468,225.47	Services to 430 homeless families. ²
St. Vincent de Paul	36,307.00	\$62,308.00	“ “ “ 211 families assisted
Springhill Housing Corp.	\$180,000.00	\$1,160,279.00	3 SHP grants serving 40 families and 55 people.
Eastpointe Housing Comm.	\$1,654,756.00	\$1,654,756.00	164 LRPB, 171 S8 Vouchers
Mt. Clemens Hsg Comm.	\$2,187,354.00	\$2,187,354.00	288 LRPB Units
New Haven Housing Comm.	\$487,612.00	\$487,612.00	88 LRPB Units
MSHDA	\$1,400,000.00	\$4,320,000.00	900 S8 Vouchers
Total	\$32,472,275.61	\$39,387,540.948	

b) How Formula Funds Leveraged Other Resources

We cannot claim that CDBG Program funds leveraged the amount displayed in the table, but their combined effect extends the County's housing and community development effort. The total level of funding is nearly 13 times the Urban County's annual CDBG and HOME allocations. The partnership between the County and partner organizations has yielded bricks and mortar improvements, more decent and affordable housing, and higher levels of service than otherwise possible. Still, the County, like other communities, faces budgetary constraints, and is reviewing its business practices for ways to maintain and, if possible, expand services.

c) Satisfaction of Match Requirements

Expenditures of \$1,282,364.13 required Match, creating an obligation of \$320,591.03, according to IDIS Report PR 33. The County reported an available match credit of \$95,71477 in its last report. The Match calculations follow:

\$221,818.00 - County general fund contributions used for HOME projects
36,850.00 - supportive housing services provided by ARC Services to Springhill Housing Corporation
50,313.00 - donated labor and reduced cost materials from Solid Ground³
15,980.00 - correction of over-reported Match obligation in 2002 CAPER⁴
\$324,291.00 - subtotal of match earned
+ 95,714.71 2006 match credit as reported on HUD 40107 A,
\$420,005.71 - in Match for the reporting period.
- 320,591.03 - match obligation for the reporting period
\$ 99,414.68 - match credit

² CDBG funds were used to create a transitional housing facility. Services were provided through non-CDBG funding.

³ This is based on a HOME commitment Solid Ground conditioned on final approval of a larger request for its Transitional Housing facility in Roseville. HUD authorized this commitment.

⁴ The reader is referred to HUD 40107 A for 2002, and submitted to HUD in November 2003. This document erroneously identified a match liability of \$104,640.49, while the PR 33 identifies a match liability of \$88,660.03, creating an "match over-payment" of \$15,980.00.

A detailed Match accounting is found in form HUD 40107 A. The Consortium has, moreover, identified additional sources to ensure the adequacy of future match, easing concerns that future Match might not be adequate to meet the need.

Managing the Process (Actions to Comply with Planning Requirements)

The Urban County of Macomb, and the MHC have partnered with community development agencies to ensure benefit to intended groups and individuals. The County has, for example, addressed each major area of need, as noted below. They have, singly and/or collectively:

- developed strategies to address housing needs in four areas: homebuyer assistance, rental assistance, homeowner rehabilitation assistance, and transitional housing.
- continued relationships with the Clinton Township, Eastpointe, Mt. Clemens Housing New Haven and, Roseville, and Sterling Heights Housing Commissions, to coordinate programs and services. The MHC has, for example, certified consistency with Public Housing Agency Plans, and served as the responsible entity for NEPA compliance on behalf of the Mt. Clemens PHA. We hope to work even more closely to deliver permanent affordable housing.
- provided CDBG funds to help the CoC develop its strategic plan and obtain funding. The CoC has obtained State and Federal funding for the past three years, and continues to implement and enhance its program. The Consortium is also working closely with several CoC members to develop transitional housing.
- participated in several planning and community development bodies, including the CoC and the Michigan Community Development Director's Association (MCDDA). They work on program issues of mutual interest and concern, and have joined the Macomb/MSHDA collaborative, an unofficial body that reviews, discusses, and develops strategy to address various housing issues in Macomb County. Finally, the County joined with other Southeast Michigan Urban County Collaborative to review and collaborate on mutual concerns. These efforts have been fruitful and will continue.
- amended its Citizen Participation Plan, which resulted in more citizen and stakeholder input in preliminary development of the Consolidated Plan.

Citizen Participation (Summary of Process & Citizen Comments)

This performance report was prepared in accordance with Federal requirements as outlined in Part 91 of the Federal Register, and in accordance with County guidelines. A public hearing on this report was held on September 10, 2007. No one attended, and no comments were received during the 8/22-9/07/07 comment period.

