

# Grantee: Hamilton County, OH

## Grant: B-08-UN-39-0004

### April 1, 2021 thru June 30, 2021 Performance Report

<b>Grant Number:</b> B-08-UN-39-0004	<b>Obligation Date:</b>	<b>Award Date:</b>
<b>Grantee Name:</b> Hamilton County, OH	<b>Contract End Date:</b>	<b>Review by HUD:</b> Reviewed and Approved
<b>Grant Award Amount:</b> \$7,970,490.00	<b>Grant Status:</b> Active	<b>QPR Contact:</b> No QPR Contact Found
<b>LOCCS Authorized Amount:</b> \$7,970,490.00	<b>Estimated PI/RL Funds:</b> \$1,550,000.00	
<b>Total Budget:</b> \$9,520,490.00		

### Disasters:

#### Declaration Number

NSP

### Narratives

#### Areas of Greatest Need:

Hamilton County, Ohio is made up of 48 cities, villages, and townships outside the central city of Cincinnati. Of these 48 communities, 40 participate in the County’s Entitlement CDBG Program. All of this area has been impacted by the foreclosure crisis, but some areas have been impacted more severely than others. In determining what data would be helpful to determine the areas of greatest need, staff from the Departments of Community Development, Regional Planning, and County Commissioners reviewed information from the Clerk of Courts and Auditor’s office regarding foreclosure filings and completed foreclosures, studies completed by Working in Neighborhoods (a non-profit developer and counseling agency), and data provided by HUD, including USPS vacancy rates, Low/Mod/Middle income data, Estimated Foreclosure abandonment risk score, HMDA high cost loan rates, and predicted 18 month underlying problem foreclosure rate. This data was examined at the community level, broken down by census tract and block group. Further information regarding the final areas of greatest need is described below. To identify communities to be targeted with NSP funds, we began by examining a previously published report on Hamilton County’s foreclosure problem. The statistics in this report indicated that there were natural breaks in the data when attempting to identify communities most severely impacted. In other words, it seemed readily apparent which communities were most affected. To further validate this observation we examined the Hamilton County Clerk of Court’s records for foreclosures completed during the period from 1/1/2006 to approximately 10/15/08. Total foreclosures were calculated for each of our participating communities and were then divided by the total number of housing units in that community. The resulting “Foreclosures as a Percentage of Housing Units” allowed us to rank communities on this basis. Total foreclosures in community 2006-2008 = Foreclosures as % of Housing Units Total housing units in community A baseline of >2% was set as the minimum required in order to receive further consideration for targeting. Communities meeting the >2% minimum were then compared using foreclosure data provided by HUD. To be further considered for targeting, communities had to meet the following parameters: • “Estimated foreclosure abandonment risk score” of 8 or above in a minimum of 50% of block groups; • Community average for “Predicted 18 month underlying problem foreclosure rate” of 6% or more; • Minimum of 50% of block groups classified as “low moderate middle income eligible”. After tabulating these measurements a list of approximately 20 communities remained that were potentially eligible for targeting. At this point a decision was made to eliminate from consideration any community with less than 1,000 housing units. Although these communities had relatively high foreclosure rates, the actual number of foreclosures was minimal when compared to larger jurisdictions. A portion of our NSP funding has been reserved for such areas, i.e., small pockets where foreclosure is a problem, yet not large enough to justify designation as a targeted area. In the end, a total of 15 jurisdictions within Hamilton County qualified for targeting.

#### Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

As described in the section above, the data used to analyze the areas of greatest need in Hamilton County consisted of the following: (1) numbers and % of completed foreclosures from 2006, 2007, and 2008 through 10/15/08, obtained from the Clerk of Courts office, (2) data supplied from HUD indicating the percentage of loans in each block group that were classified as a high cost loan per HMDA , (3) the HUD supplied “Estimated Foreclosure Abandonment Risk Score”, (4) the HUD supplied “Predicted 18 month underlying problem foreclosure rate”, (5) the HUD supplied “USPS residential vacancy rate”, and (6) the HUD supplied data indicating the numbers of households, by census tract and block group, below 120% of median income. The first 3 points of data address the required areas of the statute, where the greatest percentage of home foreclosures, the highest percentage of homes financed by a subprime mortgage related loan, and identified as likely to face a significant rise in the rate of home foreclosures, be used in the targeting. In determining the uses of the funds, the Department of Community Development and the Board of County Commissioners arranged several meetings with the communities identified as targeted, to educate them about the NSP program and eligible uses, and to receive input regarding the needs of the communities. Using a survey instrument, information was collected to identify the most common types of projects that would be needed by these communities, and approximate total funding needs for each activity. In determining distribution of the funds, the number of foreclosures, using 2006, 2007, and 2008 data through 10/15/08, was

