

**Grantee: Louisiana**

**Grant: B-08-DN-22-0001**

**April 1, 2019 thru June 30, 2019 Performance Report**

---



**Grant Number:**

B-08-DN-22-0001

**Obligation Date:**

09/20/2009

**Award Date:**

03/20/2009

**Grantee Name:**

Louisiana

**Contract End Date:**

03/20/2013

**Review by HUD:**

Reviewed and Approved

**Grant Award Amount:**

\$34,183,994.00

**Grant Status:**

Active

**QPR Contact:**

James V McDonnell

**LOCCS Authorized Amount:**

\$34,183,994.00

**Estimated PI/RL Funds:**

\$1,492,496.02

**Total Budget:**

\$35,676,490.02

## Disasters:

### Declaration Number

NSP

## Narratives

### Areas of Greatest Need:

Under the Housing and Economic Recovery Act (HERA) of 2008, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allocated \$34,183,994 in grant funds to the State of Louisiana. It has been determined that the Louisiana Office of Community Development (OCD) will receive the allocated grant funds, referred to as the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP). The Office of Community Development has designated the Louisiana Housing Finance Agency (LHFA) as the lead agency in distributing and monitoring the expenditures of these funds according to the guidelines outlined by HERA and guidance published in the October 6, 2008 Federal Register. OCD will be responsible for the oversight of the agreement between OCD and LHFA which will define the roles and responsibilities of each agency. Activities included in the NSP Substantial Amendment provide for the allocation of NSP funds to areas of greatest need identified throughout the State of Louisiana. The funds are intended to return foreclosed, abandoned or blighted property to the market in order to stabilize neighborhoods. One hundred percent of NSP funds must be used to benefit individuals and households that do not exceed 120% of area median income (AMI). Twenty five percent of the funds must be used to benefit persons at or below 50% AMI. OCD and the LHFA strongly encourage grantees to use NSP funds not only to stabilize neighborhoods in the short term, but to strategically incorporate modern, green building and energy efficient improvements in all NSP activities to provide for long term affordability and increased sustainability and attractiveness of housing and neighborhoods.

### Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

The State has determined the intent of this program is to stabilize neighborhoods, and given that available resources are scarce; it is in the State's best interest to designate a small area of concentrated need as the area of greatest need. By selecting this approach over one that would produce a larger area, the State believes that it will be better able to make a noticeable and significant impact on the ongoing stability of the selected neighborhoods. To determine the areas of greatest need within HUD's designated 8,661 Census Block Groups, the State considered four (4) factors using data made available by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The review considered all block groups Statewide, including those located within jurisdictions eligible to receive a direct award of NSP funds. These factors considered were • Estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score, • HMDA high cost loan rate, • USPS residential vacancy rate and • Predicted eighteen (18) months underlying problem foreclosure rate. The process was as follows: First, the State considered the estimated foreclosure abandonment. In Louisiana these scores ranged from a low of zero (0) for nine block groups to a high of ten (10) for eighthundred and sixtytwo (862) block groups. Since the 862 block groups that received a score of 10 represented nearly ten percent (10%) of the total number of block groups, it was decided that this would be the cut off point for determining greatest need. Second, the State rated all 8,660 block groups by the percentage of high cost loans. In Louisiana the percentage of high cost loans ranged from a low of zero percent (0%) for twentyfive block groups to a high of eightyeight and nine tenths percent (88.9%) for two block groups. The ten percent cutoff was fiftyseven and six tenths percent (57.6%). Third, the State considered the USPS residential vacancy rate. In Louisiana this rate ranged from a low of zero percent for onethousand nine hundred and eight (1,908) block groups to a high of forty six and four tenths (46.4%) for two block groups. The ten percent cutoff was seven and four tenths percent (7.4%). Fourth, the State looked at the predicted eighteen (18) months underlying problem foreclosure rate. In Louisiana these ranged from a low of zero (0%) for twenty block groups to a high of twelve and three tenths (12.3%) for two block groups. The ten percent cutoff was eight and one tenth percent (8.1%). After ranking the block groups by estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score, the State then eliminated all block groups that did not also receive the minimum (top 10%) score for high cost loans. Then the State further eliminated the block groups that failed to meet the minimum 10% threshold for USPS residential vacancy, and removed any block group that was not middle, low, moderate income eligible by program rule. The above methodology left one hundred and ninetytwo (192) block groups that were deemed to have the greatest need. These 192 block groups contain 128,044



people, of which 108,298 or 84.6 percent are middle income or less. They represent those block groups scoring the most severe conditions across all four (4) of the factors for low/moderate/middle income areas and are determined to be the areas of greatest need within the State. The block groups with the greatest need as determined by the State are located primarily in North Louisiana and in the South Louisiana me

**Distribution and and Uses of Funds:**

tropolitan areas of Baton Rouge and New Orleans. The City of Shreveport contains thirty]two percent (32%) of the one hundred and ninetytwo neediest block groups (62 total block groups), including the two block groups that scored highest on foreclosure abandonment, high cost loans and predicted 18 months underlying problem foreclosure rate. Additionally the City of Shreveport contains 35 of the 100 neediest block groups within Louisiana and four of the ten neediest. The City of Alexandria has 13 of

**Definitions and Descriptions:**

**Low Income Targeting:**

**Acquisition and Relocation:**

**Public Comment:**

Overall	This Report Period	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	\$35,275,838.29
Total Budget	(\$400,651.53)	\$35,275,838.29
Total Obligated	\$0.00	\$35,204,770.44
Total Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$34,642,685.49
Program Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$33,567,716.00
Program Income Drawdown	\$0.00	\$1,074,969.49
Program Income Received	\$0.00	\$1,074,969.49
Total Funds Expended	\$0.00	\$35,058,883.22
Most Impacted and Distressed Expended	\$0.00	\$0.00
Match Contributed	\$0.00	\$79,769.37

**Progress Toward Required Numeric Targets**

Requirement	Target	Actual
Overall Benefit Percentage (Projected)		0.00%
Overall Benefit Percentage (Actual)		0.00%
Minimum Non-Federal Match	\$0.00	\$79,769.37
Limit on Public Services	\$5,127,599.10	\$0.00
Limit on Admin/Planning	\$3,418,399.40	\$3,198,339.48
Limit on Admin	\$0.00	\$3,198,339.48
Most Impacted and Distressed Threshold (Projected)	\$0.00	\$0.00
Progress towards LH25 Requirement	\$8,919,122.51	\$14,135,040.41

**Overall Progress Narrative:**



No expenditures this period.

## Project Summary

Project #, Project Title	This Report Period	To Date	
	Program Funds Drawdown	Project Funds Budgeted	Program Funds Drawdown
100, OCD Administration	\$0.00	\$791,176.72	\$445,595.59
101, LHFA's Administration	\$0.00	\$2,734,719.20	\$2,666,861.16
200, Homeownership Development	\$0.00	\$9,852,908.13	\$8,844,346.46
301, Rental Housing Development	\$0.00	\$21,425,142.85	\$20,816,747.64
400, Land Banking Assistance	\$0.00	\$834,773.12	\$758,395.15
500, Homebuyer Counseling	\$0.00	\$37,770.00	\$35,770.00



## Monitoring, Audit, and Technical Assistance

Event Type	This Report Period	To Date
Monitoring, Audits, and Technical Assistance	0	43
Monitoring Visits	0	22
Audit Visits	0	0
Technical Assistance Visits	0	21
Monitoring/Technical Assistance Visits	0	0
Report/Letter Issued	0	3