Institutional Structure (Actions Overcome Gaps & Enhance Coordination)

The MHC are affected by the following characteristics:

- The Urban County of Macomb is comprised of 21 local communities and has a strong tradition of home rule. The MHC is comprised of the Urban County, the Cities of Roseville and Sterling Heights, and Clinton Township. Each community receives its own fund sub-allocation, and each has designed its program to address local priorities in compliance with Consolidated Plan and other Program criteria.
- The County's Board of Commissioners determines major policies and procedures; and Plan priorities, objectives, and activities. Immediate Board oversight is provided through its Planning Committee, which reviews and acts on proposals before full Board consideration. This process is effective. Major decisions affecting the MHC must be approved by that body's Directors, and subsequently approved by the their respective legislative bodies.

- There is no County housing commission, or development authority, to directly promote or implement public and assisted housing. The Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), however, provides assisted housing throughout the area. Six local housing commissions also provide Low Rent Public Housing and Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher assistance. The MHC has, moreover, attracted assisted housing. No immediate changes are envisioned, but we would like to have more assisted housing partners.
- There are well-established service delivery networks to serve residents, including those with special needs, and the homeless. The CoC's comprehensive plan to address homelessness is a major component of County strategy. Its Board of Directors is comprised of government officials, the private sector, and individual citizens. It has received three MSHDA homeless grants, and three HUD Continuum of Care grants. This structure works. Please note the folding of the CoC Coordinator into MCCSA. No further changes are under consideration.
- DPED provides comprehensive services to residents and businesses, and it wants to expand and better coordinate them. With, for example, a rapidly aging County population, DPED is implemented a study of their needs, and will work with local communities to implement policy and design enhancements based on the results. Individual members of the Consortium have staff committed to overcoming obstacles and have, on their own, developed networks to improve the delivery of services to target populations.

Monitoring

1. How (and How Frequently) Monitoring Occurred

The County and the Consortium monitor programs and activities through on-site visits and technical assistance, and through reports and other documentation reviewed during the year. Staff, for example...

- monitor housing rehabilitation projects to assure work quality. Staff manage change orders, advise contractors concerning unanticipated problems, and may require changes to work already performed. The results have been salutary.
- monitor housing purchased by CHDO's to assure compliance with Housing Quality Standards, cost, and housing rehabilitation standards (when and as applicable). Staff also verify annual tenant income certifications, lease agreements, and perform continuing HQS rental inspections when and as applicable.
- monitor CDBG projects and provide technical assistance to local communities implementing them. This has increased compliance and activity effectiveness.
- continually monitoring the implementation of activities by local communities in order to ensure timely program implementation.

The County recently implemented enhanced monitoring and technical assistance policies and procedures to ensure a consistent assessment of risk and to ensure that on-site monitoring of 33% of all sub-recipients occurs annually.

This is part of a larger strategy of engagement with partner organizations.

2. Results of Monitoring and Improvements Noted

Staff have identified issues, and addressed both causes and effects, to ensure regulatory compliance, improve administrative efficiency, and enhance the value received from community development investments. The result is more (and better quality) housing, public infrastructure and facilities, and an increased level of services despite a limited amount of financial investment.

3. Self-Evaluation

a) Program Impact on Neighborhood & Community Problems

This portion of the CAPER applies solely to the Urban County and not, unless specifically mentioned, to other MHC members, which will address it on their own. The County implemented performance measures as required by HUD. These measures have confirmed that the housing and community development effort is having a significant effect on the community. Virtually every sub-recipient indicates the importance of CDBG and HOME funds in addressing local priorities.

b) Progress in Meeting Priority Needs & Objectives

The Consortium established 5 priority objectives in its 2000 Consolidated Plan. These, along with a narrative to highlight the progress made, follow.

Priority Objective #1: Provide affordable housing for LI owners and renters in Macomb County. The following occurred during the reporting period.

- The CDBG and HOME housing rehabilitation programs are mainstays of the County's housing effort since 1982, and 1,216 homes have been repaired to date. During the reporting period, 40 homes were substantially repaired, and 12 received emergency repair assistance.
- HOME Program funds were also used to acquire, repair and sell single-family homes, and to acquire rental property for developmentally-disabled adults.
- The County continued, through MCCSA, to implement its ADDI program. Twenty home-buyers were approved, are receiving homebuyer education, and are saving to buy their homes. They will receive a 3:1 ADDI to personal savings match when complete. Three families actually completed their due diligence and are now enjoying their new homes.
- The County addressed residential blight through its housing rehabilitation program. Richmond and Armada Townships, moreover, enforced codes. Finally, six communities undertook historic preservation projects. The County hopes to increase the level of CDBG and non-CDBG coordination to extend programs of this type, but only when supportive of CDBG Program requirements.