ranked by targeted community, and funds were allocated by means of a funding cap, in that order. A decision was made to allocate the funds to different projects, and then to impose a cap by community, to access these funds. Communities that will access funds for projects that create program income will then be able to access more funding in the future by having the program income replenish the funds in their allocation cap. The charts identified below demonstrate the allocations for different projects and the funding caps by targeted community. NSP Activities and Costs Activity Average Cost # of homes Cost/home Total Cost Program Income # of homes Valley Homes Redevelopment 25% of NSP funds 13 \$153,308 \$1,993,000 Acquisition (for demolition) avg. of \$25,000 subsidy/house 40 \$25,000 \$1,000,000 Demolition (residential) avg. of \$8500/house 85 \$8,500 \$722,500 Demolition (commercial) avg. of \$16,500/commercial 20 \$16,500 \$330,000 Acquisition (for rehab) avg. of \$40,000 subsidy/house 26 \$40,000 \$1,040,000 \$832,000 20 Rehab or New Construction avg. of \$60,000 subsidy/house 26 \$60,000 \$1,560,000 \$1,248,000 20 Homebuyer Downpayment Assistance avg. of \$5,000/buyer 26 \$5,000 \$130,000 Homebuyer Soft Second Mortgage avg. of \$10,000/buyer 26 \$10,000 \$260,000 Homebuyer Counseling avg. of \$750/buyer 26 \$750 \$19,500 Appraisal and Legal Services avg. of \$1800/house 66 \$1,800 \$118,800 Administration 10% of grant \$797,050 Total \$7,970,850 \$2,080,000 Grand total \$10,050,850 (with anticipated program income) Spending Caps by Community Jurisdiction # Foreclosures 2006 - 2008 Funding Cap Appraisal/Legal Services 25% rental Admin Colerain Township 844 \$585,000 Springfield Township 610 \$510,000 Forest Park 434 \$435,000 Norwood 289 \$375,000 North College Hill 229 \$350,000 Cheviot 145 \$300

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

,000 Golf Manor 108 \$260,000 Mt. Healthy 106 \$260,000 St. Bernard 87 \$235,000 Cleves 75 \$230,000 Lincoln Heights 73 \$230,000 Elmwood Place 69 \$225,000 Lockland 68 \$225,000 Silverton 63 \$225,000 Woodlawn 50 \$215,000 Balance of County \$400,000 Subtotal \$5,060,000 \$120,000 \$1,993,000 \$797,000 Total of all funds \$7,970,000 In determining the use of the 25% of funds to go to households at or below 50% of median income, discussions indicated that the use of these funds would mainly have to be rental, as t

Definitions and Descriptions:

Low Income Targeting:

Acquisition and Relocation:

Public Comment:

Overall	This Report Period	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	\$0.00	\$9,363,538.34
Total Budget	\$0.00	\$9,363,538.34
Total Obligated	\$0.00	\$9,327,460.96
Total Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$9,190,460.37
Program Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$7,970,490.00
Program Income Drawdown	\$0.00	\$1,219,970.37
Program Income Received	\$0.00	\$1,219,970.37
Total Funds Expended	\$0.00	\$9,190,460.37
HUD Identified Most Impacted and Distressed	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Funds	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
Match Funds	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
Non-Match Funds	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

Funds Expended

Overall	This Period	To Date
Cincinnati Habitat for Humanity	\$ 0.00	\$ 201,853.04
Cincinnati Housing Partners	\$ 0.00	\$ 302,199.29
Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority	\$ 0.00	\$ 60,000.00
Community Action Agency	\$ 0.00	\$ 18,739.74
Hamilton County Community Development Department	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,465,907.13
Homesteading and Urban Redevelopment Corporation	\$ 0.00	\$ 2,777,284.46
Model Group	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,993,000.00
Volunteers of America Greater Ohio	\$ 0.00	\$ 371,476.71

## Progress Toward Required Numeric Targets

Requirement	Target	Projected	Actual
Overall Benefit Percentage	99.99%	.00%	.00%
Minimum Non Federal Match	\$.00	\$7,939,648.00	\$.00
Overall Benefit Amount	\$8,705,677.77	\$.00	\$.00
Limit on Public Services	\$1,195,573.50	\$.00	\$.00
Limit on Admin/Planning	\$797,049.00	\$813,941.58	\$715,675.45
Limit on Admin	\$.00	\$813,941.58	\$715,675.45
Most Impacted and Distressed	\$.00	\$.00	\$.00
Progress towards LH25 Requirement	\$2,380,122.50		\$2,708,229.44

## Overall Progress Narrative:

No activity in this quarter

## Project Summary

Project #, Project Title	This Report	To Date	
	Program Funds Drawdown	Project Funds Budgeted	Program Funds Drawdown
9999, Restricted Balance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
NSP - 1, Redevelopment - rental properties for <50%	\$0.00	\$1,993,000.00	\$1,993,000.00
NSP - 2, Acquisition for Rehabilitation	\$0.00	\$3,180,020.45	\$2,385,874.30
NSP - 3, Demolition of residential and commercial property	\$0.00	\$1,373,891.37	\$1,059,937.28
NSP - 4, Acquisition of Residential properties for	\$0.00	\$2,050,822.62	\$1,907,415.05
NSP - 6, Administration	\$0.00	\$817,005.56	\$563,513.37
NSP - 7, Purchase and Rehab - Homebuyer Counseling	\$0.00	\$750.00	\$750.00
NSP- 8, Acquisition/Redevelopment of rental- West Union	\$0.00	\$105,000.00	\$60,000.00