Priority Objective #2: Maintain existing and create new public facilities and infrastructure in LI and/or blighted areas. Streets, water and sewer, drainage improvements, and sidewalk projects were implemented in several communities, including Center Line, Eastpointe, Memphis, Mt. Clemens, New Baltimore, New Haven, and Shelby Township.

Several others (Armada Village and Township, Lenox Township, New Haven, Ray Township, Richmond City and Township, Utica, and New Haven) funded EMS and Fire Facilities. Still others, including Macomb, Bruce, Ray, and Washington Townships, the Cities of Fraser and Richmond, and the Village of Romeo have expanded or rehabilitated senior centers. Thirteen others provided services from their senior centers.

Still others, including Harrison Township, Mt. Clemens, New Haven, developed parks and recreational facilities which enhanced the quality of life. Nine others either developed or improved their senior center, and 13 spent funds for senior services. Finally, 2 communities purchased large print books for elderly and disabled readers.

Priority Objective #3: Assist the homeless, and prevent homelessness among at-risk populations, including those with special needs. The County allocated CDBG funds to Lighthouse Outreach, MCREST, Samaritan House, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Solid Ground, and Turning Point to address the needs of at-risk people and families.

Priority Objective #4: Provide and expand human services to LI people, particularly those with special needs and those at risk of homelessness. The County allocated CDBG funds to numerous senior centers and parks and recreational departments, Care House, Macomb Family Services, MCCSA, the Shelby Lions Club and Wigs 4 Kids, to expand the number and quality of services available to LI residents.

Priority Objective #5: Encourage comprehensive planning, and management and capacity development. Three communities: Mt. Clemens, and Harrison and Richmond Townships, undertook comprehensive planning activities. The County continued its senior needs study.

Local communities must, by definition, respond to resident need. It therefore follows that local communities are integral to CDBG program delivery. They must identify and quickly address citizen needs, and do so observing Federal law and regulation. County staff worked closely with communities during the reporting period to identify and address needs with Block Grant or other sources, as appropriate. Overall capacity, in this regard, increased during the reporting period.

c) Provision of Housing for Lower-Income Persons

Please refer to the preceding narrative in item B above.

d) Activities Not Progressing as Scheduled

The County corrected its previous failure to meet HUD's timeliness objectives, and has implemented additional measures to ensure future efficiency and effectiveness.

e) How Activities & Strategies Affected Needs

Although the above cited strategies and activities address community needs there are insufficient resources to address the number and variety of needs over a populous, diverse, and territorially large entity like Macomb County. That said, the CDBG and HOME programs address several housing, human service, public facility and infrastructure needs, and serve and sheltering the homeless and special needs populations. The strategy works but, ideally should be expanded.

f) Indicators of Results

The County developed performance measures and outcomes as required by HUD. Certain factors, e.g. the number of homes repaired and their impact on surrounding neighborhoods can be readily and objectively observed; while others, e.g. homeless prevention activities or services to at-risk and special needs populations, may not be readily apparent to the public. In such instances success is measured when bad things do not occur. The results are transparent. At-risk families, for example, remain housed, physical abuse does not occur, and elderly people remain independent longer, and at less cost. Although difficult to observe, these measures nevertheless, affect the entire community.

It is therefore fair to say that the impact of the County's CDBG and HOME Programs, on residents and communities, is positive, despite the gloomy local economy. Neglected homes are becoming community assets; neighborhoods are being upgraded through housing; infrastructure and public facility improvements; essential human services are being provided; and lives are being improved. The testimonials of citizens and local officials underscore their significance.

g) Barriers to Strategy Implementation

Several obstacles hinder Consolidated Plan strategy implementation. Some are structural while others have a regulatory basis. These follow:

First, scarce funds limit Program scope, effectiveness, and potential. Although Macomb County receives and leverages large CDBG and HOME grants, its large geographic size and the overall needs are too great to make truly significant inroads, especially in the area's bleak economy. In order to counteract negative trends, the County has, and will continue to, pursue every reasonable source of leverage. Gaps, however, will remain and possibly worsen.

On a related note, the need for housing assistance still exceeds the availability of housing resources. The Eastpointe Housing Commission, which administers 171 Housing Choice Vouchers, reports a waiting list of 2,728 households. It is obvious that there is a large un-addressed need for affordable rental housing. The County is working with partners to expand the supply of affordable housing despite stagnant or declining resources.

Second, the County elected to repair homes requiring moderate, rather than substantial, levels of rehabilitation. It can therefore repair more structures than otherwise possible, but limiting its ability to address homes requiring deeper repair subsidies. Some homes cannot be repaired with existing resources.

Third, and related to the above, the scarcity of funds prevents rehabilitation in deteriorating neighborhoods and minimizes opportunities for neighborhood improvement and preservation. The County wants to locate additional partners to expand this initiative.

Fourth, fund scarcity makes it difficult to implement other forms of housing assistance. As a result, whole categories of need are difficult to address. These include LMI renters and special needs populations. It is difficult to maintain the current level of, let alone expand, affordable rental housing. Although the County and partner organizations are working on it, solutions are elusive.

Fifth, HOME Program requirements limit expenditures to completed projects. It takes considerable time (and money) to interview and qualify applicants, inspect properties, prepare work write-ups, cost estimates, and commission lead inspections. Applicants may, however, be ineligible and properties may not be repairable. In such instances, expenses have been incurred in good faith, but the Program allows reimbursement only if they are classified as administrative costs, limited to 10% of grant funds. This approach isn't viable for Macomb County, which has therefore and reluctantly, used CDBG funds to cover them. This hurts that program, which has its own purpose, objectives, and budgetary constraints. Regulatory relief would create a more customer-responsive program.

Sixth, the cost of Davis Bacon compliance is so onerous that several local communities will not use CDBG to finance construction projects. The County understands the statutory basis for these requirements, but must report the overwhelmingly negative reception in the community. Changes should be considered as HUD searches for ways to make its programs more customer-friendly.

Finally, although HUD is attempting to make IDIS user-friendly, much remains undone. IDIS still consumes too much staff time for too little local benefit. Unexplained changes have, for example, made it difficult to draw funds and set up projects; and simply downloading and printing the IDIS reports required for this document required much staff time and effort. IDIS remains a hurdle.

h) Status of Major Goals and Targets

The County's program is meeting major goals and objectives (please refer to the narrative on pp. 11-12). A summary follows:

- 1) Housing production (see table on p. 16) fell 3 units short of the annual objectives. This goal was ambitious, but the assistance provided approached projections.
- 2) County assistance to the CoC addressed capacity issues and increased the level of financial assistance for homeless programs and services. The County also assisted several independent homeless facilities and service providers.
- 3) A number of projects were implemented to replace or improve deteriorating infrastructure.
- 4) Public facilities, particularly senior centers, were built/improved, some as multi-year projects.

- 5) A number of public service activities addressed the needs of youth, senior citizens, at-risk families, abused women and children, and special needs populations.

These are significant, but we want more leverage to do more.

i) Adjustments & Improvements to Activities & Strategies

Although the County continues its search for new approaches in its CDBG and HOME programs, it did not, apart from creating the Macomb HOME Consortium, significantly alter its Consolidated Plan, approved by HUD on July 1, 2006. Several tactical changes were made to administration and the housing repair programs, and new programs are always possible, should funding emerge. Such changes, in reality, are not expected to be significant if they materialize.

Actions to Evaluate and Reduce Lead-Based Paint

The County has incorporated the provisions of the Lead Safe Housing Rule (LSHR) into its housing rehabilitation programs. Staff is trained, proficient, and State-certified. The County employs qualified contractors to perform lead-related repairs. Every property inspected for deficiencies is analyzed for the presence of lead-based paint and attendant hazards. All hazards identified are corrected during rehabilitation, using safe work practices, performed by certified contractors, with follow-up testing to ensure safety. The County is compliant with the LSHR.

Macomb County has not experienced, with the immediately following exception, difficulties because of the LSHR: Repair costs are higher, and some homes, repairable using non-compliant practices, become prohibitively expensive and are not, as a result, repaired. Resident children continue to live in lead-exposed unhealthy conditions, and may be at higher risk of lead poisoning than if their homes were repaired using non-compliant techniques. We have no empirical data to support this assertion, but believe it to be true.

Actions to Foster & Maintain Affordable Housing

The County, through DPED, provides planning services to communities. These include review and approval of master plans (emphasizing environmental considerations), reviewing proposals for compatibility with County parks and trails plans, working with communities to mitigate the effects of local plans on adjacent communities, and working with them to assure consistency with regional planning objectives. These functions do not directly affect housing. The County, however, does have a role in the administration and promotion of affordable housing programs. This role has expanded and we hope to continue that expansion in the future.

Specific Housing Objectives:

The following tables highlight accomplishments 1) progress in providing housing for extremely-low income, low-income and moderate-income households; 2) housing that meets Section 215 standards and; 3) efforts to address needs of worst case and disabled households.

Program	2006/7 Planned	2006/7 Completed	2005/6 Completed	2004/5 Completed	2003/4 Completed	2002/2003 Completed
Owner Housing						
CDBG Em. Repair	5	12	2	7	14	15
HOME Rehab	50	40	50	44	19	39
CHDO (HoM)	0	0	2	5	3	2
Owner Subtotal	55	52	54	56	41	64
Renter Housing						
CHDO (Springhill)	3	3	2	4	1	7
MSHDA	900	900	900	900	900	900
Salvation Army (TH)	0	0	84	84	62	62
Eastpointe HC	295	295	295	295	295	295
Mt. Clemens HC	288	288	288	288	288	288
New Haven HC	88	88	88	88	88	88
Renter Subtotal	1574	1574	1657	1,655	1,675	1,646
# Meeting 215	1,574	1,574	1,711	1,704	1,661	1,531

The following table identifies the assistance provided to ELI, VLI and LI households.

Renter	ELI	VLI	LI	Total	Type
HOME-Springhill	3	0	0	3	Dev-Disabled
Eastpointe HC	137	25	2	164	Elderly LRPB
Eastpointe HC	78	37	3	118	Section 8
Mt. Clemens HC	279	8	1	288	LRPB
New Haven HC	83	5	0	88	LRPB
MSHDA	675	135	90	900	Section 8
Total	1255	210	96	1561	

Actions to Improve Public Housing and Resident Initiatives

There is, as indicated, no County public housing commission, and no Low Rent Public Housing programs have therefore been directly undertaken by Macomb County. This section is therefore not applicable. It should be noted, however, that the 3 Macomb County housing commissions, identified in the preceding table, provided 540 low-rent public housing units in the County's jurisdiction. It should also be noted that each of the commissions has plans in place to maintain and improve the physical condition of units and management efficiency.

Actions to Remove Barriers to Affordable Housing

As previously indicated, Macomb County is economically diverse and offers affordable housing opportunities for people at various income levels. This is at least partly due to DPED's offering of comprehensive planning services to municipalities, and to its review and approval of master and site plans. It also offers housing rehabilitation, homebuyer assistance, and rental acquisition programs through a number of County agencies and through housing partners. The County is open to, and is seeking, new opportunities to expand the amount and type of affordable housing available in the County. Other actions have already been described.

Homeless Needs

1. Actions Taken to Address Needs of Homeless Persons

Despite limited resources, the County has addressed the needs of its homeless population as follows:

- There are several homeless shelters and transitional housing facilities located in Macomb County's corporate boundaries. Please refer to the narratives on pp. 7-8 and on pp. 20-21 for a listing of activities addressing the needs of homeless and at-risk populations.
- Several entities provide outreach and assistance to the homeless and those at-risk of homelessness. These include the Macomb County Departments of Health and Mental Health, MCCSA, the Macomb CoC, St. Vincent de Paul, Turning Point, Care House, Samaritan House, and Lighthouse Outreach. Each provides homeless prevention and/or assistance services. Without them, there would be more homeless and their condition more extreme.
- The County supports the Macomb CoC, an organization with a formal structure, by-laws, and IRS non-profit status. The County's Board of Commissioners authorized \$100,000 in CDBG financial assistance over four years for strategic planning purposes. The CoC obtained MSHDA and HUD homeless funding between 2004 and 2006. This strategy is working. The County has absorbed the CoC Coordinator position, to ensure sufficient resources for the position. This was a critical, and favorable, development.
- Individual communities have allocated CDBG funds to well-established provider organizations for homeless and special needs activities.
- As mentioned, DPED staff have worked with two CoC partners, Solid Ground and MCREST, to develop transitional housing.

These actions address the needs of the homeless and special needs populations.

2. New Federal Resources Obtained From Homeless SuperNOFA

Please refer to item 1 above.

Community Development Block Grant Program Narrative

1. Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives

a) Use of CDBG Funds for Consolidated Plan Priorities, Needs and Goals

Please refer to the narrative in Section 3 pp. 11-12.

b) Progress Made in Affordable Housing Goals through CDBG

Please refer to the tables and accompanying narratives on pp. 15-16.

c) Extent That CDBG Funds Benefited ELI, VLI, and LI Persons

\$2,606,346.13 was spent for activities that address the needs of LMI persons. This is 92% of total expenditures, and well over the 70% compliance threshold. IDIS Report CO4PR26

d) Compliance With Planning/Administrative, and With Public Service Caps

The County obligated \$259,455.66, 14.43% of all expenditures, for public services, and within the 15% maximum allowed by statute. It also spent \$276,569.13, or 15.35%, for planning and/or administration,. This, too, is within the statutory limit. Source: IDIS Report PR26.

2. Changes in Program Objectives

a) Nature of, and Reasons for, Changes in Program Objectives

No changes were made in program objectives.

b) Changes to be Made Based on Experience

Apart from the aforementioned program changes, and some opportunistic changes made to support homeless and transitional housing objectives, no programs have been altered.

3. Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Activities

a) Efforts to Obtain Resources Indicated in Consolidated Plan

The County and the MHC have obtained all resources identified in its Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans, and will continue to pursue every reasonable resource in the future.

b) Provision of Certifications of Consistency in Fair and Impartial Manner

The Consortium provided certifications of consistency for Public Housing Agency Plans submitted by the Eastpointe Housing Commission and by the Mt. Clemens Housing Commission. No other such requests were submitted for consideration.

c) Non-Hindrance of Consolidated Plan Implementation by Willful Action

The Consortium has taken reasoned and effective actions to implement all Consolidated Plan goals and objectives, as highlighted elsewhere in this report.

4. Funds Not Used for National Objectives

a) How CDBG Funds did not Meet National Objectives

All CDBG activities addressed one of two national objectives, activities principally benefiting lower-income persons, or activities addressing slums or blighted conditions, primarily on a spot

basis. The percentage of funds attributable to lower-income benefit was 92%. All CDBG projects undertaken during the reporting period addressed one of the national objectives.

b) How Non-Compliance with Overall Benefit Certification Occurred

See the immediately preceding item a.

5. Anti-Displacement and Relocation

a) Steps Taken to Minimize Displacement

Macomb County, as a matter of policy, does not displace households, and none were displaced during the reporting period as a result of Federal action. .

b) Steps Taken to Identify Entities Covered by URA and Section 104 (d)

No Federally assisted activities were taken during the reporting period which caused permanent involuntary displacement resulting from acquisition, demolition or rehabilitation of real property, or from the conversion of occupied or habitable low-income housing to other purposes.

c) Steps Taken to Ensure Timely Notices to Displaced Entities

This section is not applicable since no displacement resulted from federally assisted activities during the reporting period.

6. Low/Mod Job Activities

a) Efforts to Ensure First Consideration

The County has not, and does not intend to, implement any CDBG economic development activities. This section is therefore inapplicable.

b) Listing of Permanent Jobs Created and Retained and Those not Made Available to LMI Persons

This section is not applicable since Macomb County took no CDBG Economic Development activities during the reporting period.

c) Actions to Provide Skills, Education and Training for Skilled LMI Jobs

This section is not applicable to Macomb County, which undertook no CDBG Economic Development activities.

7. How Location, Nature etc. of Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities Demonstrates Compliance w/ LMI Benefit Objective

Macomb County implemented a number and variety of limited clientele activities. These can be divided into 4 major areas: 1) centers and services for the elderly and disabled, 2) homeless prevention facilities and services, 3) youth activities, and 4) family services. Of these, the first two are presumed to benefit lower-income people. Youth and family service activities require income verification as a pre-condition of receiving assistance. Verification is obtained and maintained by the provider, and is forwarded for County review when payment is requested.

8. Program Income Received

All program income received by the County comes from repayments of housing rehabilitation loans. There are two types of loan accounts generating income. First, there are repayments from installment loans. Second there are repayments on deferred interest loans. Income from the first will shrink as the pool of active loans is closed out. Income from deferred payment loans will continue into the future.

a) Amount of PI returned by Fund

Program Income: \$90,336,44 was received. Source: HUD IDIS Report PR26. All was spent for eligible CDBG activities.

b) Repayments for Float-Funded Activities

There were no float-funded activities during the reporting period.

c) Other Loan Repayments by Category

There were no other loan repayments during the reporting period.

d) PI Received From Sale of Property

No CDBG-related real property or personalty was sold during the reporting period.

9. Adjustments for Disallowed Costs

a) Activity Name and IDIS Number

No CDBG activities were disallowed during the program year.

b) Affected Program Year

Not applicable.

c) Amount of Repayment

Not applicable.

d) If Multi-Year Reimbursement, Amount and Schedule for Reimbursement

Not applicable.

10. Loans and Other Receivables

a) Principal Balance for Each Float-Funded Activity

There were no float-funded activities undertaken during the reporting period.

b) Total Number Outstanding Loans and Principal Balance as of End of Reporting Period

Please refer to Attachment 3 for a list of installment loans currently outstanding.

c) List of Forgivable and Deferred Loans

Please refer to Attachment 3 for a list of deferred payment loans currently outstanding. No forgivable loans were made from the CDBG program.

d) Number of CDBG Defaulted Loans

There were no defaulted loans during the reporting period.

e) List of For Sale Properties Acquired/Improved with CDBG Funds

There are no CDBG-assisted properties acquired or improved that are for sale.

11. Lump Sum Draw-down Agreements

The County has no lump sum draw-down agreement. This section is therefore not applicable.

12. Housing Rehabilitation

a) Number of Projects and Units Completed for Each Program

Please refer to the narrative and table found on pp. 15-16.

b) Total CDBG Funds in Each Program

c) Other Public and Private Funds Used

Several homeowners contributed funds to pay costs not permitted for housing rehabilitation, typically when the project costs exceeded the loan limits and the owner agreed to pay the excess cost out-of-pocket, or when the owner desired non-essential improvements, based on style or other preferences.

13. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas – Progress in Achieving Benchmark Objectives

This Section is not applicable since Macomb County has no neighborhood revitalization strategy areas as defined by HUD.

Anti-Poverty Strategy

The County's Anti-Poverty strategy, outlined on p. 18 of the 2006 Annual Plan, coordinates activities between the departments responsible for its implementation. MCCSA and DPED have jointly targeted and leveraged resources, particularly housing resources, when possible, to address LMI needs. Examples follow, which have improved the quality of life for many families.

- DPED work with MCCSA to combine weatherization and emergency repairs. This allows for a more extensive degree of repair than would otherwise be possible. There is no data, however, indicating whether combined projects occurred during the reporting period.
- MCCSA administers the County's ADDI program, based on its highly successful IDA program. DPED retains overall responsibility for grant management. To date 12 families have been approved, and one additional family has already purchased its home.
- Within DPED, the Small Business Technology Development Center works with start-up businesses (including micro-enterprises), providing free consultative assistance and formalized training in business basics.
- The SBTDC Business Counselor also worked with three non-profit organizations during the reporting period to develop business plans that will help them operate successfully.
- Outreach is provided to W/MBE's and we have partnered with the MMBDC to provide minority business and employment opportunities throughout the County.
- Work with the CoC, Solid Ground, MCREST, Samaritan House, Lighthouse Outreach, Turning Point, and other agencies, has enabled the County to address its homeless and at-risk populations. It financially assists the above-named organizations.

These actions have mitigated the effects of poverty in Macomb County.

Non-Homeless Special Needs

The County has sponsored several activities to address the needs of special needs populations. These include assistance to the following organizations:

- Care House: advocates for, and assists, children who have been sexually abused, or who have suffered from criminal acts. During the reporting period, 248 young people suspected to have been severely physically or sexually abused were assisted. All were under the age of 18. Although the target population is for children over 12, 112 were 6 or younger, 122 were between 7 and 12, and 13 were 12 or over. Family counseling was also provided for a cumulative assistance total of 545⁵ people.

⁵ Data used was reported for 2004 program year, since no new data was made available, and given likely continued performance at previous levels.

- Turning Point: advocated for, and assisted victims of domestic violence. Roughly 4,500 individuals were served during the reporting period, receiving counseling and advocacy services, forensic examinations, emergency shelter, educational presentations, crisis intervention, and sponsoring community conferences.
- Samaritan House: assisted a total of 6,790 individuals with emergency food, shelter, and utility allowances.
- St. Vincent de Paul: (St. Mary Queen of Creation) provided emergency payments to prevent utility shutoffs and homelessness. A total of 119 families received utility and rent assistance during the reporting period.
- Lighthouse Outreach Center: assisted several thousand at-risk families with emergency food, clothing, toys, money to prevent utility shutoff and other emergency needs, and counseling. It received several semi-truckloads of food for distribution during the reporting period. Through MCCSA, it provided bulk food to approximately 1,800 families per month.
- MCREST: provided emergency shelter and operational materials for those shelters. It also started a relapse/prevention program for clients, and continued its 90-day intensive case management program. Over 1,100 people have been provided emergency shelter during the reporting period, based on 2004 data. CDBG funds were used to pay for the costs of shelter and materials required to operate the facilities.
- Springhill Housing Corporation: provided affordable rental units for developmentally-disabled individuals, and supportive housing services. One additional unit was purchased during the reporting period, with 10 individuals assisted to date. SHC also received supportive housing grants for the County's CoC. These have expanded services available to the homeless.
- MCCSA provided home-buyer assistance, home chore services to 16,300 persons, emergency medical assistance to roughly 350 persons, emergency food and heating assistance, transportation, nutrition, food stamps and Head Start instruction to hundreds of low-income County residents. All are designed to help at-risk families escape from poverty.

These actions are significant, and underscore the County's commitment to providing all possible assistance to those who need it.

HOME Narrative

1. Assessment of Progress Made in Implementing HOME Program Objectives

The County implemented its ADDI program during the reporting period. Ten homebuyer commitments have been made to date, and one additional family having purchased its home. MCCSA staff, which manages ADDI, is working to qualify other homebuyers and ensure that those already approved complete the program, and purchase their homes.

The level of HOME program activity was considerably higher during the reporting period compared to the preceding year. As indicated, \$1,819,727.42 was spent for housing rehabilitation during the reporting period.

With continuing maturation of staff on the job, plus revamped policies and procedures, the program is stronger than ever.

Administrative improvements included:

- new monitoring procedures to assure HQS compliance in rental properties receiving HOME assistance, and to assure income eligibility of tenants occupying them.
- revamped citizen participation guidelines, which have improved stakeholder, if not citizen, input into the development of the Consolidated Plan.
- staff training including LSHR, Uniform Act, and HUD performance measures, have increased capacity to comply with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the program.
- streamlined sub-recipient forms and new Agreements designed to strengthen administrative controls over the program.

2. The results of on-site rental housing inspections:

The County of Macomb has contracted with the Springhill Housing Corporation to provide rental-housing. Eight units have been purchased and occupied, starting three years ago. Inspections continue, and we monitored the CHDO in early 2007. All units have therefore been monitored in compliance with HOME Program regulations, and meet standards for habitability.

3. Assessment of Affirmative Marketing Actions:

As indicated previously, the MMBDC posts CDBG bid announcements to facilitate member (MBE) consideration of County contracting opportunities. Please refer to the attached HUD 40107, which shows a high level of participation by WBE's. One MBE sub-contractor worked on a County project during the reporting period.

Most County HOME funding is used for homeowner rehabilitation, with the exception of CHDO activities. There have been no developments of 5 or more units to date. Even though the compliance threshold has not been crossed, the County and its CHDO's conduct affirmative outreach to the entire potential market in order to ensure that fair and equal housing (when applicable) and contracting opportunities occur, in accordance with 24CFR 92.351.

4. An Assessment of Outreach to W/MBE's:

Macomb County has, despite best efforts, experienced a low level of participation by women's and minority business enterprises, particularly minority businesses, in its CDBG and HOME programs. Progress occurred during the reporting period, primarily due the County/MMBDC collaboration. Examples follow:

- DPED was the lead sponsor of a minority business conference at Macomb Community College in February 2005. Representatives from the County, local government, and W/MBE firms gathered to network. This event was successful in achieving its stated objective.
- MMBDC distributes bid announcements to all members by e-mail so that member firms can consider and respond to any contracting opportunities that they are interested in. This followed a 2005 contractor's meeting in order to identify and qualify new contractors for its housing repair programs. Although one MBE followed up, it failed to submit the necessary documentation to establish eligibility, and it did not receive any work as a result.
- DPED implemented a revamped W/MBE contractor solicitation procedure in 2006. Using its relationship with the MMBDC, it posts bid invitations with the MMBDC, thereby encouraging participation.

5. Analysis of Fund Distribution to Housing Needs in Consolidated Plan:

The County has limited HOME Program funding to address the identified needs in a significant manner. HOME is, however, the major funding source available and the County, through its Board of Commissioners, has sought to use it wisely as follows:

- A major portion of its HOME is allocated to homeowner rehabilitation. This program provides moderate level subsidies (typically up to \$20,000 per unit) to bring homes to local code and Section 8 HQS. Forty homes were repaired during the reporting period.
- It has, through Springhill Housing Corporation, acquired 1 additional rental unit for disabled individuals, primarily those with developmental disabilities. Seven units have been acquired to date and six occupied.
- Twenty homebuyers are enrolled in the County's ADDI program and are currently receiving homebuyer education and amassing down-payments. ADDI will match homebuyer savings at a 3:1 ratio. All purchasers have up to 24 months to achieve their savings targets, and complete other due diligence requirements. Three families have purchased a home.
- Although not integral to the HOME program, staff is aware of the affordable housing dearth, particularly rental units and housing for at-risk of residents. The County is promoting alternate modes of affordable housing.

6. HOME Match Report

Please refer to HUD 40107-A following this narrative.

7. HOME W/MBE Report

Please refer to HUD 40107 following this narrative.

Emergency Shelter Narrative

Macomb County does not receive ESG funding and this section is not applicable.

HOPWA Narrative

Macomb County does not receive HOPWA funding and this section is not applicable.

Public Participation Narrative

1. Macomb County received a total of \$1,710,959 in CDBG funding, \$1,407,116 in HOME funding and \$34,500 in ADDI funding during the reporting period. It received \$90,336.44 in CDBG program income, according to IDIS report PR26, and \$505,667.70 in HOME program income. The amounts committed and the funds distributed geographically have already been reviewed.

2. Summary of accomplishments by priority need: Macomb County achieved the following during the reporting period:

- a. Public Services: several thousand persons were served during the reporting period.
- b. Public Facilities and Infrastructure: 19 projects were assisted during the reporting period.
- c. Economic Development: no economic development projects occurred during the reporting period, since assistance is rendered through the County's Small Business and Technology Development Center.

Appendices

HUD 40107 - W/MBE Report

HUD 40107-A -HOME Match Report

IDIS Reports PR03, PR06 PR26, PR33